WRITINGS OF A A HODGE

by A.A. Hodge

A collection of theological writings, sermons, and essays by A.A. Hodge, compiled for study and devotional reading.

119 Chapters

Table of Contents

1. 00.00. Hodge, A. A. - Library
2. 01.00a. Introduction
3. 01.00b. Contents
4. 01.01. Of the Holy Scripture
5. 01.02. Of God and the Holy Trinity
6. 01.03. Of God's Eternal Decree
7. 01.04. Of Creation
8. 01.05. Of Providence
9. 01.06. Of The Fall of Man, of Sin, and of the Punishment Thereof
10. 01.07. Of God's Covenant With Man
11. 01.08. Of Christ The Mediator
12. 01.09. Of Free Will
13. 01.10. Of Effectual Calling
14. 01.11. Of Justification
15. 01.12. Of Adoption
16. 01.13. Of Sanctification
17. 01.14. Of Saving Faith
18. 01.15. Of Repentance Unto Life
19. 01.16. Of Good Works
20. 01.17. Of the Perseverance of the Saints
21. 01.18. Of Assurance of Grace and Salvation
22. 01.19. Of the Law of God
23. 01.20. Of Christian Liberty and Liberty of Conscience
24. 01.21. Of Religious Worship and the Sabbath Day
25. 01.22. Of Lawful Oaths and Vows
26. 01.23. Of the Civil Magistrate
27. 01.24. Of Marriage and Divorce
28. 01.25. Of the Church
29. 01.26. Of the Communion of the Saints
30. 01.27. Of the Sacraments
31. 01.28. Of Baptism
32. 01.29. Of the Lord's Supper
33. 01.30. Of Church Censures
34. 01.31. Of Synods and Councils
35. 01.32. Of the State of Men after Death, and of the Resurrection of the Dead
36. 01.33. Of the Last Judgment
37. 02.0.1. OUTLINES OF THEOLOGY
38. 02.0.2. Table of Contents
39. 02.0.3. Preface to First Edition

40. 02.0.4. Preface to Revised and Enlarged Edition
41. 02.01. Christian Theology; Its Several Branches; And Their Relation to Other...
42. 02.02. Origin of the Idea of God and Proof of His Existence.
43. 02.03. The Sources of Theology.
44. 02.04. The Inspiration of the Bible.
45. 02.05. The Rule of Faith and Practice
46. 02.06. A Comparison of Systems
47. 02.07. Creeds and Confessions
48. 02.08. The Attributes of God
49. 02.09. The Holy Trinity.
50. 02.10. The Decrees God in General.
51. 02.11. Predestination.
52. 02.12. The Creation of the World
53. 02.13. Angels
54. 02.14. Providence
55. 02.15. The Moral Constitution of the Soul, Will, Liberty, Etc.
56. 02.16. Creation and Original State of Man.
57. 02.17. Covenant of Works.
58. 02.18. The Nature of Sin and the Sin of Adam.
59. 02.19. Original Sin (Peccatum Habituale)
60. 02.20. Inability.
61. 02.21. Imputation of Adam's First Sin.
62. 02.22. The Covenant of Grace.
63. 02.23. The Person of Christ
64. 02.24. Mediatorial Office of Christ.
65. 02.25. The Atonement:its Nature, Necessity, Perfection, and Extent.
66. 02.26. The Intercession of Christ.
67. 02.27. Mediatorial Kingship of Christ.
68. 02.28. Effectual Calling
69. 02.29. Regeneration.
70. 02.30. Faith.
71. 02.31. Union of Believers Christ.
72. 02.32. Repentance, and the Romish Doctrine of Penance.
73. 02.33. Justification.
74. 02.34. Adoption, and the Order of Grace Application of Redemption, in the Se...
75. 02.35. Sanctification.
76. 02.36. Perseverance Saints.
77. 02.37. Death and the State of the Soul After Death
78. 02.38. The Resurrection
79. 02.39. The Second Advent and General Judgment.
80. 02.40. Heaven and Hell
81. 02.41. Sacraments

82. 02.42. Baptism:its Nature and Design, Mode, Subjects, Efficacy and Necessity
83. 02.43. The Lords Supper.
84. 03.0.1. POPULAR LECTURES ON THEOLOGICAL THEMES.
85. 03.0.2. Table of Contents
86. 03.0.3. Preface
87. 03.01. LECTURE 01 - GOD-HIS NATURE AND RELATION TO THE UNIVERSE
88. 03.02. LECTURE 02 - THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE.
89. 03.03. LECTURE 03 - MIRACLES.
90. 03.04. LECTURE 04 - THE HOLY SCRIPTURES-THE CANON AND INSPIRATION.
91. 03.05. LECTURE 05 - PRAYER AND THE PRAYER-CURE.
92. 03.06. LECTURE 06 - THE TRINITY OF PERSONS IN THE GODHEAD.
93. 03.07. LECTURE 07 - PREDESTINATION.
94. 03.08. LECTURE 08 - THE ORIGINAL STATE OF MAN.
95. 03.09. LECTURE 09 - GOD'S COVENANTS WITH MAN-THE CHURCH.
96. 03.10. LECTURE 10 - THE PERSON OF CHRIST.
97. 03.11. LECTURE 11 - THE OFFICES OF CHRIST
98. 03.12. LECTURE 12 - THE KINGLY OFFICE OF CHRIST
99. 03.13. LECTURE 13 - THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST
100. 03.14. LECTURE 14 - THE LAW OF THE KINGDOM
101. 03.15. LECTURE 15 - SANCTIFICATION AND GOOD WORKS-HIGHER LIFE
102. 03.16. LECTURE 16 - THE SACRAMENTS
103. 03.17. LECTURE 17 - THE LORD'S SUPPER
104. 03.18. LECTURE 18 - THE STATE OF MAN AFTER DEATH AND THE RESURRECTION.
105. 03.19. LECTURE 19 - FINAL REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS
106. S. A Short History of Creeds and Confessions
107. S. Assurance and Humility
108. S. Free Will
109. S. GOD -- His Nature And Relation To The Universe
110. S. God's Covenants With Man--The Church
111. S. Predestination
112. S. ROMANS CHAPTER 5:1-11
113. S. Regeneration
114. S. Sacraments - Baptism
115. S. Sanctification
116. S. Sola Scriptura "The Rule Of Faith And Practice"
117. S. THE ORDO SALUTIS
118. S. The Holy Scriptures - The Canon and Inspiration
119. S. The Inspiration of The Bible

Chapter 1

00.00. Hodge, A. A. - Library

Hodge, A. A. - Library Hodge, A. A. - Commentary on The Westminster Confession of Faith Hodge, A. A. - Outlines of Theology Hodge, A. A. - Popular Lectures on Theological Themes S. A Short History of Creeds and Confessions S. Assurance and Humility

S. Free Will S. God’s Covenants With Man--The Church S. GOD -- His Nature And Relation To The Universe S. Predestination

S. Regeneration S. ROMANS CHAPTER 5:1-11 S. Sacraments - Baptism S. Sanctification S. Sola Scriptura "The Rule Of Faith And Practice S. The Inspiration of The Bible S. The Holy Scriptures - The Canon and Inspiration S. THE ORDO SALUTIS

01.00a. Introduction

A.A. Hodge: Biographical overview

Archibald Alexander Hodge (1823-1886), an American Presbyterian leader, was the principal of Princeton Seminary between 1878 and 1886. He was the son of Charles Hodge and named after the first principal of Princeton Seminary, Archibald Alexander.

A. A. Hodge attended the College of New Jersey (later Princeton University) and Princeton Theological Seminary, and, after spending three years (1847-1850) in India as a missionary, held pastorates at Lower West Nottingham, Maryland (1851-1855), Fredericksburg, Virginia (1855-1861), and Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania (1861-1864). In 1864 he accepted a call to the chair of systematic theology in the Western Theological Seminary (later Pittsburgh Theological Seminary) in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. There he remained until in 1877 he was called to Princeton to be the associate of his father in the chair of systematic theology, to the full duties of which he succeeded in 1878. This post he retained till his death. At the time of his death, Hodge was in the zenith of his powers. Every element that entered into his eminent reputation put on its best expression during the closing years of his life. He was public-spirited, and helped every good cause. He was a trustee of the College of New Jersey and a leading man in the Presbyterian Church. He was a man of wide interests and touched the religious world at many points. During the years immediately preceding his death he was writing, preaching, lecturing, making addresses, coming into contact with men, influencing them, and by doing so widening the influence of the Christianity.

Hodge's distinguishing characteristic as a theologian was his power as a thinker. He had a mind of singular acuteness, and though never a professed student of metaphysics, he was essentially and by nature a metaphysician. His theology was that of the Reformed confessions. He had no peculiar views and no peculiar method of organizing theological dogmas; and though he taught the same theology that his father had taught before him, he was independent as well as reverent. His first book and that by which he is best known was his Outlines of Theology, which was translated into Welsh, modern Greek, and Hindustani. The Atonement is still one of the best treatises on the subject. This was followed by his commentary on the Westminster Confession of Faith, a very useful book, full of clear thinking and compact statement. He contributed some important articles to encyclopedias – Johnson's, McClintock and Strong's, and the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. He was one of the founders of the Presbyterian Review, to the pages of which he was a frequent contributor.

01.00b. Contents

Contents Chapter 1. Of The Holy Scripture Chapter 2. Of God and of the Holy Trinity Chapter 3. Of God' s Eternal Decree Chapter 4. Of Creation Chapter 5. Of Providence Chapter 6. Of the Fall of Man, of Sin, and of the Punishment Thereof Chapter 7. Of God' s Covenant with Man Chapter 8. Of Christ the Mediator Chapter 9. Of Free Will Chapter 10. Of Effectual Calling Chapter 11. Of Justification Chapter 12. Of Adoption Chapter 13. Of Sanctification Chapter 14. Of Saving Faith Chapter 15. Of Repentance unto Life Chapter 16. Of Good Works Chapter 17. Of the Perseverance of the Saints Chapter 18. Of Assurance of Grace and Salvation Chapter 19. Of the Law of God Chapter 20. Of Christian Liberty, and Liberty of Conscience Chapter 21. Of Religious Worship, and the Sabbath-Day Chapter 22. Of Lawful Oaths and Vows Chapter 23. Of the Civil Magistrate Chapter 24. Of Marriage and Divorce Chapter 25. Of the Church Chapter 26. Of Communion of Saints Chapter 27. Of the Sacraments Chapter 28. Of Baptism Chapter 29. Of the Lord' s Supper Chapter 30. Of Church Censures Chapter 31. Of Synods and Councils Chapter 32. Of the State of Men after Death, and of the Resurrection of the Dead Chapter 33. Of the Last Judgment

01.01. Of the Holy Scripture

Chapter One

Of the Holy Scripture

SECTION I. --Although the light of nature; and the works of creation; and providence; do so far manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God, as to leave men unexcusable; yet are they not sufficient to give that knowledge of God and of His will, which is necessary unto salvation. Therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times, and in divers manners, to reveal; Himself, and to declare; that His will unto His Church; and afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the Church against the corruption of the flesh, and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing: which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary; those former ways of God's revealing His will unto His people being now ceased. Scripture Proof Texts

Romans 2:14-15; Romans 1:19-20; Psalms 19:1-3; Romans 1:32, with Romans 2:1; 1 Corinthians 1:21; 1 Corinthians 2:13-14; Hebrews 1:1; Proverbs 22:19-21; Luke 1:3-4; Romans 15:4; Matthew 4:4, Matthew 4:7, Matthew 4:10; Isaiah 8:19-20; 2 Timothy 3:15; 2 Peter 1:19; Hebrews 1:1-2. This section affirms the following propositions: -

1. That the light of nature and the works of creation and providence are sufficient to make known the fact that there is a God, and somewhat of his nature and character, so as to leave the disobedience of men without excuse.

2. That nevertheless the amount and kind of knowledge thus attainable is not sufficient to enable any to secure salvation.

3. That consequently it has pleased God, of his sovereign grace, to make, in various ways and at different times, a supernatural revelation of himself and of his purposes to a chosen portion of the human family.

4. And that subsequently God has been pleased to commit that revelation to writing, and that it is now exclusively embraced in the Sacred Scriptures.

1. The light of nature and the works of creation and providence are sufficient to enable men to ascertain the fact that there is a God, and somewhat of his nature and character, end thus render them inexcusable.

Three generically distinct false opinions have been entertained with respect to the capacity of men, in their present circumstances, to attain to any positive knowledge of the being and character of God.

(1.) There is the assumption of all those extreme Rationalists who deny the existence of any world beyond the natural one discoverable by our senses, and especially of that school of Positive Philosophy inaugurated by Auguste Comte in France, and represented by John Stuart Mill and

Herbert Spencer in England, who affirm that all possible human knowledge is confined to the facts of our experience and the uniform laws which regulate the succession of those facts; that it is not possible for the human mind, in its present state, to go beyond the simple order of nature to the knowledge of an absolute First Cause, or to a designing and disposing Supreme Intelligence, even though such an one actually exists; that whether there be a God. or not, yet as a matter of fact he is not revealed, and as a matter of principle could not, even if revealed, be recognized by man in the present state of his faculties. This assumption is disproved - (a.) By the fact that men of all nations, ages, and degrees of culture, have discerned the evidences of the presence of a God in the works of nature and providence, and in the inward workings of their own souls. This has been true, not only of individuals, communities, or generations unenlightened by science, but pre-eminently of some of the very first teachers of positive science in the modern scientific age, such as Sir Isaac Newton, Sir David Brewster, Dr. Faraday, etc. (b.) By the fact that the works of nature and providence are full of the manifest traces of design, and that they can be scientifically explained, and as a matter of fact are explained by these very sceptics themselves, only by the recognition and accurate tracing out of the evident " intention" which each of these works is adapted to subserve in their mutual relations. (c.) The same is disproved from the fact that conscience, which is a universal and indestructible element of human nature, necessarily implies our accountability to a personal moral Governor, and as a matter of fact has uniformly led men to a recognition of his existence and of their relation to him.

(2.) An extreme opinion on this subject has been held by some Christians, to the effect that no true and certain knowledge of God can be derived. by man, in his present condition, from the light of nature in the entire absence of a supernatural revelation; that we are altogether dependent upon such a revelation for any certain knowledge that God exists, as well as for all knowledge of his nature and his purposes. This opinion is disproved -- (a.) By the direct testimony of Scripture. Romans 1:20-24; Romans 2:14-15. (b.) By the fact that many conclusive arguments for the existence of a great First Cause, who is at the same time an intelligent personal Spirit and righteous moral Governor, have been drawn by a strict induction from the facts of nature alone, as they lie open to the natural understanding. The fact that this argument remains unanswerable shows that the process by which the conclusions are drawn from purely natural sources is legitimate. (c.) All nations, however destitute of a supernatural revelation they may have been, have yet possessed some knowledge of a God. And in the case of the most enlightened of the heathen, natural religion has given birth to a considerable natural theology. We must, however, distinguish between that knowledge of the divine character which may be obtained by men from the worlds of nature arid providence in the exercise of their natural powers alone, without any suggestions or assistance derived from a supernatural revelation -- as is illustrated in the theological writings of some most eminent of the heathen who lived before Christ -- and that knowledge which men in this age, under the clear light of a supernatural revelation, are competent to deduce from a study of nature. The natural theology of the modern Rationalists demonstrably owes all its special excellences to that Christian revelation it is intended to supersede.

(3.) The third erroneous opinion which has been entertained on this subject is that of Deists and theistic Rationalists -- viz., that the light of nature, when legitimately used, is perfectly sufficient of itself to lead men to all necessary knowledge of God’s being, nature, and purposes. Some German Rationalists, while admitting that a supernatural revelation has been given in the Christian

Scriptures, yet insist that its only office is to illustrate and enforce the truths already given through the light of nature, which are sufficient in themselves, and need re-enforcement only because they are ordinarily not properly attended to by men. But, in opposition to this, the Confession teaches --

2. That the amount of knowledge attainable by the light of nature is not sufficient to enable any to secure salvation. This is proved to be true -- (1.) From Scripture. 1 Corinthians 1:21; 1 Corinthians 2:13-14. (2.) From the fact that man's moral relations to God have been disturbed by sin; and while the natural light of reason may teach an unfallen being spontaneously how he should approach and serve God, and while it may teach a fallen being what the nature of God may demand as to the punishment of sin, it can teach nothing by way of anticipation as to what God may be sovereignly disposed to do in the way of remission, substitution, sanctification, restoration, etc. (3.) 'From the facts presented in the past history of all nations destitute of the light of revelation, both before and since Christ. The truths they have held have been incomplete and. mixed with fundamental error; their faith has been uncertain; their religious rites have been degrading, and their lives immoral. The only apparent exception to this fact is found in the case of some Rationalist' in Christian lands; and their exceptional superiority to others of their creed is due to the secondary influences of that system of supernatural religion which they deny, but the power of which they cannot exclude.

Hence, the Confession teaches in this section --

3. That consequently it has pleased God, of his sovereign grace, to make, in various ways and at different times, a super natural revelation of himself and of his purposes to a chosen portion of the human family. And that --

4. God has been pleased subsequently to commit that revelation to writing, and it is now exclusively embraced in the Sacred Scriptures.

Since, as above shown, the light of nature is insufficient to enable men to attain such a knowledge of God and his will as is necessary for salvation, it follows -- (1.) That a supernatural revelation is absolutely necessary for man; and, (2.) From what natural religion alone teaches us of the character of God, it follows that the giving of such a revelation is in the highest degree antecedently probable on his part. Man is essentially a moral agent, and needs a clearly revealed rule of duty; and a religious being, craving communion with God. In his natural state these are both unsatisfied. But God is the author of human nature. His intelligence leads us to believe that he will complete all his works and crown a religious nature with the gift of a religion practically adequate to its wants. The benevolence of God leads us to anticipate that he will not leave his creatures in bewilderment and ruin for the want of light as to their condition and duties. And his righteousness occasions the presumption that he will at some time speak in definite and authoritative tones to the conscience of his subjects. (3.) As a matter of fact, God has given such a revelation. Indeed he has in no period of human history left himself without a witness. His communications to mankind through the first three thousand years were made in very " diverse manners"-- by theophanies and audible voices, dreams, visions, the Urim and Thummim, and prophetic inspiration; and the results of these communications were diffused and perpetuated by means of tradition. The fact that such a revelation has been made, and. that we ' have it in the Christian Scriptures, is fully substantiated by that mass of proof styled the " Evidences of Christianity." The main departments of this evidence are the following: --

(a.) The Old and New Testaments, whether the Word of God or not, bear all the marks of genuine and authentic historical records.

(b.) The miracles recorded in these Scriptures are established as facts by abundant testimony; and when admitted as facts they demonstrate the religion they accompany to be from God.

(c.) The same is true in all respects with regard to the many explicit prophecies already fulfilled which are contained in the Scriptures.

(d.) The unparalleled perfection of the moral system they teach, and the supernatural intelligence they discover in adaptation to all human characters and conditions in all ages.

(e.) The absolutely perfect excellence of its Founder.

(f.) The spiritual power of Christianity, as shown in the religious experience of individuals, and also in the wider influence it exerts over communities and nations in successive generations. For the questions concerning the Holy Scriptures as containing the whole of this revelation now made by God to men, see below.

SECTION II. Under the name of Holy Scripture, or the Word of God written, are now contained all the books of the Old and New Testament, which are these: Of the Old Testament:

Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, I Samuel, II Samuel, I Kings, II Kings, I Chronicles, II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, The Song of Songs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. Of the New Testament:

The Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, The Acts of the Apostles, Paul's Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians I, Corinthians II, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians I , Thessalonians II , To Timothy I , To Timothy II, To Titus, To Philemon, The Epistle to the Hebrews, The Epistle of James, The first and second Epistles of Peter, The first, second, and third Epistles of John, The Epistle of Jude, The Revelation of John.

All which are given by inspiration of God to be the rule of faith and life.

SECTION III. The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the canon of the Scripture, and therefore are of no authority in the Church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than other human writings.

Scripture Proof Texts

Luke 16:29, Luke 16:31; Ephesians 2:20; Revelation 22:18-19; 2 Timothy 3:16; Luke 24:27, Luke 24:44; Romans 3:2; 2 Peter 1:21.

These sections affirm the following propositions: --

1. That the complete canon of Scripture embraces in the two great divisions of the Old and the New Testaments all the particular books here named.

2. That the books commonly called Apocrypha form no part of that canon, and are to be regarded as of no more authority than any other human writings.

3. That all the canonical books were divinely inspired, and are thus given to us as an authoritative rule of faith and practice.

1. The complete canon of Scripture embraces in the two great divisions of the Old and New Testaments all the particular books here named. The Old Testament is the collection of inspired writings given by God to his Church during the Old Dispensation of the Covenant of Grace; and the New Testament is the collection of those inspired writings which he gave during the New or Christian Dispensation of that Covenant.

We determine what books have a place in this canon or divine rule by an examination of the evidences which show that each of them, severally, was written by the inspired. prophet or apostle whose name it bears; or, as in the case of the Gospels of Mark and Luke, written under the superintendence and published by the authority of an apostle. This evidence in the case of the Sacred Scriptures is of the same kind of historical and critical proof as is relied upon by all literary men to establish the genuineness and authenticity of any other ancient writings, such as the Odes of Horace or the works of Herodotus. In general this evidence is (a) Internal, such as language, style, and the character of the matter they contain; (b) External, such as the testimony of contemporaneous writers, the universal consent of contemporary readers, and corroborating history drawn from independent credible sources. The genuineness of the books constituting the Old Testament canon as now received by all Protestants is established as follows: --

(1.) Christ and his apostles endorse as genuine and authentic the canon of Jewish Scriptures as it existed in their time. (a) Christ often quotes as the Word of God the separate books and the several divisions embraced in the Jewish Scriptures -- viz., the Law, the Prophets, and. the Holy Writings or Psalms. Mark 14:49; Luke 24:44; John 5:39. (b) The apostles also quote them as the Word of God; 2 Timothy 3:15-16; Acts 1:16. (c) Christ often rebuked the Jews for disobeying, but never for forging or corrupting their Scriptures, Matthew 22:29.

(2.) The Jewish canon thus endorsed by Christ and his apostles is the same as that we now have. (a) The New Testament writers quote as Scripture almost every one of the books we recognize, and no others. (b) The Septuagint, or Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, made in Egypt B.C. 285, which was itself frequently quoted by Christ and his apostles, embraced every book contained in our copies. (c) Josephus, born A.D. 37, enumerates as Hebrew Scriptures the same books by their classes. (d) The testimony of the early Christian writers uniformly agrees with that of the ancient Jews as to every book. (e) Ever since the time of Christ both Jews and Christians, while rival and hostile parties, have separately kept the same canon, and agree perfectly as to the genuineness and authenticity of every book. The evidence which establishes the canonical authority of the several books of the New Testament may be generally stated as follows: (a) The early Christian writers in all parts of the world agree in quoting as of apostolical authority the books we receive, while they quote all other contemporaneous writings only for illustration. (b) The early Church Fathers furnish a number of catalogues of the books received by them as apostolical, all of which agree perfectly as to most of the books, and differ only in a slight degree with reference to some last written or least generally circulated. (c) The earliest translations of the Scriptures prove that, at the time they were made, the books they contain were recognized as Scripture. The

Peshito, or early Syriac translation, agrees almost entirely with ours; and the Vulgate, prepared by Jerome A.D. 385, was based on the Italic or early Latin version, and agrees entirely with ours. (d) The internal evidence corroborates the external testimony in the case of all the books. This consists of the language and idiom in which they are written; the harmony in all essentials in the midst of great variety in form and circumstantials; the elevated spirituality and doctrinal consistency of all the books; and their practical power over the consciences and hearts of men.

2. But the books called Apocrypha form no part of the sacred canon, and are to be regarded as of no more authority than any other human writings. The word Apocrypha (anything hidden) has been applied to certain ancient writings whose authorship is not manifest, and for which unfounded claims have been set up for a place in the canon. Some of these have been associated with the Old and. some with the New Testament. In this section of the Confession, however, the name is applied. principally to those spurious scriptures for which a place is claimed in the Old Testament canon by the Roman Church. These are Tobit, Wisdom, Judith, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, and the two books of Maccabees. They also prefix to the book of Daniel the History of Susannah, and insert in the third chapter the Song of the Three Children; and add to the end of the book the History of Bel and the Dragon. That these books have no right to a place in the canon is proved by the following facts: (1.) They never formed a part of the Hebrew Scriptures. They have always been rejected by the Jews, to whose guardianship the Old Testament Scriptures were committed. (2.) None of them were ever quoted by Christ or the apostles. (3.) They were never embraced in the list of the canonical books by the early Fathers; and even in the Roman Church their authority was not accepted by the most learned and candid men until after it was made an article of faith by the Council of Trent, late in the sixteenth century. (4.) The internal evidence presented by their contents disproves their claims. None of them make any claim to inspiration, while the best of them disclaim it. Some of them consist of childish fables, and inculcate bad morals. And this section teaches --

3. That all the canonical Scriptures were divinely inspired, and are thus given us as an authoritative rule of faith and practice. The books of Scripture were written by the instrumentality of men, and the national and personal peculiarities of their authors have been evidently as freely expressed in their writing, and their natural faculties, intellectual and moral, as freely exercised in their production, as those of the authors of any other writings. Nevertheless these books are, one and all, in thought and verbal expression, in substance and form, wholly the Word of God, conveying with absolute accuracy and divine authority all that God meant them to convey, without any human additions or admixtures. This was accomplished by a supernatural influence of the Spirit of God acting upon the spirits of the sacred writers, called "inspiration;" which accompanied them uniformly in what they wrote; and which, without violating the free operation of their faculties, yet directed them in all they wrote, and secured the infallible expression of it in words. The nature of this divine influence we, of course, can no more understand than we can in the case of any other miracle. But the effects are plain and certain -- viz., that all written under it is the very Word of God, of infallible truth, and of divine authority; and this infallibility and authority attach as well to the verbal expression in which the revelation is conveyed as to the matter of the revelation itself. The fact that the Scriptures are thus inspired is proved because they assert it of themselves; and because they must either be credited as true in this respect, or rejected as false in all respects; ’and because God authenticated the claims of their writers by accompanying their teaching with

"signs and wonders and divers miracles." Hebrews 2:4. Wherever God sends his "sign," there he commands belief; but it is impossible that he could unconditionally command belief except to truth infallibly conveyed.

(1.) The Old Testament writers claimed to be inspired. Deuteronomy 31:19-22; Deu_ 34:10; Numbers 16:28-29; 2 Samuel 23:2. As a characteristic fact, they speak in the name of God, prefacing their messages with a "Thus saith the LORD. "The mouth of the LORD hath spoken it." Deuteronomy 18:21-22; 1 Kings 21:19; Jeremiah 9:12, etc.

(2.) The New Testament writers introduce their quotations from the Old Testament with such formulas as, "The Holy Ghost saith," Hebrews 3:7; "The Holy Ghost this signifying," Hebrews 9:8; "Saith God," Acts 2:17; 1 Corinthians 9:9-10; "The Lord by the mouth of his servant David saith," Acts 4:25; "The Lord limiteth in David a certain day, saying," Hebrews 4:7.

(3.) The inspiration of the Old Testament is expressly affirmed in the New Testament. Luke 1:70; Hebrews 1:1; 2 Timothy 3:16; 1 Peter 1:10-12; 2Pet 1:21.

(4.) Christ and his apostles constantly quote the Old Testament as infallible, as that which must be fulfilled. Matthew 5:18; John 10:35; Luke 24:44; Matthew 2:15-23, etc.

(5.) Inspiration was promised to the apostles. Matthew 10:19; Matthew 28:19-20; Luke 12:12; John 13:20; John 14:26; John 15:26-27; John 16:13.

(6.) They claimed to have the Spirit, in fulfillment of the promise of Christ, Acts 2:33; Acts 15:28; 1 Thessalonians 1:5; -- to speak as the prophets of God, 1 Corinthians 4:1; 1 Thessalonians 4:8; -- to speak with plenary authority, 1 Corinthians 2:13; 2 Corinthians 13:2-4; Galatians 1:8-9. They put their writings on a level with the Old Testament Scriptures. 2 Peter 3:16; 1 Thessalonians 5:27.

SECTION IV. The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed, and obeyed, depends not upon the testimony of any man, or Church; but wholly upon God (who is truth itself) the author thereof: and therefore it is to be received, because it is the Word of God.[9]

SECTION V. We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the Church to an high and reverent esteem of the Holy Scripture.[10] And the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is, to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it does abundantly evidence itself to be the Word of God: yet notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts.[11] Scripture Proof Texts

[9] 2 Peter 1:19, 2 Peter 1:21; 2 Timothy 3:16; 1John 5:9; 1 Thessalonians 2:13. [10] 1 Timothy 3:15; [11] 1 John 2:20, 1 John 2:27; John 16:13-14; 1 Corinthians 2:10-12; Isaiah 59:21. This section teaches the following propositions: --

1. That the authority of the inspired Scriptures does not rest upon the testimony of the Church, but directly upon God. This proposition is designed to deny the Romish heresy that the inspired Church is the ultimate source of all divine know ledge, and that the written Scripture and ecclesiastical tradition alike depend upon the authoritative seal of the Church for their credibility.

They thus make the Scriptures a product of the Spirit through the Church; while, in fact, the Church is a product of the Spirit through the instrumentality of the Word. It is true that the testimony of the early Church to the apostolic authorship of the several books is of fundamental importance, just as a subject may bear witness to the identity of an heir to the crown; but the authority of the Scriptures is no more derived from the Church than that of the king from the subject who proves the fact that he is the legal heir.

2. That the internal evidences of a divine origin contained in and inseparable from the Scriptures themselves are conclusive. This is a part of the evidences of Christianity considered under sect. i. The internal marks of a divine origin in the Bible are such as -- (1.) The phenomena it presents of a supernatural intelligence: in unity of design developed through its entire structure, although it is composed of sixty-six separate books, by forty different authors, writing at intervals through sixteen centuries; in its perfect freedom from all the errors incident to the ages of its production, with regard to facts or opinions of whatever kind; in. the marvellous knowledge it exhibits of human nature under all possible relations and conditions; in the original and luminous solution it affords of many of the darkest problems of human history and destiny. (2.) The unparalleled perfection of its moral system: in the exalted view it gives of God, his law, and moral government; in its exalted yet practical and beneficent system of morality, set forth and effectively enforced; in its wondrous power over the human conscience; and in the unrivalled extent and persistence of its influence over communities of men.

3. Yet that the highest and most influential faith in the truth and authority of the Scriptures is the direct work of the Holy Spirit on our hearts. The Scriptures to the unregenerate man are like light to the blind. They may be felt as the rays of the sun are felt by the blind, but they cannot be fully seen. The Holy Spirit opens the blinded eyes and gives due sensibility to the diseased heart; and thus assurance comes with the evidence of spiritual experience. When first regenerated, he begins to set the Scriptures to the test of experience; and the more he advances, the more he proves them true, and the more he discovers of their limitless breadth and fulness, and their evidently designed adaptation to all human wants under all possible conditions.

SECTION VI. The whole counsel of God concerning all things necessary for His own glory, man's salvation, faith and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men.[12] Nevertheless, we acknowledge the inward illumination of the Spirit of God to be necessary for the saving understanding of such things as are revealed in the Word:[13] and that there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God, and government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature, and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word, which are always to be observed.[14] Scripture

Proof Texts

[12] 2 Timothy 3:15-17; Galatians 1:8-9; 2 Thessalonians 2:2 [13], John 6:45; 1 Corinthians 2:9-12; [14] 1 Corinthians 11:13-14; 1 Corinthians 14:26, 1 Corinthians 14:40. This section teaches the following propositions: --

1. The inspired Scriptures of the Old. And New Testaments are a complete rule of faith and practice: they embrace the whole of whatever supernatural revelation God now makes to men, and are abundantly sufficient for all the practical necessities ’of men or communities. This is proved -- (1.) From the design of Scripture. It professes to lead us to God. Whatever is necessary to that end it must teach us. If any supplementary knowledge is necessary, it must refer to it. Incompleteness in such an undertaking would be falsehood. But (2.) while Christ and his apostles constantly refer to Scripture as an authoritative rule, neither they nor the Scriptures themselves ever refer to any other source of divine revelation whatsoever. They therefore assume all the awful prerogatives of completeness. John 20:31; 2 Timothy 3:15-17. And (3.), as a matter of fact, the Scriptures do teach a perfect system of doctrine, and all the principles which are necessary for the practical regulation of the lives of individuals, communities, and churches. The more diligent men have been in the study of the Bible, and the more assiduous they have been in carrying out its instructions into practice, the less has it been possible for them to believe that it is incomplete in any element of a perfect rule of all that which man is to believe concerning God, and of all that duty which God requires of man.

2. Nothing during the present dispensation is to be added to this complete rule of faith, either by new revelations of the Spirit or by traditions of men. No new revelations of the Spirit are to be expected now --

(1.) Because he has already given us a complete and all-sufficient rule. (2.) because, while the Old. Testament foretells the new dispensation, the New Testament does not refer to any further revelation to be expected before the second advent of Christ: they always refer to the "coming" or "appearance" of Christ as the very next supernatural event to be anticipated. (3.) As a matter of fact, no pretended revelations of the Spirit since the days of the apostles have borne the marks or been accompanied with the "signs" of a supernatural revelation: on the contrary, all that have been made public -- as those of Swedenborg and the Mormons -- are inconsistent with Scripture truth, directly oppose the authority of Scripture, and teach bad morals; while private revelations have been professed only by vain enthusiasts, and are incapable of verification.

Traditions of men cannot be allowed to supplement Scripture as a rule of faith, because -- (1.) The Scriptures, while undertaking to lead men to a saving knowledge of God, never once ascribe authority to any such a supplementary rule. (2.) Christ rebukes the practical observance of it in the Pharisees. Matthew 15:3-6; Mark 7:7-8. (3.) Tradition cannot supplement Scripture, because, while the latter is definite, complete, and perspicuous, the former is essentially indeterminate, obscure, and fragmentary. (4.) The only system of ecclesiastical tradition which pretends to rival the Scriptures as a rule of faith is that of the Roman Church; and her traditions are, many of them, demonstrably of modern origin. None can be traced to the apostolic age, much less to an apostolic origin: they are inconsistent with the clear teaching of Scripture, and with the opinions of many of the highest authorities in that Church itself in past ages.

3. Nevertheless, a personal spiritual illumination by the power of the Holy Ghost is necessary, in every case, for the practical and saving knowledge of the truth embraced in the Scriptures. This necessity does not result from any want of either completeness or clearness in the revelation, but from the fact that man in a state of nature is carnal, and unable to discern the things of the Spirit of God. Spiritual illumination differs from inspiration, therefore, (1.) In that it conveys no new truths to

the understanding, but simply opens the mind and heart of the subject to the spiritual discernment and appreciation of the truth already objectively presented in the Scriptures; and (2.) In that it is an element in regeneration common to all the children of God, and not peculiar to prophets or apostles; and hence, (3.) In that it is private and personal in its use, and not public.

4. That, while the Scriptures are a complete rule of faith and practice, and while nothing is to be regarded as an article of faith to be believed, or a religious duty obligatory upon the conscience, which is not explicitly or implicitly taught in Scripture, nevertheless they do not descend in practical matters into details, but, laying down general principles, leave men to apply them in the exercise of their natural judgment, in the light of experience, and in adaptation to changing circumstances, as they are guided by the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit. This liberty, of course, is allowed only within the limits of the strict interpretation of the principles taught in the Word, and in the legitimate application of those principles, and applies to the regulation of the practical life of the individual and of the Church, in detailed adjustments to changing circumstances.

SECTION VII. All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all:[15] yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed for salvation are so clearly propounded, and opened in some place of Scripture or other, that not only the learned, but the unlearned, in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them.[16] Scripture Proof Texts [15] 2 Peter 3:16; [16] Psalms 119:105, Psalms 119:130. This section affirms --

1. That the Scriptures are in such a sense perspicuous that all that is necessary for man to know, in order to his salvation or for his practical guidance in duty, may be learned therefrom; and --

2. That they are designed for the personal use, and are adapted to the instruction, of the unlearned as well as the learned.

Protestants admit that many of the truths revealed in the Scriptures in their own nature transcend human understanding, and that many prophecies remain intentionally obscure until explained by their fulfillment in the developments of history. Nevertheless, Protestants affirm, and Romnnists deny -- (1.) That every essential article of faith and rule of practice may be clearly learned from Scripture; and (2.) That private and unlearned Christians may be safely allowed to interpret Scripture for themselves. On the other hand, it is true that, with the advance of historical and critical knowledge, and by means of controversies, the Church as a community has made progress in the accurate interpretation of Scripture and in the full comprehension of the entire system of truth revealed therein. That the Protestant doctrine on this subject is true, is proved --

(a.) From the fact that all Christians promiscuously are commanded to search the Scriptures. 2 Timothy 3:15-17; Acts 17:11; John 5:39.

(b.) From the fact that the Scriptures are addressed either to all men or to the whole body of believers. Deuteronomy 6:4-9; Luke 1:3; Romans 1:7; 1 Corinthians 1:2; 2 Corinthians 1:1; and the salutations of all the Epistles except those to Timothy and Titus.

(c.) The Scriptures are affirmed to be perspicuous. Psalms 119:105, Psalms 119:130; 2 Corinthians 3:14; 2 Peter 1:18-19; 2 Timothy 3:15-17.

(d.) The Scriptures address men as a divine law to be obeyed and as a guide to salvation. If for all practical purposes they are not perspicuous they must mislead, and so falsify their pretensions.

(e.) Experience has uniformly proved the truth of the Protestant doctrine. Those Churches which have most faithfully disseminated the Scriptures in the vernacular among the mass of the people have conformed most entirely to the plain and certain sense of their teaching in faith and practice; while those Churches which have locked them up in the hands of a priesthood have to the greatest degree departed from them both in letter and spirit.

SECTION VIII. The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old), and the New Testament in Greek (which, at the time of the writing of it, was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, and, by His singular care and providence, kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentical;[17] so as, in all controversies of religion, the Church is finally to appeal unto them.[18] But, because these original tongues are not known to all the people of God, who have right unto, and interest in the Scriptures, and are commanded, in the fear of God, to read and search them,[19] therefore they are to be translated in to the vulgar language of every nation unto which they come,[20] that, the Word of God dwelling plentifully in all, they may worship Him in an acceptable manner;[21] and, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, may have hope.[22] Scripture Proof Texts

[17] Matthew 5:18; [18] Isaiah 8:20; Acts 15:15; [19] John 5:39, John 5:46; [20] 1 Corinthians 14:6, 1 Corinthians 14:9, 1 Corinthians 14:11-12, 1 Corinthians 14:24, 1 Corinthians 14:27-28; [21] Colossians 3:16; [22] Romans 15:4. This section teaches,--

1. That the Old Testament having been originally written in Hebrew, and the New Testament in Greek -- which were the common languages of the large body of the Church in their respective periods -- the Scriptures in those languages are the absolute rule of faith and ultimate appeal in all controversies.

2. That the original sacred text has come down to us in a state of essential purity. d. That the Scriptures should be translated into the vernacular languages of all people, and copies put into the hands of all capable of reading them. The true text of the ancient Scriptures is ascertained by means of a careful collation and comparison of the following: --

1. Ancient manuscripts. The oldest existing Hebrew manuscripts date from the ninth or tenth century. The oldest Greek manuscripts date from the fourth to the sixth century. Many hundreds of these have been collated by eminent scholars in forming the text of modern Hebrew and Greek Testaments. The differences are found to be unimportant, and the essential integrity of our text is established.

2. Quotations from the apostolic Scriptures found in the writings of the early Christians. These are so numerous that the whole New Testament might be gathered from the worlds of writers dating before the seventh century, and they prove the exact state of the text at the time in which they were made.

3. Early translations into other languages. The principal of these are the Samaritan Pentateuch, which the Samaritans inherited from the ten tribes; the Greek Septuagint, B.C. 285; the Peshito or ancient Syriac version, A.D, 100; the Latin Vulgate of Jerome, A.D. 385; the Coptic of the fifth

century, and others of less critical value.

SECTION IX. The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself: and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it must be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly.[23]

SECTION X. The supreme judge by which all controversies of religion are to be determined, and all decrees of councils, opinions of ancient writers, doctrines of men, and private spirits, are to be examined, and in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture.[24] Scripture Proof Texts [22] 2 Peter 1:20-21; Acts 15:15-16. [24] Matthew 22:29, Matthew 22:31; Ephesians 2:20 with Acts 28:25.

These sections teach,--

1. That the infallible and only true "rule" for the interpretation of Scripture is Scripture itself.

2. That the Scriptures are the supreme "judge" in all controversies concerning religion. The authority of the Scriptures as the ultimate rule of faith rests alone in the fact that they are the Word of God. Since all these writings are one revelation, and the only revelation of his will concerning religion given by God to men, it follows: --

(1.) That they are complete as a revelation in themselves, and are not to be supplemented or explained by light drawn from any other source. (2.) That the different sections of this revelation mutually supplement and explain one another. The Holy Spirit who inspired the Scriptures is the only adequate expounder of his own words, and he is promised to all the children of God as a Spirit of light and truth. In dependence upon his guidance, Christians are of course to study the Scriptures, using all the helps of true learning to ascertain their meaning; but this meaning is to be sought in the light of the Scriptures themselves taken as a whole, and not in the light either of tradition or of philosophy.

"A rule is a standard of judgment; a judge is the expounder and applier of that rule to the decision of particular cases." The Romish doctrine is, that the Papal Church is the infallible teacher of men in religion; that, consequently, the Church authoritatively determines, (1.) What is Scripture; (2.) What is tradition; (3.) What is the true sense of Scripture and of tradition; and (4.) What is the true application of that rule to every particular question of faith or practice. The Protestant doctrine is,-- (1.) That the Scriptures are the only rule of faith and practice; (2.) (a) Negatively, that there is no body of men qualified or authorized to interpret the Scriptures or to apply their teachings to the decision of particular questions in a sense binding upon their fellow - Christians; (3) Positively, that the Scriptures are the only authoritative voice in the Church; which is to be interpreted and applied by every individual for himself, with the assistance, though not by the authority, of his fellow-Christians. Creeds and confessions, as to form, bind those only who voluntarily profess them; and as to matter, they bind only so far as they affirm truly what the Bible teaches, and because the Bible does so teach. This must be true -- (1.) Because the Scriptures, which profess to teach us the way of salvation, refer us to no standard or judge in matters of religion beyond or above themselves; and because no body of men since the apostles has ever existed, with the qualifications or with the authority to act in the office of judge for their fellows. (2.) Because, as we have seen, the Scriptures are themselves complete and perspicuous. (3.) Because all Christians are commanded to search the Scriptures, and to judge both doctrines and professed teachers

themselves. John 5:39; 1 John 2:20, 1 John 2:27; 1 John 4:1-2; Acts 17:11; Galatians 1:8; 1 Thessalonians 5:21. (4.) Because all Christians are promised the Holy Spirit to guide them in the understanding and practical use of the truth. Romans 8:9; 1 John 2:20, 1 John 2:27

01.02. Of God and the Holy Trinity

Chapter Two

Of God and the Holy Trinity

SECTION 1. There is but one only,(1) living, and true God,(2) who is infinite in being and perfection,(3) a most pure spirit,(4) invisible,(5) without body, parts,(6) or passions;(7) immutable,(8) immense,(9) eternal,(10) incomprehensible,(11) almighty,(12) most wise,(13) most holy,(14) most free,(15) most absolute;(16) working all things according to the counsel of His own immutable and most righteous will,(17) for His own glory;(18) most loving,(19) gracious, merciful, long-suffering, abundant in goodness and truth, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin;(20) the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him;(21) and withal, most just, and terrible in His judgments,(22) hating all sin,(23) and who will by no means clear the guilty.(24) Scripture Proof Texts

(1) Deuteronomy 6:4 1 Corinthians 8:4, 1 Corinthians 8:6; (2) 1 Thessalonians 1:9; Jeremiah 10:10; (3) Job 11:7-9; Job 26:14; (4) John 4:24; (5) 1 Timothy 1:17; (6) Deuteronomy 4:15-16; John 4:24, with Luke 24:39; (7) Acts 14:11, Acts 14:15; (8) James 1:17; Malachi 3:6; (9) 1 Kings 8:27; Jeremiah 23:23-24; (10) Psalms 90:2; 1 Timothy 1:17; (11) Psalms 145:3; (12) Genesis 17:1; Revelation 4:8; (13) Romans 16:27; (14) Isaiah 6:3; Revelation 4:8; (15) Psalms 115:3; (16) Exodus 3:14; (17) Ephesians 1:11; (18) Proverbs 16:4; Romans 11:36; (19) 1 John 4:8, 1 John 4:16; (20) Exodus 34:6-7; (21) Hebrews 11:6; (22) Nehemiah 9:32-33; (23) Psalms 5:5-6; (24) Nahum 1:2-3; Exodus 34:7. (25) John 5:26. (26) Acts 7:2 (27) Psalms 119:68. (28) 1 Timothy 6:15; Romans 9:5. (29) Acts 17:24-25. (30) Job 22:2-3. (31) Romans 11:36; (32) Revelation 4:11; 1 Timothy 6:15; Daniel 4:25, Daniel 4:35; (33) Hebrews 4:13;

SECTION 2. God has all life,(25) glory,(26) goodness,(27) blessedness,(28) in and of Himself; and is alone in and unto Himself all-sufficient, not standing in need of any creatures which He has made,(29) nor deriving any glory from them,(30) but only manifesting His own glory in, by, unto, and upon them. He is the alone fountain of all being, of whom, through whom, and to whom are all things;(31) and has most sovereign dominion over them, to do by them, for them, or upon them whatsoever Himself pleases.(32) In His sight all things are open and manifest,(33) His knowledge is infinite, infallible, and independent upon the creature,(34) so as nothing is to Him contingent, or uncertain.(35) He is most holy in all His counsels, in all His works, and in all His commands.(36) To Him is due from angels and men, and every other creature, whatsoever worship, service, or obedience He is pleased to require of them.(37) Scripture Proof Texts

(34) Romans 11:33-34; Psalms 147:5; (35) Acts 15:18; Ezekiel 11:5; (36) Psalms 145:17; Romans 7:12; (37) Revelation 5:12-14.

These sections teach the following propositions: --

1. There is but one living and true God.

2. This God is a free personal Spirit, without bodily parts or passions.

3. He possesses all absolute perfections in and of himself.

4. He possesses all relative perfections with respect to his creatures.

5. He is self-existent and absolutely independent, the sole support, proprietor, and sovereign disposer, of all his creatures.

1. There is but one living and true God.

There have been false gods innumerable, and the title " god" has been applied to angels (Psalms 97:7), because of their spirituality and exalted excellence; and to magistrates (Psalms 82:1, Psalms 82:6), because of their authority; and Satan is called "the god of this world" (2 Corinthians 4:4), because of his usurped dominion over the wicked. In opposition, therefore, to the claims of all false gods, and in exclusion of all figurative use of the term, it is affirmed that there is but one true God, one living God. This affirmation includes two propositions: (a) There is but one God. (b) This one God is an absolute unit, incapable of division. That there is but one God is proved --

(1.) From the fact that every argument that establishes the being of God, suggests the existence of but one. There must be one First Cause, but there is no evidence of more than one. There must be one Designing Intelligence and one Moral Governor, but neither the argument from design nor from conscience suggests more than one.

(2.) The creation throughout its whole extent is one system, presenting absolute unity of design, and hence evidently emanating from one Designing Intelligence.

(3.) The same is true of the system of providential government.

(4.) The sense of moral accountability innate in man witnesses to the unity of the source of all absolute authority.

(5.) All the instincts and cultivated habits of reason lead us to refer the multiplicity of the phenomenal world backward and upward to a ground of absolute unity, which being infinite and absolute, necessarily excludes division and rivalry.

(6.) The Scriptures constantly affirm this truth. Deuteronomy 6:4; 1 Corinthians 8:4. The indivisible unity of this one God is proved by the same arguments. For an essential division in the one Godhead would in effect constitute two Gods; besides, the Scriptures teach us that the Christian Trinity is one undivided God: "I and my Father are one." John 10:30.

2. This God is a free personal Spirit, without bodily parts or passions.

There is a very ancient, prevalent, and persistent mode of thought, which pervades a great deal of our literature in the present day, which tends to compound God with the world, and to identify him with the laws of nature, the order and beauty of creation. In one way or another he is considered as sustaining to the phenomena of nature the relation of soul to body, or of whole to parts, or of permanent substance to transient modes. Now all the arguments that establish the being of a God agree with the Scriptures in setting him forth as a personal spirit, distinct from the world. By Spirit we mean the subject to which the attributes of intelligence, feeling, and will belong, as active

properties. Where these unite there is distinct personality. The argument from design proves that the great First Cause, to whom the system of the universe is to be referred, possesses both intelligence, benevolence, and will, in selecting ends, and in choosing and adapting means to effect those ends. Therefore he is a personal spirit. The argument from the sense of moral accountability, innate in all men, proves that we are subject to a Supreme Lawgiver, exterior and superior to the person he governs; one who takes knowledge of us, and will hold us to a strict personal account. Therefore he is a personal spirit, distinct from -- though intimately associated with -- the subjects he governs.

We know spirit by self-consciousness, and in affirming that God is a spirit --

(1.) We affirm that he possesses in infinite perfection all those properties which belong to our spirits, (a) because the Scriptures affirm that we were created in his image; (b) because they attribute all these properties severally to him; (c) because our religious nature demands that we recognize them in him; (d) because their exercise is evidenced in his works of creation and providence; (e) because they were possessed by the divine nature in Christ. And --

(2.) We deny that the properties of matter, such as bodily parts and passions, belong to him. We make this denial --

(a) because there is no evidence that he does possess any such properties; and, (b) because, from the very nature of matter end its affections, it is inconsistent with those infinite and. absolute perfections which are of his essence, such as simplicity, unchangeableness, unity, omnipresence, etc. When the Scriptures, in condescension to our weakness, express the fact that God hears by saying that he has an ear, or that he exerts power by attributing to him a hand, they evidently speak metaphorically, because in the case of men spiritual faculties are exercised through bodily organs. And when they speak of his repenting, of his being grieved, or jealous, they use metaphorical language also, teaching us that he acts toward us as a man would when agitated by such passions. Such metaphors are characteristic rather of the Old than of the New Testament, and occur for the most part in highly rhetorical passages of the poetical and prophetical books.

3. He possesses all absolute perfections in and of himself.

4. He possesses all relative perfections with respect to his creatures. The attributes of God are the properties of his all-perfect nature. Those are absolute which belong to God considered in himself alone -- as self-existence, immensity, eternity, intelligence, etc. Those are relative which characterize him in his relation to his creatures -- as omnipresence, omniscience, etc.

It is evident that we can know only such properties of God as he has condescended to reveal to us, and only so much of these as he has revealed. The question, then, is, What has God revealed to us of his perfections in his Word?

(1.) God is declared to be infinite in his being. Hence he can exist under none of the limitations of time or space. He must be eternal, and he must fill all immensity. These three, therefore, must be the common perfections of all the properties that belong to his essence: He is infinite, eternal, omnipresent in his being; infinite, eternal, omnipresent in his wisdom, in his power, in his justice, etc. When God is said to be infinite in his knowledge, or his power, we mean that he knows all things, and that he can effect all that he wills, without any limit. When we say that he is infinite in

his truth, or his justice, or his goodness, we mean that he possesses these properties in absolute perfection.

(2.) His immensity. When we attribute this perfection to God we mean that his essence fills all space. This cannot be effected through multiplication of his essence, since he is ever one and indivisible; nor through its extension or diffusion, like ether, through the interplanetary spaces, because it is pure spirit. The spirit of God, like the spirit of a man, must be an absolute unit, without extension or dimensions. Therefore, the entire indivisible Godhead must, in the totality of his being, be simultaneously present every moment of time at every point of space. He is immense absolutely and from eternity. He has been omnipresent, in his essence and in all the properties thereof, ever since the creation, to every atom and element of which it consists. Although God is essentially equally omnipresent to all creatures at all times, yet, as he variously manifests himself at different times and places to his intelligent creatures, so he is said to be peculiarly present to them under such conditions. Thus, God was present to Moses in the burning bush. Exodus 3:2-6. And Christ promises to be in the midst of two or three met together in his name. Matthew 18:20.

(3.) His eternity. By affirming that God is eternal, we mean that his duration has no limit, and that his existence in infinite duration is absolutely perfect. He could have had no beginning, he can have no end, and in his existence there can be no succession of thoughts, feelings or purposes. There can be no increase to his knowledge, no change as to his purpose. Hence the past and the future must be as immediately and as immutably present with him as the present. Hence his existence is an ever-abiding, all-embracing present, which is always contemporaneous with the ever-flowing times of his creatures. His knowledge, which never can change, eternally recognizes his creatures and their actions in their several places in time; and his actions upon his creatures pass from him at the precise moments predetermined in his unchanging purpose.

Hence God is absolutely unchangeable in his being and in all the modes and states thereof. In his knowledge, his feelings, his purposes, and hence in his engagements to his creatures, he is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. "The counsel of the LORD standeth for ever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations." Psa_ 33:11.

(4.) The infinite intelligence of God, including omniscience and absolutely perfect wisdom, is clearly taught in Scripture. God’s knowledge is infinite, not only as to the range of objects it embraces, but also as to its perfection. (a) We know things only as they stand related to our organs of perception, and only in their properties; God knows them immediately, in the light of his own intelligence and in their essential nature. (b) We know things successively, as they are present to us, or as we pass inferentially from the know to the before unknown; God knows all things eternally, by one direct, all-comprehensive intuition. (c) Our knowledge is dependent; God’s is independent. Ours is fragmentary; God’s total and complete. Ours is in great measure transient; God’s is permanent.

God knows himself -- the depths of his own infinite and eternal being, the constitution of his nature, the ideas of his reason the resources of his power, the purposes of his will. In knowing the resources of his power, he knows all things possible. In knowing the immutable purposes of his will, he knows all that has existed or that will exist, because of that purpose.

Wisdom presupposes knowledge, and is that excellent practical use which the absolutely perfect intelligence and will of God make of his infinite knowledge. It is exercised in the election of ends, general and special, and in the selection of means in order to the accomplishment of those ends; and is illustrated gloriously in the perfect system of God's works of creation, providence, and grace.

(5.) The omnipotence of God is the infinite efficiency resident in, and inseparable from, the divine essence, to effect whatsoever he wills, without any limitation soever except such as lies in the absolute and immutable perfections of his own nature. The power of God is both unlimited in its range and infinitely perfect in its mode of action. (a) We are conscious that the powers inherent in our wills are very limited. Our wills can act directly only upon the course of our thoughts and a few bodily actions, and can only very imperfectly control these. The power inherent in God's will acts directly upon its objects, and effects absolutely and unconditionally all he intends. (b) We work through means; the effect often followers only remotely, and our action is conditioned by external circumstances. God acts immediately, with or without means as he pleases. When he acts through means it is a condescension, because the means receive all their efficiency from his power, not his power from the means. And the power of God is absolutely independent of all that is exterior to his own all-perfect nature. The power of God is the power of his all-perfect, self-existent essence. He has absolutely unlimited power to do whatsoever his nature determines him to will. But this power cannot be directed against his nature. The ultimate principles of reason and of moral right and wrong are not products of the divine power, but are principles of the divine nature. God cannot change the nature of right and wrong, etc., because he did not make himself, and these have their determination in his own eternal perfections. He cannot act unwisely or unrighteously; not for want of the power as respects the act, but for want of will, since God is eternally, immutably, and most freely and spontaneously, wise and righteous.

God's omnipotence is illustrated, but never exhausted, in his works of creation and providence. God's power is exercised at his will, but there ever remains an infinite reserve of possibility lying back of the actual exercise of power, since the Creator always infinitely transcends his creation.

(6.) The absolutely perfect goodness of God. The moral perfection of God is one absolutely perfect righteousness. Relatively to his creatures his infinite moral perfection always presents that aspect which his infinite wisdom decides to be appropriate to the case. He is not alternately merciful and just, nor partially merciful and partially just, but eternally and perfectly merciful and just. Both are right; both are equally and spontaneously in his nature; and both are perfectly and freely harmonized by the infinite wisdom of that nature. His goodness includes (a) Benevolence, or goodness viewed as a disposition to promote the happiness of his sensitive creatures; (b) Love, or goodness viewed as a disposition to promote the happiness of intelligent creatures, and to regard with complacency their excellences; (c) Mercy, or goodness exercised toward the miserable; (d) Grace, or goodness exercised toward the undeserving. The grace of God toward the undeserving evidently rests upon his sovereign will (Matthew 11:26; Romans 9:15), and can be assured to us only by means of a positive revelation. Neither reason nor conscience nor observation of nature can assure us, independently of his own special revelation, that he will be gracious to the guilty. Our duty is to forgive injuries; we as individuals have nothing to do with either forgiving or pardoning sin. That God's goodness is absolutely perfect and inexhaustible is proved from universal experience, as well as from Scripture. James 1:17; James 5:11. It is exercised, however,

not in making the happiness of his creatures indiscriminately and unconditionally a chief end, but is regulated by his wisdom in order to the accomplishment of the supreme ends of his own glory and their excellence.

(7.) God is absolutely true. This is a common property of all the divine perfections and actions. His knowledge is absolutely accurate; his wisdom infallible; his goodness and justice perfectly true to the standard of his own nature. In the exercise of all his properties God is always self-consistent. He is also always absolutely true to his creatures in all his communications, sincere in his promises and threatenings, and faithful in their fulfillment. This lays the foundation for all rational confidence in the constitution of our own natures and in the order of the external world, as well as in a divinely-accredited, supernatural revelation. It guarantees the validity of the information of our senses, the truth of the intuitions of reason and conscience, the correctness of the inferences of the understanding, and the general credibility of human testimony, and pre-eminently the reliability of every word of the inspired Scriptures.

(8.) The infinite justice of God. This, viewed absolutely, is the all-perfect righteousness of God's being considered in himself. Viewed relatively, it is his infinitely righteous nature exercised, as the moral Governor of his intelligent creatures. in the imposition of righteous laws, and. in their righteous execution. It appears in the general administration of his government viewed as a whole, and distributively in his dealing to individuals that treatment which righteously belongs to them, according to his own covenants and their own deserts. God is most willingly just, but his justice is no more an optional product of his will than is his self-existent being. It is an immutable principle of his divine constitution. He is "of purer eyes than to behold evil, and cannot look on iniquity." Habakkuk 1:13. "He cannot deny himself." 2 Timothy 2:13. God does not make his demands just by willing them, but he wills them because they are just. The infinite righteousness of his immutable being determines him to regard and to treat all sin as intrinsically hateful and deserving of punishment. The punishment of sin and its consequent discouragement is an obvious benefit to the subjects of his government in general. It is a revelation of righteousness in God, and a powerful stimulant to moral excellence in them. But God hates sin because it is intrinsically hateful, and punishes it because such punishment is intrinsically righteous. This is proved --

(a.) From the direct assertions of Scripture: "To me belongeth vengeance and recompense." Deuteronomy 32:35. "According to their deeds, accordingly he will repay." Isaiah 59:18, "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you." 2 Thessalonians 1:6. "Knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death." Romans 1:32.

(b.) The Scriptures teach that the vicarious suffering of the penalty due to his people by Christ, as their substitute, was absolutely necessary to enable God to continue " just " and at the same time " the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." Romans 3:26. " If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." Galatians 2:21. "If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." Galatians 3:21. That is, if God could have, in consistency with justice, pardoned sinners without an expiation, " verily" he would not have sacrificed. his own Son " in vain."

(c.) It is a universal judgment of awakened sinners that their sin deserves punishment, and that immutable righteousness demands it. And this is the sentence universally pronounced by the

moral sense of enlightened men with regard to all crime.

(d.) The same changeless principle of righteousness was in culcated by all the divinely appointed sacrifices of the Mosaic dispensation: "Almost all things by the law are purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission." Hebrews 9:22. It has also been illustrated in the sacrificial rites of all heathen nations, and in all human laws and penalties.

(9.) The infinite holiness of God. Sometimes this term is applied to God to express his perfect purity: "Sanctify yourselves, and be ye holy; for I am holy." Leviticus 11:44. In that case it is an element of his perfect righteousness. " The Lord is righteous in all his ways, and holy in all his works." Psalms 145:17. Sometimes it expresses his transcendently august and venerable majesty, which is the result of all his harmonious and blended perfections in one perfection of absolute and infinite excellence: "And one cried to another, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory." Isaiah 6:3.

5. God is self-existent and absolutely independent, the sole support, proprietor, and sovereign disposer, of his creatures. Since God is eternal and the creator out of nothing of all things that exist besides himself, it follows (1.) That his own being must have the cause of its existence in itself -- that is, that he is self-existent; (2.) That he is absolutely independent, in his being, purposes, and actions, of all other beings; and (3.) That all other beings of right belong to him, and in fact are absolutely dependent upon him in their being, and subject to him in their actions and destinies. The sovereignty of God is his absolute right to govern and dispose of the world of his own hands according to his own good pleasure. This sovereignty rests not in his will abstractly, but in his adorable person. Hence it is an infinitely wise, righteous, benevolent, and powerful sovereignty, unlimited by anything outside of his own perfections. The grounds of his sovereignty are -- -(1.) His infinite superiority. (2.) His absolute ownership of all things, as created by him. (3.) The perpetual and absolute dependence of all things upon him for being, and of all intelligent creatures for blessedness, Daniel 4:25, Daniel 4:35; Revelation 4:11.

SECTION 3. In the unity of the Godhead there be three Persons of one substance, power, and eternity: God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost.(38) The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; (39) the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son. (40) Scripture Proof Texts

(38) 1 John 5:7; Matthew 3:16-17; Matthew 28:19; 2 Corinthians 13:14; (39) John 1:14, John 1:18; (40) John 15:26; Galatians 4:6.

Having before shown that there is but one living and true God, and that his essential properties embrace all perfections, this section asserts in addition --

1. That Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are each equally that one God; and that the indivisible divine essence and all divine perfections and prerogatives belong to each in the same sense and degree.

2. That these titles, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are not different names of the same person in different relations, but of different persons.

3. That these three divine persons are distinguished from one another by certain persona1 properties, and are revealed in a certain order of subsistence and of operation.

These propositions embrace the Christian doctrine of the Trinity (three in unity), which is no part of natural religion, though most clearly revealed in the inspired Scriptures -- indistinctly, perhaps, in the Old Testament, but with especial definiteness in the New Testament.

1. Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are each equally the one God; and the indivisible divine essence and all divine perfections and prerogatives belong to each in the same sense and degree.

Since there is but one God, the infinite and the absolute First Cause, his essence, being spiritual, cannot be divided. If then Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are that one God, they must each equally consist of that same essence. And since the attributes of God are the inherent properties of his essence, they are inseparable from that essence; and it follows that if Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, consist of the same numerical essence, they must have the same identical attributes in common -- that is, there is common to them the one intelligence and the one will, etc. The Scriptures are full of the evidences of this fundamental truth. It has never been questioned whether the Father is God. That the Son is the true God is proved by the following considerations: --

(1.) Christ existed before he was born of the Virgin. (a) He was with the Father "before the world was." John 8:58; John 17:5. (b) "He came into the world"--" He came down from heaven." John 3:13; John 16:28.

(2.) All the names and titles of God are constantly applied to Christ, and to none others except to the Father and the Spirit: as Jehovah, Jeremiah 23:6; -- mighty God, everlasting Father, Isaiah 9:6; -- God, John 1:1; Hebrews 1:8; -- God over all, Romans 9:5; -- the true God, and eternal life, 1 John 5:20; -- the Alpha and the Omega, the Almighty, Revelation 1:8.

(3.) All divine attributes are predicated of him: Eternity, John 8:58; John 17:5; Revelation 1:8; Revelation 22:13; -- immutability, Hebrews 1:10-11; Hebrews 13:8; -- omnipresence, Matthew 18:20; John 3:13; -- omniscience, Matthew 11:27; John 2:24-25; Revelation 2:28; -- omnipotence, John 5:17; Hebrews 1:3.

(4.) The Scriptures attribute all Divine works to Christ: Creation, John 1:3-10; Colossians 1:10, Colossians 1:17; -- preservation and providential government, Hebrews 1:3; Colossians 1:17; Matthew 28:18; -- the final judgment, John 5:22; Matthew 25:31-32; 2 Corinthians 5:10; -- giving eternal life, John 10:28; -- sending the Holy Ghost, John 16:7; -- sanctification, Ephesians 5:25-27.

(5.) The Scriptures declare that divine worship should be paid to him: Hebrews 1:6; Revelation 1:5-6; Revelation 5:11-12; 1 Corinthians 1:2; John 5:23. Men are to be baptized into the name of Jesus, as well as into the names of the Father and the Holy Ghost. The grace of Jesus is invoked in the apostolical benediction. That the Holy Ghost is the true God is proved in a similar manner.

(1.) He is called God. What the Spirit says Jehovah says. Compare Isaiah 6:8-9, with Acts 28:25-26; and Jeremiah 31:33 with Hebrews 10:15-16. To lie to the Holy Ghost is to lie to God. Acts 5:3-4.

(2.) Divine perfections are ascribed to him: Omniscience, 1 Corinthians 2:10-11; -- omnipresence, Psalms 139:7; -- omnipotence, Luke 1:35; Romans 8:11.

(3.) Divine works are attributed to him: Creation, Job 26:13; Psalms 104:30; -- miracles, 1 Corinthians 12:9-11; -- regeneration, John 3:6; Titus 3:5.

(4.) Divine worship is to be paid to him. His gracious influences are invoked in the apostolical benediction. 2 Corinthians 13:14. We are baptized into his name. Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is never forgiven. Matthew 12:31-32.

2. These titles, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are not the names of the same person in different relations, but of different persons.

Since there is but one indivisible and inalienable spiritual essence, which is common to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and since they have in common one infinite intelligence, power, will, etc., when we say they are distinct persons we do not mean that one is as separate from the other as one human person is from every other. Their mode of subsistence in the one substance must ever continue to us a profound mystery, as it transcends all analogy. All that is revealed to us is, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, stand so distinguished and related that,--

(1.) They use mutually the personal pronouns I, thou, he, when speaking to or about each other. Thus Christ continually addresses the Father, and speaks of the Father and of the Holy Ghost: "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter," John 14:16; "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was," John 17:5. Thus Christ speaks of the Holy Ghost: "I will send him;" "He shall testify of me;" " Whom the Father will send in my name," John 14:26, and John 15:26.

(2.) That they mutually love one another, act upon and through one another, and take counsel together. The Father sends the Son, John 17:3; and the Father and Son send the Spirit, Psalms 104:30. The Father giveth commandment to the Son, John 10:18; the Spirit "speaks not of himself "--" he testifies of" and "glorifies" Christ. John 15:26; John 16:13-15.

(3.) That they are eternally mutually related as Father and Son and Spirit. That is, the Father is the Father of the Son, and the Son the Son of the Father, and the Spirit the Spirit of the Father and of the Son.

(4.) That they work together in a perfectly harmonious economy of operations upon the creation; -- the Father creating and sitting supreme in the general administration; the Son becoming incarnate in human nature, and, as the Theanthropos, discharging the functions of mediatorial prophet, priest, and king; the Holy Ghost making his grace omnipresent, and applying it to the souls and bodies of his members: the Father the absolute origin and source of life and law; the Son the revealer; the Holy Ghost the executor.

There are a number of Scripture passages in which all the three persons are set forth as distinct and yet as divine: Matthew 28:19; 2 Corinthians 13:14; Matthew 3:13-17; John 15:26, etc.; 1 John 5:7.

3. These three divine persons are distinguished from one another by certain personal properties, and are revealed in a certain order of subsistence and of operation. The "attributes" of God are the properties of the divine essence, and therefore common to each of the three persons, who are "the same in substance," and therefore "equal in power and glory." The "properties" of each divine person, on the other hand, are those peculiar modes of personal subsistence, and that peculiar order of operation, which distinguish each from the others, and determine the relation of each to the others. This is chiefly expressed to us by the personal names by which they are revealed. The

peculiar personal property of the first person is expressed by the title Father. As a person he is eternally the Father of his only begotten Son. The peculiar personal property of the second person is expressed by the title Son. As a person he is eternally the only begotten Son of the Father, and hence the express image of his person, and the eternal Word in the beginning with God. The peculiar property of the third person is expressed by the title Spirit. This cannot express his essence, because his essence is also the essence of the Father and the Son. It must express his eternal personal relation to the other divine persons, because he is as a person constantly designated as the Spirit of the Father and the Spirit of the Son. They are all spoken of in Scripture-in a constant order; the Father first, the Son second, the Spirit third. The Father sends and operates through both the Son and the Spirit. The Son sends and operates through the Spirit. Never the reverse in either case. The Son is sent by, acts for, and reveals the Father. The Spirit is sent by, acts for, and reveals both the Father and the Son. The persons are as eternal as the essence, equal in honour, power, and glory. Three persons, they are one God, being identical in essence and divine perfections. " I and my Father are one." John 10:30. "The Father is in me and I in him." John 10:38. "He that hath seen the Son, hath seen the Father." John 14:9-11. The most ancient and universally accepted statement of all the points involved in the doctrine of the Trinity, is to be found in the Creed of the Council of Nice, A.D. 325, as amended by the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381.

01.03. Of God's Eternal Decree

Chapter Three

Of God’s Eternal Decree

SECTION 1: GOD from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass:(l) yet so, as thereby neither is God the author of sin,(2) nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established.(3)

SECTION 2: ALTHOUGH God knows whatsoever may or can come to pass upon all supposed conditions;(4) yet hath he not decreed anything because he foresaw it as future, or as that which would come to pass upon such conditions.(5)

(1) Ephesians 1:11; Romans 11:33; Hebrews 6:17; Romans 9:15, Romans 9:18. (2) James 1:13, James 1:17; 1 John 1:5. (3) Acts 2:23; Matthew 17:12; Acts 4:27, Acts 4:28; John 19:11; Proverbs 16:33. (4) Acts 15:18; 1 Samuel 23:11, 1 Samuel 23:12; Matthew 11:21, Matthew 11:23. (5) Romans 9:11, Romans 9:13, Romans 9:16, Romans 9:18.

These Sections affirm the following propositions:--

1. God has had from eternity an unchangeable plan with reference to his creatures. As an infinitely intelligent Creator and providential Ruler, God must have had a definite purpose with reference to the being and destination of all that he has created, comprehending in one all-perfect system his chief end therein, and all subordinate ends and means in reference to that chief end. And since he is an eternal and unchangeable Being, his plan must have existed in all its elements, perfect and unchangeable, from eternity. Since he is an infinite, eternal, unchangeable, and absolutely wise, powerful, and sovereign Person, his purposes must partake of the essential attributes of his own being. And since God’s intelligence is absolutely perfect and his plan is eternal, since his ultimate end is revealed to be the single one of his own glory, and the whole work of creation and providence is observed to form one system, it follows that his plan is also single-one all-comprehensive intention, providing for all the means and conditions as well as the ends selected.

2. The plan of God comprehends and determines all things and events of every kind that come to pass.

(1) This is rendered certain from the fact that all God’s works of creation and providence constitute one system. No event is isolated, either in the physical or moral world, either in heaven or on earth. All of God’s supernatural revelations and every advance of human science conspire to make this truth conspicuously luminous. Hence the original intention which determines one event must also determine every other event related to it, as cause, condition, or consequent, direct and indirect, immediate and remote. Hence, the plan which determines general ends must also determine even the minutest element comprehended in the system of which those ends are parts.

The free actions of free agents constitute an eminently important and effective element in the system of things. If the plan of God did not determine events of this class, he could make nothing certain, and his government of the world would be made contingent and dependent, and all his purposes fallible and mutable.

(2) The Scriptures expressly declare this truth-

(a) Of the whole system in general. He "worketh all things after the counsel of his own will" (Ephesians 1:11).

(b) Of fortuitous events (Proverbs 16:33; Matthew 10:29, Matthew 10:30).

(c) Of the free actions of men. "The king's heart is in the hands of the LORD, as the rivers of water: he turneth it whithersoever he will" (Proverbs 21:1). "We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them" (Ephesians 2:10). "It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure" (Php 2:13).

(d) Of the sinful actions of men. "Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain" (Acts 2:23). "For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done" (Acts 4:27, Acts 4:28). (Compare Genesis 37:28 with Genesis 45:7, Genesis 45:8; Isaiah 10:5.)

It must be remembered, however, that the purpose of God with respect to the sinful acts of men and wicked angels is in no degree to cause the evil, nor to approve it, but only to permit the wicked agent to perform it, and then to overrule it for his own most wise and holy ends. The same infinitely perfect and self-consistent decree ordains the moral law which forbids and punishes all sin, and at the same time permits its occurrence, limiting and determining the precise channel to which it shall be confined, the precise end to which it shall be directed, and overruling its consequences for good: "But as for you, 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).

3. This all-comprehensive purpose is not, as a whole nor in any of its constituent elements, conditional. It in no respect depends upon his foresight of events not embraced in and determined by his purpose. It is absolutely sovereign, depending only on the "wise and holy counsel of his own will." A very obvious distinction must always be kept in mind between an event being conditioned on other events, and the decree of God with reference to that event being conditioned. Calvinists believe, as all men must, that all events in the system of things depend upon their causes, and are suspended on conditions. That is, if a man does not sow seed, he will not reap; if he does sow, and all the favorable climatic influences are present, he will reap. If a man believes, he shall be saved; if he does not believe, he will not be saved. But the all-comprehensive purpose of God embraces and determines the cause and the conditions, as well as the event suspended upon them. The decree, instead of altering, determines the nature of events, and their mutual relations. It makes free actions free in relation to their agents, and contingent events contingent in relation to their conditions; while at the same time, it makes the entire system of events, and every element embraced in it, certainly future. An absolute decree is one which, while it may determine many conditional events by determining their conditions, is itself suspended on no condition. A

conditional decree is one which determines that a certain event shall happen on condition that some other undecreed event happens, upon which undecreed event the decree itself, as well as the event decreed, is suspended. The Confession in this section teaches that all the decrees of God are unconditional.

All who believe in a divine government agree with Calvinists that the decrees of God relating to events produced by necessary causes are unconditional. The only debate relates to those decrees which are concerned with the free actions of men and of angels. The Socinians and Rationalists maintain that God cannot certainly foresee free actions, because from their very nature they are uncertain until they are performed. Arminians admit that he certainly foresees them, but deny that he determines them. Calvinists affirm that he foresees them to be certainly future because he has determined them to be so. The truth of the Calvinist view is proved-

(1) From the fact that, as shown above, the decrees of God determine all classes of events. If every event that comes to pass is foreordained, it is evident that there is nothing left undetermined upon which the decree can be conditioned.

(2) Because the decrees of God are sovereign. This is evident-(a) Because God is the eternal and absolute Creator of all things. All creatures exist, and are what they are, and possess the properties peculiar to them, and act under the very conditions in which they act, because of God's plan. (b) It is directly affirmed in Scripture (Daniel 4:35; Isaiah 40:13, Isaiah 40:14; Romans 9:15-18; Ephesians 1:5).

(3) God's decree includes and determines the means and conditions upon which events depend, as well as the events themselves: "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy" (Ephesians 1:4). "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God" (Ephesians 2:8). "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth" (2 Thessalonians 2:13). In the case of Paul's shipwreck, God first promised Paul absolutely that not a life should be lost (Acts 27:24). But Paul said, verse 31, "Except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved."

(4) The Scriptures declare that the salvation of individuals is conditioned upon the personal act of faith, and at the same time that the decree of God with regard to the salvation of individuals rests solely upon "the counsel of his own will," "his own good pleasure." "For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth," etc. (Romans 9:11). "Being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will" (Ephesians 1:11; 1:5; Matthew 11:25, Matthew 11:26).

4. The purpose of God is, with reference to all the objects embraced within it, certainly efficacious. The decree of God is merely a purpose which he executes in his works of creation and providence. When it is said that all the decrees of God are certainly efficacious, it is not meant that they are the proximate causes of events, but that they render, under the subsequent economy of creation and providence, every event embraced in them absolutely certain. This is evident-

(1) From the nature of God as an infinitely wise and powerful person and absolute sovereign.

(2) From the fact that the decrees relate to all events without exception, and are sovereign and unconditional.

(3) The Scriptures declare, with reference to such events, that there is a needs-be that they should happen as it was determined (Matthew 16:21; Luke 24:44; Luke 22:22).

5. This purpose must in all things be perfectly consistent with his own most wise, benevolent, and holy nature. This is a self-evident truth from the nature of God as an eternal, absolutely perfect, and unchangeable Being. His decrees must be absolutely perfect in wisdom and righteousness. The problem of the permission of sin is to us insoluble, because unexplained. The fact is certain, the reason beyond discovery. If God be infinitely wise and powerful, he might have prevented it. It is evident that it is consistent with absolute righteousness to permit it and to overrule it. The Arminian admits that God foresaw that sin and misery would certainly eventuate upon the conditions of creation he established. He is therefore as unable as the Calvinist is to explain why God, notwithstanding that certain knowledge, did not change those conditions.

It remains certain, however, that God is not the cause of sin because He is absolutely holy. Moreover, sin is essentially defined as a violation of God's will (ovomia), and God cannot violate His own will. Also, having free agency we are responsible for our actions. We must assert that God has permitted sin for the purpose of overruling it in the interests of righteousness and benevolence, for His own glory and our highest good.

6. The purpose of God is in all things perfectly consistent with the nature and the mode of action of the creatures severally embraced within it. This is certain-

(1) Because the one eternal, self-consistent, all-comprehensive purpose of God at the same time determines the nature of the agent, his proper mode of action, and each action that shall eventuate. As God's purpose cannot be inconsistent with itself, the element of it determining the nature of the agent cannot be inconsistent with the element of it determining any particular action of the agent.

(2) Because the decrees of God are not the proximate causes of events; they only make a given event certainly future. It provides that free agents shall be free agents, and free actions free actions; and that a given free agent shall exist, and that he shall freely perform a certain free action under certain conditions.

Now, that a given free action is certainly future, is obviously not inconsistent with the perfect freedom of the agent in that act: (a) Because all admit that God certainly foreknows the free actions of free agents, and if so, they must be certainly future, although free. (b) God's actions are certainly holy, though free; and the same is true of all glorified spirits in heaven. (c) The actions of the devil, and of finally reprobate men and angels, will forever be certainly wicked, yet free and responsible.

SECTION 3: BY the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels(6) are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.(7)

SECTION 4: THESE angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished.(8)

SECTION 5: THOSE of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory,(9) out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving him thereunto;(10) and all to the praise of his glorious grace.(11)

(6) 1 Timothy 5:21; Matthew 25:41. (7) Romans 9:22, Romans 9:23; Ephesians 1:5-6; Proverbs 16:4. (8) 2 Timothy 2:19; John 13:18. (9) Ephesians 1:4, Ephesians 1:9, Ephesians 1:11; Romans 8:30; 2 Timothy 1:9; 1 Thessalonians 5:9. (10) Romans 9:11, Romans 9:13, Romans 9:16; Ephesians 1:4, Ephesians 1:9. (11) Ephesians 1:6, Ephesians 1:12. The preceding sections having affirmed that the eternal, sovereign, immutable, unconditional decree of God determines all events of every class that come to pass, these sections proceed to affirm, by way of specification, the following propositions:

1. The decree of God determines that out of the mass of fallen humanity certain individuals shall attain to eternal salvation, and that the rest shall be left to be dealt with justly for their sins. The Socinian holds that the free acts of men, being in their nature uncertain, cannot be foreknown as certainly future. Since, therefore, God does not foreknow who will repent and believe, his election amounts to no more than his general purpose to save all believers as a class. The Arminian holds that God, foreseeing from all eternity who will repent and believe, elects those individuals to eternal life on that condition of faith and repentance thus certainly foreknown. The Calvinist holds that God has elected certain individuals to eternal life, and all the means and conditions thereof, on the ground of his sovereign good pleasure. He chooses them to faith and repentance, and not because of their faith and repentance. That God does choose individuals to eternal life is certain.

(1) The subjects are always spoken of in Scripture as individuals: "As many as were ordained to eternal life believed" (Acts 13:48; 2 Thessalonians 2:13; Ephesians 1:4).

(2) The names of the elect are said to be "written in heaven," and to be "in the book of life" (Php 4:3; Hebrews 12:23).

(3) The blessings to which men are elected are such as pertain to individuals, not to communities; and they are represented as elected to these spiritual qualifications, and not because they belong to the class which possesses them. They are elected "to salvation," "to the adoption of sons," "to be holy and without blame before him in love" (2 Thessalonians 2:13; Galatians 4:4, Galatians 4:5; Ephesians 1:4).

2. This election is unchangeable. This is self-evident.

3. It is not conditioned upon foreseen faith or repentance, but in each case upon sovereign grace and personal love, according to the secret counsel of his will.

(1) It is expressly declared not to rest upon works; but foreseen faith and repentance are works (Romans 11:4-7; 2 Timothy 1:9).

(2) Faith and repentance are expressly said to be the fruits of election, and consequently cannot be its conditions. They are also declared to be the gifts of God, and cannot therefore be the conditions upon which he suspends his purpose (Ephesians 2:10; Ephesians 1:4; 1 Peter 1:2;

Ephesians 2:8; Acts 5:31; 1 Corinthians 4:7). "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing" (John 6:37, John 6:39). "But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep" (John 10:26). "And as many as were ordained to eternal life believed" (Acts 13:48).

(3) The Scriptures represent men by nature as "dead in trespasses and sins"; and faith and repentance as the exercise of regenerated souls; and regeneration as the work of God-a "new birth," a "new creation," a "quickening from the dead." Faith and repentance, therefore, must be conditioned upon God's purpose, and cannot condition it (Ephesians 2:1; John 3:3, John 3:5; Ephesians 2:5, Ephesians 2:10).

(4) The Scriptures expressly say that election is conditioned on the "good pleasure of God's will": "Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace...In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will" (Ephesians 1:5,11; Matthew 11:25, Matthew 11:26; John 15:16, John 15:19).

(5) God claims the right of sovereign, unconditional election as his prerogative: "Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour?" (Romans 9:21). If of the same lump, the difference is not in the clay. "So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy" (Romans 9:16).

4. The ultimate end or motive of God in election is the praise of his glorious grace. This is expressly asserted in Ephesians 1:5-6, Ephesians 5:12. In the chapter on Creation it will be shown that the final end of God in all his works, as a whole, is the manifestation of his own glory. If it be the final end of the whole, it must be the end also of the special destination of all the parts.

SECTION 6: AS God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto.(12) Wherefore they who are elected being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ;(13) are effectually called unto faith in Christ by his Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified,(14) and kept by his power through faith unto salvation.(15) Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified and saved, but the elect only.(16)

(12) 1 Peter 1:2; Ephesians 1:4-5; Ephesians 2:10; 2 Thessalonians 2:13. (13) 1 Thessalonians 5:9-10; Titus 2:14. (14) Romans 8:30; Ephesians 1:5; 2 Thessalonians 2:13. (15) 1 Peter 1:5. (16) John 17:9; Romans 8:28; John 6:64, John 6:65; John 10:26; John 8:47; 1 John 2:19. This section affirms:

1. That although the decree of God is one eternal, all-comprehensive intention, the several elements embraced within it necessarily sustain the relation to one another of means to ends. In determining the ends he intends to accomplish, God at the same time determines the means by which he intends to accomplish them. And God's purpose with respect to the end necessarily, in the logical order, takes precedence of and gives direction to his purpose with respect to the means.

2. That, in the matter of the redemption of men, the end which God determined was the salvation of certain individuals, called "the elect"; and that he appointed, as means to that end, redemption by Christ, effectual calling, justification, adoption, sanctification, perseverance in grace unto death.

3. That as the means are intended to effect the end, so they are not to be exercised in the case of any whose salvation has not been adopted as that end. None but the elect are redeemed by Christ, or effectually called, or justified, or adopted, or sanctified.

1. That the purposes of God do sustain the relation to one another of means to ends is evident-

(1) From the fact that his purposes are the product of an infinite intelligence the very office of which is to coordinate a great system of means in the accomplishment of a great design.

(2) God accomplishes his eternal purposes in his works of creation and providence, and in the economy of both he habitually uses systems of means in subordination to predetermined ends.

(3) All the events decreed as a matter of fact eventuate in the relation of means in subordination to ends. They must therefore have been embraced in the same order in the divine decree.

(4) God explicitly tells us that he determines one thing in order to accomplish another. He predestinates men to salvation, "through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth," to "the praise of the glory of his grace" (2 Thessalonians 2:13; Ephesians 1:6).

2. That the gift of Christ to make atonement for sin, and of the Holy Ghost to regenerate and sanctify, are in the divine designed as means to accomplish his purpose to secure the salvation of the elect, has been doubted by some theologians, but is explicitly affirmed both positively and negatively in this section of the Confession. In the time that this Confession was written, the phrase "to redeem" was used in the same sense in which we now use the phrase "to make atonement for." The Confession affirms, first, positively, that Christ was eternally appointed to make atonement as a means of executing the purpose to save the elect; and second, negatively, that he has made atonement for none others. The class of theologians who do not agree with the Confession at this point, view the purposes of God, with respect to man’s salvation and the gift of Christ to be a Savior, as sustaining respectively the following order: Out of infinite pity and universal benevolence, God determined to give his Son to die for the redemption from the curse of the law of all mankind, ruined by the fall; but, foreseeing that if left to themselves all men would certainly reject Christ and be lost, God, in order to carry out and apply his plan of human redemption, and moved by a special love to certain persons, elected them out of the mass of mankind to be recipients of the special effectual grace of the Holy Ghost, and thus to salvation. The doctrine taught in the Confession and held by the great body of the Reformed Churches is, that God, moved by a special personal love, elected certain men out of the mass of the fallen race to salvation, and in order to accomplish that purpose he determined to send Christ to die for them and the Holy Ghost to renew and sanctify them. That the view of the Confession is the true one is plain-

(1) From the very statement of the case. The gift of Christ to die for the elect is a very adequate means to accomplish the decree of their salvation. But, on the other hand, the decree to give the efficacious influences of the Holy Ghost only to the elect is a very inadequate means of accomplishing the purpose of redeeming all men by the sacrifice of Christ. A purpose to save all

and a purpose to save only some could not coexist in the divine mind.

(2) All the purposes of God, being unchangeable, self-consistent, and certainly efficacious, must perfectly correspond to the events which come to pass in time. He must have predestinated to salvation those and those only who are as a matter of fact saved; and he must have intended that Christ should redeem those and those only who are redeemed. God's purpose in the gift of Christ cannot be in any respect in vain. (3) Christ says explicitly, "I lay down my life for the sheep" (John 10:15).

3. None but the elect are redeemed by Christ, or effectually called, or justified, or adopted, or sanctified. This is only the negative statement of the same truth, designed to make the positive affirmation of it the more explicit and emphatic. The doctrine as to the design of God in the sacrifice of Christ is stated again in Chapter 8. Section 8. of the Confession, and will be more appropriately stated and discussed in that place.

SECTION 7: 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.(17)

(17) Matthew 11:25, Matthew 11:26; Romans 9:17, Romans 9:18, Romans 9:21, Romans 9:22; 2 Timothy 2:19-20; Jud1: 4; 1 Peter 2:8. This section teaches the following propositions:

1. That as God has sovereignly destinated certain persons, called the elect, through grace to salvation, so he has sovereignly decreed to withhold his grace from the rest; and that this withholding rests upon the unsearchable counsel of his own will, and is for the glory of his sovereign power.

2. That God has consequently determined to treat all those left in their sins with exact justice according to their own deserts, to the praise of his justice, which demands the punishment of all unexpiated sin. This decree of reprobation, as it is called, is the aspect which God's eternal purpose presents in its relation to that portion of the human family which shall be finally condemned for their sins.

Reprobation consists of two elements, the negative and the positive. In its negative aspect God does not elect the reprobate, but "passes over" him; in this God is absolutely sovereign, resting upon His good pleasure alone, since those passed over are no worse than those elected. Positively, reprobation is not sovereign, but purely judicial, since God has determined to treat the reprobate according to what they deserve. This doctrine, instead of being inconsistent with the principles of absolute justice, necessarily follows from the application of those principles to the case in hand.

(1) All men alike are "by nature the children of wrath," and justly obnoxious to the penalty of the law antecedently to the gift of Christ to be their Savior. It is because they are in this condition that vicarious satisfaction of divine justice was absolutely necessary in order to the salvation of any, otherwise, the apostle says, "Christ is dead in vain." Hence if any are to be saved, justice itself demands that their salvation shall be recognized as not their right, but a sovereign concession on the part of God. None have a natural right to salvation. And the salvation of one cannot give a right

to salvation to another.

(2) Salvation is declared to be in its very essence a matter of grace; and if of grace, the selection of its subjects is inalienably a matter of divine discretion (Lamentations 3:22; Romans 4:4; Romans 11:6; Ephesians 1:5-7; John 3:16; 1 John 3:16; 1 John 4:10). This doctrine as above stated is true-

(1) Because it is necessarily involved in the scriptural doctrine of election taught in the preceding sections.

(2) It is expressly taught in Scripture: "Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth" (Romans 9:18; 1 Peter 2:8; Revelation 13:8; Jude 1:4).

(3) God asserts the right involved as his righteous prerogative: "Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? Who art thou that repliest against God? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour? What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction: and that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory?" (Romans 9:19-23).

SECTION 8: THE doctrine of this high mystery of predestination is to be handled with special prudence and care,(18) that men attending the will of God revealed in his Word, and yielding obedience thereunto, may, from the certainty of their effectual vocation, be assured of their eternal election.(19) So shall this doctrine afford matter of praise, reverence, and admiration of God,(20) and of humility, diligence, and abundant consolation, to all that sincerely obey the gospel.(21)

(18) Romans 9:20; Romans 11:33; Deuteronomy 29:29. (19) 2 Peter 1:10. (20) Ephesians 1:6; Romans 11:33. (21) Romans 11:5, Romans 11:6, Romans 11:20; 2 Peter 1:10; Romans 8:33; Luke 10:20. This section teaches that the high mystery of predestination is to be handled with special prudence and care. This necessity arises from the fact that it is often abused, and that its proper use is in the highest degree important. The principle of divine sovereignty in the distribution of grace is certainly revealed in Scripture, is not difficult of comprehension; and is of great practical use to convince men of the greatness and independence of God, of the certain efficacy of his grace and security of his promises, and of their own sin and absolute dependence. But the philosophy of the relation of his sovereign purpose to the free agency of the creature, and to the permission of moral evil, is not revealed in the Scriptures, and cannot be discovered by human reason, and therefore ought not to be rashly meddled with. This truth ought not, moreover, to be obtruded out of its due place in the system, which includes the equally certain truths of the freedom of man and the free offers of the gospel to all.

While the principle of sovereign election as lying at the foundation of all grace is thus clearly revealed, the election or nonelection of particular persons is not revealed in the Scriptures. The preceptive and not the decretive will of God is the rule of human duty. Election is first with God, and grace consequent upon it. But with man duty and grace are first, and the inference of personal election only consequent upon the possession of grace. The command to repent and believe is addressed to all men indiscriminately, and the obligation rests equally upon all. The concern of the inquirer is simply with the fact that the grace is offered, and assured to him upon condition of acceptance, and with his duty to accept and improve it. Afterward it is the great privilege of the

believer to make the fact of his eternal calling and election sure, by adding to faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge etc.; for if he do these things he shall never fall (2 Peter 1:5-10).

01.04. Of Creation

Chapter Four

Of Creation

SECTION 1: IT pleased God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,(1) for the manifestation of the glory of his eternal power, wisdom, and goodness,(2) in the beginning, to create, or make of nothing, the world, and all things therein, whether visible or invisible, in the space of six days, and all very good.(3)

(1) Hebrews 1:2; John 1:2-3; Genesis 1:2; Job 26:13; Job 33:4. (2) Romans 1:20; Jeremiah 10:12; Psalms 104:24; Psalms 33:5-6. (3) Genesis 1:1-31; Hebrews 11:3; Colossians 1:16; Acts 17:24. This section teaches that matter is not self-existing; that God created the visible universe ex nihilo (from nothing) in six days, all of which was very good, to the manifestation of His own glory.

1. There is a very obvious distinction between the substances of things and the forms into which those substances are disposed. In our experience the elementary substances which constitute things are permanent, as oxygen, hydrogen, and the like, while the organic and inorganic forms in which they are combined are constantly changing. That personal spirits and the various forms in which the material elements of the universe are disposed are not self-existent or eternal is self-evident; and the universality, the constancy, and the rapidity of the changes of the latter are rendered more obvious and certain with every advance of science. That the elementary substances of things were created out of nothing was never believed by the ancient heathen philosophers, but is a fundamental principle of Christian Theism. This is proved by the following considerations:

(1) The Scriptures speak of a time when the world was absolutely nonexistent. Christ speaks of the glory "which I had with thee before the world was" (John 17:5, John 17:24). "Before thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God" (Psalms 90:2).

(2) The Hebrew word translated "to create," and used by Moses to reveal the fact that God created the world, is the very best afforded by any human language anterior to revelation to express the idea of absolute making. It is introduced at the beginning, of an account of the genesis of the heavens and of the earth. In the beginning-in the absolute beginning-God created all things (heaven and earth). After that there was chaos, and subsequently the Spirit of God, brooding over the deep, brought the ordered world into being. The creation came before chaos, as chaos before the bringing of things into their present form. Therefore the substances of things must have had a beginning as well as their present forms.

(3) The Scriptures always attribute the existence of things purely to the will, "word," "breath" of God, and never, even indirectly, imply the presence of any other element or condition of their being, such as preexisting matter: "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear"

(Hebrews 11:3; Psalms 33:6; Psalms 148:5).

(4) If God be not the creator of substance ex nihilo , as well as the former of worlds and of things, he cannot be absolutely sovereign in his decrees or in his works of creation, providence or grace. On every hand he would be limited and conditioned by the self-existent qualities of preexistent substance, and their endless consequences. But the Scriptures always represent God as the absolute sovereign and proprietor of all things (Romans 11:36; 1 Corinthians 8:6; Colossians 1:16; Revelation 4:11; Nehemiah 9:6).

(5) The same traces of designed and precalculated correspondences may be clearly observed in the elementary and essential properties and laws of matter that are observed in the adjustments of matter in the existing forms of the world. If the traces of design observed in the existing forms of the world prove the existence of an intelligent former, for the same reason the traces of design in the elementary constitution of matter prove the existence of an intelligent creator of those elements out of nothing.

2. Hence theologians have distinguished between the creatio prima or first creation of the elementary substance of things ex nihilo , and the creatio secunda or second creation or combination of the elements and the formation of things, and their mutual adjustments in the system of the universe. This section attributes creation in both of these senses to the one true God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The Scriptures attribute creation-(1) To God absolutely, without distinction of person (Genesis 1:1, Genesis 1:26). (2) To the Father (1 Corinthians 8:6). (3) To the Father through the Son (Hebrews 1:2). (4) To the Father through the Spirit (Psalms 104:30). (5) To the Son (John 1:2-3). (6) To the Spirit (Genesis 1:2; Job 33:4). This section, using the precise words of Scripture (Exodus 20:11), declares that God performed the work of creation, in the sense of formation and adjustment of the universe in its present order, "in the space of six days." Since the Confession was written the science of geology has come into existence, and has brought to light many facts before unknown as to the various conditions through which this world, and probably the stellar universe, have passed previously to the establishment of the present order. These facts remain in their general character unquestionable, and indicate a process of divinely regulated development consuming vast periods of time. In order to adjust the conclusions of that science with the inspired record found in the first chapter of Genesis, some suppose that the first verse relates to the creation of the elements of things at the absolute beginning, and then, after a vast interval, during which the changes discovered by science took place, the second and subsequent verses narrate how God in six successive days reconstructed and prepared the world and its inhabitants for the residence of man. Others have supposed that the days spoken of are not natural days, but cycles of vast duration. No adjustment thus far suggested has been found to remove all difficulty. The facts which are certain are- (1) The record in Genesis has been given by divine revelation, and therefore is infallibly true. (2) The book of revelation and the book of nature are both from God, and will be found, when both are adequately interpreted, to coincide perfectly. (3) The facts upon which the science of geology is based are as yet very imperfectly collected and much more imperfectly understood. The time has not come yet in which a profitable comparison and adjustment of the two records can be attempted. (4) The record in Genesis, brief and general as it is, was designed and is admirably adapted to lay the foundation of an intelligent faith in Jehovah as the absolute creator and the immediate former and providential ruler of all things. But it was not designed either to prevent or to take the place of a scientific interpretation of all existing

phenomena, and of all traces of the past history of the world which God allows men to discover. Apparent discrepancies in established truths can have their ground only in imperfect knowledge. God requires us both to believe and to learn. He imposes upon us at present the necessity of humility and patience.

3. God himself pronounced all the works of his hands, when completed, very good (Genesis 1:31). This does not mean that finite and material things possessed an absolute perfection, nor even that they possessed the highest excellence consistent with their nature. But it means-(1) That all things in this world were at that time excellent according to their respective kinds-the human souls morally excellent after the law of moral agents, and the world and all its organized inhabitants excellent according to their several natures and relations. (2) That each and the whole was perfectly good with reference to the general and special design of God in their creation.

4. With respect to the final end of God in the creation of the universe two distinct opinions have been entertained by theologians: (1) That God proposed for himself as his ultimate end the promotion of the happiness, or as others say the excellence, of his creatures. (2) That God proposed for himself the manifestation of his own glory. This is obviously a question of the highest importance. Since the chief end of every system of means and agencies must govern and give character to the whole system, so our view of the chief end of God in his works must give character to all our views as to his creative, providential, and gracious dispensations. Our Confession very explicitly takes the position that the chief end of God in his eternal purposes, and in their temporal execution in creation and providence, is the manifestation of his own glory (Chapter 3., Sections 3., 5., 7.; Chapter 4., Section 1.; Chapter 5., Section 1.; Chapter 6., Section 1.; Chapter 33., Section 2.; Larger Catechism, questions 12, 18; Shorter Catechism, question 7). That this opinion is true is proved:

(1) The Scriptures explicitly assert that this is the chief end of God in creation (Colossians 1:16; Proverbs 16:4); and of things as created (Revelation 4:11; Romans 11:36).

(2) They teach that the same is the chief end of God in his eternal decrees (Ephesians 1:5-6, Ephesians 1:12).

(3) Also of God’s providential and gracious governing and disposing of his creatures (Romans 9:17, Romans 9:22-23; Ephesians 3:10).

(4) It is made the duty of all moral agents to adopt the same as their personal ends in all things (1 Corinthians 10:31; 1 Peter 4:11).

(5) The manifestation of his own glory is intrinsically the highest and worthiest end that God could propose to himself.

(6) The highest attainment of this supreme end carries with it the largest possible measure of good to the creature.

(7) God as the absolute creator and sovereign cannot have the final ends or motives of his action exterior to himself. Otherwise all God’s actions would be subordinated to the finite and created ends he had adopted as his ultimate objects.

SECTION 2: AFTER God had made all other creatures, he created man, male and female,(4) with reasonable and immortal souls,(5) endued with knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness, after his own image,(6) having the law of God written in their hearts,(7) and power to fulfill it;(8) and yet under a possibility of transgressing, being left to the liberty of their own will, which was subject unto change(9) Besides this law written in their hearts, they received a command not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil;(10) which while they kept, they were happy in their communion with God, and had dominion over the creatures.(11)

(4) Genesis 1:27. (5) Genesis 2:7; Ecclesiastes 12:7; Luke 23:43; Matthew 10:28. (6) Genesis 1:26; Colossians 3:10; Ephesians 4:24. (7) Romans 2:14-15. (8) Ecclesiastes 7:29. (9) Genesis 3:6; Ecclesiastes 7:29. (10) Genesis 2:17; Genesis 3:8-11, Genesis 3:23. (11) Genesis 1:26, Genesis 1:28.

We turn in this section to the immediate creation of man by God.

1. Man was created immediately by God, and last of the creatures. According to God's plan of successive creation, and of progressive advance in complexity and excellence of organization and endowment, man's true place is last in order as the immediate end and crown of this lower creation. The scientific advocates of the hypothesis of organic development have denied that man was created immediately by God, and have held that the higher and more complex living organisms were developed gradually and by successive stages from the lower and more simple as the physical condition of the world became gradually favorable to their existence, and that man at the proper time came last of all from the last link in the order of being immediately below him. That man, on the contrary, was immediately created by God, his body out of earthly materials previously created and his soul out of nothing, is rendered certain by the following evidence:

(1) The hypothesis of development is a mere dream of unsanctified reason, utterly unsupported by facts. Not one single individual specimen of an organized being passing in transition from a lower species to a higher has been found among the myriads of existing species, nor among the fossil remains of past species preserved in the record of the rocks.

(2) The Scriptures expressly affirm the fact of man's immediate creation (Genesis 1:26-27; Genesis 2:7).

(3) This truth is rendered obvious, also, by the immense distance which separates man from the nearest of the lower animals; from the incomparable superiority of man in kind as well as degree; and from the revealed and experienced fact that "God is the father of our spirits," and that we are immortal, "joint heirs with Christ" (Hebrews 12:9; Romans 8:17).

2. That God created one human pair, from whom the entire race in all its varieties has descended by generation, is a fundamental truth of the Christian revelation.

One class of scientists, as Sir Charles Lyell, have concluded, from the positions and associations in which human remains have been found, that man has existed upon the Earth thousands of years before Adam, who is regarded as the ancestor only of a particular variety of the race. All this weighs nothing against the positive teaching of the Scriptures, since the facts upon which the conclusion is based are not all certainly substantiated, and have not been thoroughly digested; and in any event can prove nothing as to the relation of Adam to the race, but only that he was

created longer ago than we supposed.

Another class, of which the leader is Professor Agassiz, maintain that the differences between the different varieties of the human race are so great and so persistent that it is impossible that they could have been generated from the same parents, and that the progenitors of each variety were created separately, each in their appropriate geographical center. This conclusion of science may be fairly balanced by the extreme opposite one above stated. If, in view of all the facts of the case, it is possible for one class of philosophers to conclude that men, monkeys and dogs, etc., have descended, under the modifying influence of different conditions, from like progenitors, surely it is folly for another class to affirm that it is impossible that all the varieties of men have sprung from the same parents. That the doctrine of this section is true is proved:

(1) The differences between the varieties of the human family are no greater than have been effected by differences of condition and training among individuals of some of the lower orders of animals of known common descent.

(2) The human family form one and not different species. (a) Because the races freely intermix and produce permanently fertile offspring. (b) Because their mental, moral, and spiritual natures are identical.

(3) Archaeological, historical, and philological investigations all indicate a common origin to all nations.

(4) The Scriptures directly assert this fact (Acts 17:26; Genesis 10:1-32). And the scriptural doctrines of original sin and of redemption presuppose it as a fundamental and essential condition (1 Corinthians 15:21-22; Romans 5:12-19).

3. God created man in his own image. This proposition includes the following elements: (1) Man was created like God, as to the physical constitution of his nature-a rational, moral, free, personal spirit. This fact is the essential condition upon which our ability to know God, as well as our capacity to be subjects of moral government, depends. And in this respect the likeness is indestructible.

(2) He was created like God as to the perfection and integrity of his nature. This includes (a) Knowledge (Colossians 3:10), or a capacity for the right apprehension of spiritual things. This is restored when the sinner is regenerated, in the grace of spiritual illumination. (b) Righteousness and true holiness (Ephesians 4:24), the perfect moral condition of the soul, and eminently of the character of the governing affections and will.

(3) In respect to the dignity and authority delegated to him as the head of this department of creation (Genesis 1:28).

Pelagians have held that a created holiness is an absurdity; that, in order that a permanent disposition or habit of the soul should have a moral character, it must be self-decided-i.e., formed by a previous unbiased choice of the will itself. They therefore hold that God created Adam simply a moral agent, with all the constitutional faculties prerequisite for moral action, and perfectly unbiased by any tendency of his nature either to good or evil, and left him to form his own moral character-to determine his own tendencies by his own volition. But this view is not true, because-

(1) It is absurd. A state of moral indifference in an intelligent adult moral agent is an impossibility. Such indifference is itself sin. It is of the essence of moral good that it brings the will and all the affections of the soul under obligation.

(2) If God did not endow man with a positive moral character, he could never have acquired a good one. The goodness of a volition arises wholly from the positive goodness of the disposition or motive which prompts it. But if Adam was created without a positive holy disposition of soul, his first volition must have either been sinful from defect of inherent goodness, or at best indifferent. But it is evident that neither a sinful nor an indifferent volition can give a holy moral character to whatever dispositions or habits may be consequent upon it.

(3) The Scriptures teach that Adam was created in "righteousness and true holiness" (Ephesians 4:24).

(a) God proclaimed all his works "very good" (Genesis 1:31). But the "goodness" of a moral agent essentially involves a holy character.

(b) Ecclesiastes 7:29: "God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions."

(c) In Genesis 1:27 it is declared that man was created in "the image of God." In Ephesians 4:24 and Colossians 3:10, men in regeneration are declared to be re-created in "the image of God." Regeneration is the restoration of human nature to its pristine condition, not a transmutation of that nature into a new form. The likeness to God which was lost by the fall must therefore be the same as that to which we are restored in the new birth. But the latter is said to consist in "knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness."

(4) Christ is the model Man (1 Corinthians 15:45, 1 Corinthians 15:47), produced by immediate divine power in the womb of the Virgin, not only without sin, but positively predetermined to holiness. In his mother’s womb he was called "that holy thing" (Luke 1:35).

4. That God should have furnished Adam with sufficient knowledge for his guidance is necessarily implied in the feet that Adam was a holy moral agent and God a righteous moral governor. Even his corrupt and degenerate descendants are declared to have in the law written upon the heart a light sufficient to leave them "without excuse" (Romans 1:20; Romans 2:14-15). Adam, moreover, enjoyed special and direct revelation from God, and was particularly directed as to the divine will with respect to his use of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

5. That Adam, although created holy and capable of obedience, was at the same time capable of falling, is evident from the event. This appears to have been the moral condition in which both angels and men were created. It evidently was never intended to be the permanent condition of any creature. It is one, also, of the special elements of which we can have no knowledge, either from experience or observation. God, angels, and saints in glory are free, but with natures certainly and infallibly prompting them to holiness. Devils and fallen men are free, with natures infallibly prompting them to evil. The imperfectly sanctified Christian is the subject of two conflicting inherent tendencies, the law in the members and the law of the Spirit; and his only security is that he is "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation." This point will come up again under Chapter 6., Section 5.

01.05. Of Providence

Chapter Five

Of Providence

SECTION 1: GOD, the great Creator of all things, doth uphold,(1) direct, dispose, and govern all creatures, actions, and things,(2) from the greatest even to the least,(3) by his most wise and holy providence,(4) according to his infallible foreknowledge,(5) and the free and immutable counsel of his own will,(6) to the praise of the glory of his wisdom, power, justice, goodness, and mercy.(7)

(1) Hebrews 1:3. (2) Daniel 4:34-35; Psalms 135:6; Acts 17:25-26, Acts 17:28; Job 38, 39, 40, 41 (3) Matthew 10:29-31. (4) Proverbs 15:3; Psalms 104:24; Psalms 145:17. (5) Acts 15:18; Psalms 94:8-11. (6) Ephesians 1:11; Psalms 33:10-11. (7) Isaiah 63:14; Ephesians 3:10; Romans 9:17; Genesis 45:7; Psalms 145:7.

Since the eternal and immutable purpose of God has certainly predetermined whatsoever comes to pass, it follows that he must execute his own purpose not only in his works of creation, but likewise in his continual control of all his creatures and all their actions. This section therefore teaches:

1. That God having created the substances of which all things are composed out of nothing, having endued these substances with their respective properties and powers, and having out of them formed all things organic and inorganic, and endowed them severally with their respective properties and faculties, he continues to sustain them in being and in the possession and exercise of those properties during the entire period of their existence.

2. That God directs all the actions of his creatures according to their respective properties and relations.

3. That his providential control extends to all his creatures and all their actions of every kind.

4. That his providential control is in all respects the consistent execution of his eternal, immutable, and sovereign purpose.

5. That the final end of his providence is the manifestation of his own glory.

1. With regard to the question how God is concerned in upholding and preserving the things he has made, three different classes of opinion have prevailed:

(1) Deists and Rationalists generally regard God as sustaining no other relation to his works than that of the first of a series of causes and effects. He is supposed to touch the creation only at its commencement, and having given to things a permanent independent being exterior to himself, he leaves them to the unmodified exercise of their own faculties.

(2) Pantheists regard all the phenomena of the universe of every kind as merely the various modes of one universal absolute substance. The substance is one, the modes many; the substance abides, the modes rapidly succeed each other; the substance is God, the modes we call things. Some true Christian theologians have taken a view of the relation of God to the world which comes perilously near, if it does not coincide with, this great Pantheistic heresy. This view is, that God's power is constantly exerted in continually creating every individual thing again and again every fraction of duration; that created things have no real being of their own, and exist only as thus they are each moment the product of creative energy; and hence that the immediate cause of the state or action of any creature one moment of time is not its state or action the previous moment, but the direct act of divine creative power.

If this be so, it is plain that God is the only real agent in the universe; that he is the immediate cause of all things, including all evil passions and wicked thoughts and acts; that consciousness is a thorough delusion, and the free agency and moral accountability of man vain imaginations.

(3) The third view is the true one, and it stands intermediate between the two above stated extremes. It may be stated as follows- (a) God gave to all substances, both material and spiritual, a real and permanent existence as entities.

(b) They really possess all such active and passive properties as God has severally endued them with.

(c) These properties have a real and not merely an apparent efficiency as second causes in producing the effects proper to them.

(d) But these created substances, although possessing a real existence exterior to God, and exerting real efficiency as causes, are not self-existent; that is, the ground of their continued existence is in God and not in them. Though not to be confounded with God, they are not to be separated from him, but "in him live and move, and have all their being."

(e) The precise nature of the exercise of divine energy whereby God interpenetrates the universe with his presence, embraces it and all things therein in his power, and upholds them in being, is not revealed, and of course is indiscoverable. That God always continues to exert his almighty power in upholding in being and in the possession and use of their endowments all things he has made is proved-

(1) From the fact that continued dependence is inseparable from the idea of a creature. The abiding cause of the creature's continued existence must ever be in God, as it is not in itself.

(2) The relation of the creation to God cannot be analogous to that of a product of human skill to its maker. The one is exterior to his work. The intelligence and the power of the other is eternally omnipresent to every element of his work.

(3) A sense of absolute dependence for continued being, power, and blessedness, is involved in the religious consciousness of all men.

(4) It is explicitly taught in Scripture: "By him all things consist" (Colossians 1:17). "He upholdeth all things by the word of his power" (Hebrews 1:3). "In him we live and move and have our being." (Acts 17:28). "O bless our God...which holdeth our soul in life" (Psalms 66:8, Psalms 66:9; Psalms

63:8; Psalms 36:6).

2. That God governs the actions of his creatures; and- 3. That his government extends to all his creatures and all their actions, is proved-

(1) By the fact that the religious nature of man demands the recognition of this truth. It is involved in the sense of dependence and of subjection to a moral government which is involved in all religious feeling, and is recognized in all religions.

(2) It is evidenced in the indications of intelligence everywhere present in the operations of external nature. The harmony, the due proportion, and the exquisite concurrence in action, which continue among so many elements throughout ceaseless changes, prove beyond question the presence of an intelligence embracing all and directing each.

(3) The same is likewise indicated in the intelligent design evidently pursued in the developments of human history during long periods and throughout vast areas, and embracing myriads of agents. "That God is in history" is a conclusion of just science as well as a dictate of true religion.

(4) The Scriptures abound in prophecies fulfilled and unfulfilled, and promises and threatenings. Many of these are not mere enunciations of general principles, but specific declarations of purpose with reference to his treatment of individuals conditioned upon their conduct. The fulfillment of these could not be left to the ordinary course of nature, since there is often no natural connection between what is threatened or promised and the conditions on which they are suspended. God must therefore, by a constant providential regulation of the system of things, execute his own word to his creatures.

(5) The Scriptures explicitly declare that such a providential control is exerted-(a) Over the physical world (i.) In general (Job 37:6-13; Ps. Psalms 104:14; Psalms 135:6-7; Psalms 147:15-18). (ii.) Individual events in the natural world, however trivial (Matthew 10:29). (b) Over fortuitous events (Job 5:6; Proverbs 16:33). (c) Over the brute creation (Psalms 104:21-27; Psalms 147:9). (d) Over the general affairs of men (Job 12:23; Isaiah 10:12-15; Daniel 2:21; Daniel 4:25). (e) Over the circumstances of individuals (1 Samuel 2:6-8; Proverbs 16:9; James 4:13-15). (f) Over the free actions of men (Exodus 12:36; Psalms 33:14-15; Proverbs 19:21; Proverbs 21:1; Php 2:13). (g) Over the sinful actions of men (2 Samuel 16:10; Psalms 76:10; Acts 4:27-28). (h) Especially all that is good in man, in principle or action, is attributed to God’s constant gracious control (Php 2:13; Php 4:13; 2 Corinthians 12:9-10; Ephesians 2:10; Psalms 119:36; Galatians 5:22, Galatians 5:25).

4. That the providential control of all things by God is the consistent execution in time of his eternal and immutable purpose is evident-

(1) From the statement of the case. Since God’s eternal purpose relates to and determines all that comes to pass, and since it is immutable, his providential control of all things must be in execution of his purpose. And since his purpose is infinitely wise, righteous, and benevolent, and absolutely sovereign (as shown above), his providential execution of the decree must possess the same characteristics.

(2) The same is explicitly declared in Scripture: "He worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." (Ephesians 1:11; Isaiah 28:29; Acts 15:18.)

5. It is evident that the chief design of God in his eternal purpose and in his works of creation must also be his chief end in all his providential dispensations. This has been shown above to be the manifestation of his own glory. It is also directly asserted as the final end of his providence. (Romans 9:17; Romans 11:36.)

SECTION 2: ALTHOUGH in relation to the foreknowledge and decree of God, the first cause, all things come to pass immutably and infallibly;(8) yet, by the same providence, he orders them to fall out according to the nature of second causes, either necessarily, freely, or contingently.(9)

SECTION 3: GOD in his ordinary providence makes use of means,(10) yet is free to work without,(11) above,(12) and against them,(13) at his pleasure.

(8) Acts 2:23. (9) Genesis 8:22; Jeremiah 31:35; Exodus 21:13; Deuteronomy 19:5; 1 Kings 22:28, 1 Kings 22:1 1 Kings 22:34; Isaiah 10:6-7. (10) Acts 27:31, Acts 27:44; Isaiah 55:10-11; Hosea 2:21-22. (11) Hosea 1:7; Matthew 4:4; Job 34:10. (12) Romans 4:19-21. (13) 2 Kings 6:6; Daniel 3:27.

These sections teach the doctrine that God's purpose is efficacious and consistent, effected through means (secondary causes subject to His control), and that He possesses the power to effect His purpose directly and through His own energy.

1. That the providential control which God exercises over all his creatures and all their actions is always certainly efficacious, plainly follows (1) From his own infinite wisdom and power. (2) From the fact, before proved, that his eternal purpose determines the occurrence of all that comes to pass, and is immutable and certainly efficacious. (3) The fact is expressly declared in Scripture. (Job 23:13; Psalms 33:11; Lamentations 2:17.)

2. That the manner in which God controls his creatures and their actions, and effects his purposes through them, is in every case perfectly consistent with the nature of the creature and of his mode of action, is certain-

(1) From the fact that God executes the different parts of the same eternal, self-consistent purpose, in his works of creation and providence. It is in the execution of the same unchangeable plan that God first created everything, endowed it with its properties, determined its mode of action and its mutual relations to all other things, and ever afterward continues to preserve it in the possession of its properties and to guide it in the exercise of them. As God must always be consistent to his own plan, so his mode of action upon the creatures whose existence and constitution have been determined by that plan must always be consistent with their natures and mode of action so determined.

(2) The same fact is proved by our uniform experience and observation. We are conscious of acting freely according to the law of our constitution as free agents. Even in the writings of the prophets and apostles, who wrote under the control of a specific divine influence, rendering even their selection of words infallibly accurate, we can plainly see that the spontaneous exercise of the faculties of the writers was neither superseded nor coerced. Every agent in the material and brute creations, also, is observed constantly to act, under all changing conditions, according to the uniform law of its nature.

(3) In perfect consistency with this, we see everywhere in the material world, in the lives of individual men, and in all human history, plain evidences of adjustments and combinations of elements and agents in the order of contrivance to effect purpose. This in principle is analogous to, though in many ways infinitely more perfect than, the methods by which man controls natural agents to effect his purpose. If the laws of nature and the properties of things, when imperfectly understood, can be brought subject to the providence of man, there certainly can be no difficulty in believing that they are infinitely more under the control of that God who not only understands them perfectly, but made them originally that they might subserve his purpose. It is just the perfection of God's adjustments that every event, as well as general results, are determined by his intention. Even the human soul, in the exercise of free agency, acts according to a law of its own, excluding necessity, but not excluding certainty. The springs of free action are within the soul itself. And yet, as these are modified without interfering with the liberty of the agent by the influence of other men, they certainly cannot lie beyond the control of the Infinite Intelligence who created the soul itself, and has determined all the conditions under which its character has been formed and its activities exercised.

3. That God ordinarily effects his purposes through means-that is, through the agency of second causes subject to his control-is also evident-

(1) From the fact that he originally gave them their being and properties, and adjusted their relations in the execution of these very purposes. The same design is pursued in creation and in providence. The instruments furnished and the methods of procedure inaugurated in creation must, therefore, be consistently pursued in the subsequent dispensations of providence.

(2) Universal experience and observation teach us the same fact. In ordinary providence and in the administration of a supernatural economy of grace, in the sphere of material nature and in the moral government of intelligent and responsible agents, in the government of the finished world as we find it and in all the history of the formation of the Earth and the worlds in the past, God universally accomplishes his purposes through the agency of second causes, adjusted, combined, supported, and rendered efficient, by his omnipresent Spirit for this very end.

(3) A system involving an established order of nature, and proceeding in wise adaptation of means to ends, is necessary as a means of communication between the Creator and the intelligent creation, and to accomplish the intellectual and moral education of the latter. Thus only can the divine attributes of wisdom, righteousness, or goodness, be exercised or manifested; and thus only can angel or man understand the character, anticipate the will, or intelligently and cooperate with the plan of God.

4. That God possesses the power of effecting his ends immediately, without the intervention of second causes, is self-evident; and that he at times at his sovereign pleasure exercises this power, is a matter of clear and satisfactory evidence.

(1) Since God created all second causes and endowed them with their properties, and continues to uphold them in being, that they might be the instruments of his will, all their efficiency is derived from him, and he must be able to do directly without them what he does with them, and limit, modify, or supersede them, at his pleasure.

(2) The power of God does indeed work in all the ordinary processes of nature, and his will is expressed in what is called natural law; but it does not follow that his whole power is exhausted in those processes, nor his whole will expressed in those laws. God remains infinitely greater than his works, in the execution of his eternal, immutable purposes, using the system of second causes as his constant instrument after its kind, and meanwhile manifesting his transcendent prerogatives and powers by the free exercises of his energies and utterances of his will.

(3) Occasional direct exercises of God's power in connection with a general system of means and laws appear to be necessary, not only "in the beginning" to create second causes and inaugurate their agency, but also subsequently in order to make to the subjects of his moral government the revelation of his free personality, and of his immediate interest in their affairs. At any rate such occasional direct action and revelation are certainly necessary for the education of such beings as man is in his present estate. It has been objected that miracles, or direct acts of divine power, interfering with the natural action of second causes, are inconsistent with the infinite perfections of God, since it is claimed that they indicate either a vacillation of purpose upon his part, or some insufficiency in his creation to effect completely the ends he originally intended it to accomplish. It must be remembered, however, that the eternal and immutable plan of God comprehended the miracle from the beginning as well as the ordinary course of nature. A miracle, although effected by divine power without means, is itself a means to an end and part of a plan. All natural law has its birth in the divine reason, and is an expression of will to effect a purpose. In this highest, all-comprehensive sense of the word, miracles also are according to law-they are fixed in their occurrence by God's eternal plan, and they serve definite ends as his means of communicating with and educating finite spirits. They are in no proper sense a violation of the order of nature, but only the occasional and eternally pre-calculated interpolation of a new power, the immediate energy of the divine will. The order of nature is only an instrument of the divine will, and an instrument used subserviently to that higher moral government in the interests of which miracles are wrought. Thus the order of nature and miracles, instead of being in conflict, are the intimately correlated elements of one comprehensive system.

SECTION 4: THE almighty power, unsearchable wisdom, and infinite goodness of God, so far manifest themselves in his providence, that it extends itself even to the first fall, and all other sins of angels and men,(14) and that not by a bare permission,(15) but such as has joined with it a most wise and powerful bounding,(16) and otherwise ordering and governing of them, in a manifold dispensation, to his own holy ends;(17) yet so as the sinfulness thereof proceeds only from the creature, and not from God; who, being most holy and righteous, neither is nor can be the author or approver of sin.(18)

(14) Romans 11:32-34; 2 Samuel 24:1; 1 Chronicles 21:1; 1 Kings 22:22-23; 1 Chronicles 10:4, 1 Chronicles 10:13-14; 2 Samuel 16:10; Acts 2:23; Acts 4:27-28. (15) Acts 14:16. (16) Psalms 76:10; 2 Kings 19:28. (17) Genesis 50:20; Isaiah 10:6-7, Isaiah 10:12. (18) James 1:13-14, James 1:17; 1 John 2:16. This section makes no attempt to explain the nature of those providential actions of God which are concerned in the origin of sin in the moral universe, and in the control of the willful actions of his creatures in the execution of his purposes. It simply states the important facts with respect to the relation of his providence to the sins of his creatures which are revealed in Scripture. These points are--

1. God not only permits sinful acts, but he directs and controls them to the determination of his own purposes. Sinful actions, like all others, are declared in Scripture to occur only by God's permission, and according to his purpose, so that what men wickedly do God is said to ordain (Genesis 14:4, Genesis 14:5; Exodus 7:13; Exodus 14:17; Acts 2:23; Acts 3:18; Acts 4:27-28). And he constantly restrains and controls men in their sins (Psalms 76:10; 2 Kings 19:28; Isaiah 10:15); and overrules their sins for good (Acts 3:13; Genesis 50:20).

2 Yet the sinfulness of these actions is only from the sinning agent, and God in no case is either the author or approver of sin. The providence of God, instead of causing sin or approving it, is constantly concerned in forbidding it by positive law, in discouraging it by threatenings and actual punishments, in restraining it and in overruling it against its own nature to good.

SECTION 5: THE most wise, righteous, and gracious God, oftentimes leaves for a season his own children to manifold temptations, and the corruption of their own hearts, to chastise them for their former sins, or to make known them the hidden strength of corruption, and deceitfulness of their hearts, that they may be humbled;(19) and to raise them to a more close and constant dependence for their support upon himself, and to make them more watchful against all future occasions of sin, and for various other just and holy ends. (20)

SECTION 6: AS for those wicked and ungodly men, whom God, as a righteous judge, for former sins, blinds and hardens,(21) from them he not only withholds his grace, whereby they might have been enlightened in their understandings and wrought upon in their hearts;(22) but sometimes also withdraws the gifts which they had,(23) and exposes them to such objects as their corruption makes occasion of sin;(24) and withal, gives them over to their own lusts, the temptations of the world, and the power of Satan:(25) whereby it comes to pass, that they harden themselves, even under those means which God uses for the softening of others.(26)

SECTION 7: AS the providence of God does, in general, reach to all creatures; so, after a most special manner, it takes care of his Church, and disposes all things to the good thereof.(27)

(19) 2 Chronicles 32:25-26, 2 Chronicles 32:31; 2 Samuel 24:1. (20) 2 Corinthians 12:7-9; Ps. 73; Psalms 77:1, Psalms 77:10, Psalms 77:12; Mark 14:66, to end; John 21:15-17. (21) Romans 1:24, Romans 1:26, Romans 1:28; Romans 11:7-8. (22) Deuteronomy 29:4. (23) Matthew 13:12; Matthew 25:29. (24) Deuteronomy 2:30; 2 Kings 8:12-13. (25) Psalms 81:11-12; 2 Thessalonians 2:10-12. (26) Exodus 7:3; Exodus 8:15, Exodus 8:32; 2 Corinthians 2:15-16; Isaiah 8:14; 1 Peter 2:7-8; Isaiah 6:9-10; Acts 28:26-27. (27) 1 Timothy 4:10; Amos 9:8-9; Romans 8:28; Isaiah 43:3-5, Isaiah 43:14.

We have seen that the providential government of God, as the execution through time of his eternal and immutable purpose, forms one connected system, and comprehends all created things and all their actions. In perfect consistency with this, these sections proceed to teach:

1. That the general providence of God, embracing and dealing with every creature according to its nature, consequently, although one system, embraces several subordinate systems intimately related as parts of one whole, yet also distinct in their respective methods of administration and in the immediate ends designed. The principal of these are, the providence of God over the material universe; the general moral government of God over the intelligent universe; the moral government of God over the human family in general in this world; and the special gracious

dispensation of God’s providence toward his Church.

2. These sections teach also that there is a relation of subordination subsisting between these several systems of providence, as means to ends in the wider system which comprehends them all. Thus the providential government of the material universe is subordinate as a means to an end to the moral government which God exercises over his intelligent creatures, for whose residence, instruction, and development, the physical universe was created. Thus also the providential government of God over mankind in general is subordinate as a means to an end to his gracious providence toward his Church, whereby he gathers it out of every people and nation, and makes all things work together for good to those who are called according to his purpose (Romans 8:28), and of course for the highest development and glory of the whole body. The history of redemption through all its dispensations, Patriarchal, Abrahamic, Mosaic, and Christian, is the key to the philosophy of human history in general. The race is preserved, continents and islands are settled with inhabitants, nations are elevated to empire, philosophy and the practical arts, civilization and liberty are advanced, that the Church, the Lamb’s bride, may be perfected in all her members and adorned for her Husband.

3. The moral government of God over all men, and especially his government of his Church includes also, besides an external providence ordering the outward circumstances of individuals, an internal spiritual providence, consisting of the influences of his Spirit upon their hearts. As "common grace," this spiritual influence extends to all men without exception, though in serious degrees of power, restraining the corruption of their nature, and impressing their hearts and consciences with the truths revealed in the light of nature or of revelation; and it is either exercised or judicially withheld by God at his sovereign pleasure. As "efficacious" and "saving grace," this spiritual influence extends only to the elect, and is exerted upon them at such times and in such degrees as God has determined from the beginning.

4. Hence in the way of discipline for their own good, to mortify their sins and to strengthen their graces, God often wisely and graciously, though never finally, for a season and to a degree, withdraws his spiritual influences from his own children, and "leaves them to the manifold temptations and corruptions of their own hearts."

5. Hence also God often, as a just punishment of their sins, judicially withdraws the restraints of his Spirit, and consequently whatever superficial gifts his presence may have conferred, from ungodly men, and thus leaves them to the influence of temptations, the unrestrained control of their lusts, and the power of Satan. And hence it comes to pass that the truths of the gospel and the ordinances of the Church, which are a savor of life to them to whom they are graciously blessed, become a savor of death and of increased condemnation to them who for their sins have been left to themselves.

01.06. Of The Fall of Man, of Sin, and of the Punishment Thereof

Chapter Six

Of The Fall of Man, of Sin, and of the Punishment Thereof

SECTION 1: OUR first parents being seduced by the subtlety and temptation of Satan, sinned in eating the forbidden fruit. (1) This their sin God was pleased, according to his wise and holy counsel, to permit, having purposed to order it to his own glory. (2) (1) Genesis 3:13; 2 Corinthians 11:3. (2) Romans 11:32.

God having brought the souls of Adam and Eve into being by immediate creation holy, and with sufficient knowledge as to his will, capable of obedience yet fallible, this section proceeds to teach:

1. Our first parents sinned.

2. The particular sin they committed was their eating the forbidden fruit.

It appears to be God's general plan, and one eminently wise and righteous, to introduce all the newly-created subjects of moral government into a state of probation for a time, in which he makes their permanent character and destiny depend upon their own action. He creates them holy, yet capable of falling. In this state he subjects them to a moral test for a time. If they stand the test, the reward is that their moral characters are confirmed and rendered infallible, and they are introduced into an inalienable blessedness forever. If they fail, they are judicially excluded from God's favor and communion forever, and hence morally and eternally dead. This certainly has been his method of dealing with newly-created angels and men. In the case of mankind the specific test to which our first parents were subjected was their abstaining from eating of the fruit of a single tree. As this was a matter in itself morally indifferent, it was admirably adapted to be a test of their implicit allegiance to God, of their absolute faith and submission. The dreadful sin committed by Adam and Eve seems to hvae been twofold. Their unbelief induced them to doubt the wisdom of God's prohibition and the certainty of the divine threatening; and their disobedience to God's will manifested their sin of unbelief. In respect to the origin of sin in this world, there are two questions which men constantly ask, and which it is impossible to answer:

A. How could sinful desires or volitions originate in the soul of moral agents created holy like Adam and Eve? Men exercise choice according to their prevailing desires and affections. If these are holy, their wills are holy. And the character of their prevailing affections and desires is determined by the moral state of their souls. If their souls are holy, these are holy; if their souls are sinful, these are sinful. Christ says, "A good man, out of the good treasure of the heart, bringeth forth good things; and an evil man, out of the evil treasure, bringeth forth evil things." "Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt." (Matthew 12:33, Matthew 12:35.) But Adam's heart had been created holy; how then could his action be sinful?

All our experience conspires to make the question more difficult. The sinful souls of fallen men never can give birth to holy volitions until they are regenerated by divine grace. The holy spirits of

angels and glorified men in heaven are forever removed from all liability to sinful affections or actions. In both these cases the stream continues as the fountain.

Now, although we cannot explain precisely the origin of sin in the holy soul of Adam, it is plain that the difficulty lies only in our ignorance. We have none of us experienced the same conditions of free agency as those which give character to the case of Adam. We have always been under the bondage of corruption, except insofar as we are momentarily assisted against nature by supernatural grace. Now, in order that a volition shall be holy, it must spring from a positively holy affection or disposition; and as these are not native to our hearts, we cannot exercise holy volitions without grace. But Adam was in a state of probation, holy yet fallible. Saints and angels are holy and infallible, yet their infallibility is not essential to their natures, but is a superadded divine grace sustained by the direct power of God. While holiness must always be positive, rooting itself in divine love, it is plain that sin may originate in defect; not in positive alienation, but in want of watchfulness-in the temporary ascendancy of the natural and innocent appetites of the body or constitutional tendencies of the soul over the higher powers of conscience. The external influences and the subjective motives which prompted our first parents to this dreadful sin did not in the first instance imply sin in them, but became the occasion of sin upon being allowed to occupy their minds and to sway their wills in despite of the divine prohibition. The external influences and motives combined a natural appetite for the attractive fruit with a natural desire for knowledge. But most importantly, they were seduced by the temptation of Satan, about whose fall little is known, and unto whom the true origin of sin is to be referred.

B. The other element of mystery with regard to the origin of sin relates to the permission of God. This section affirms, 4. That this sin was permissively embraced in the eternal purpose of God.

About the facts of the case there can be no doubt. (1) God did certainly foreknow that if such a being as Adam was put in such conditions as he was, he would sin as he sinned. Yet, in spite of this certain knowledge, God created that very being and put him in those very conditions; and having determined to overrule the sin for good, he sovereignly decreed not to intervene to prevent, and so he made it certainly future. (2) On the other hand, God did neither cause nor approve Adam’s sin. He forbade it, and presented motives which should have deterred from it. He created Adam holy and fully capable of obedience, and with sufficient knowledge of his duty, and then left him alone to his trial. If it be asked why God, who abhors sin, and who benevolently desires the excellence and happiness of his creatures, should sovereignly determine to permit such a fountain of pollution, degradation, and misery to be opened, we can only say, with profound reverence, "Even so, Father; for so it seemed good in thy sight."

5. That God from the beginning designed to order the sin of Adam to his own glory is included in what we have already proved in the chapters on Creation and Providence-(1) That God overrules the sins of his creatures for good. (2) That the chief end of all God’s purposes and works is the manifestation of his own glory.

SECTION 2: BY this sin they fell from their original righteousness, and communion with God,(3) and so became dead in sin,(4) and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body.(5)

(3) Genesis 3:6-8; Ecclesiastes 7:29; Romans 3:23. (4) Genesis 2:17; Ephesians 2:1. (5) Titus 1:15; Genesis 6:5; Jeremiah 17:9; Romans 3:10-18.

Naturally, man depends upon the providential sustaining power of God; but as a moral and religious being he depends upon the intimate and loving communion of God's Spirit for spiritual life and right moral action. Therefore-

1. By this sin man must have instantly been cut off from this loving communion of the Divine Spirit. This must have been under any constitution the natural effect of sin. And under that covenant relation into which man had been introduced in the gracious providence of God at his creation, it was specifically provided that the commission of the forbidden act should be followed by instant death; that is, instant penal exclusion from the source of all moral and spiritual life. See ch. 7., s. 2. Genesis 2:17. Therefore-

2. The principle of spiritual life having been withdrawn as the punishment of that first sin, our first parents must have instantly lost their original righteousness; their allegiance had been violated, their faith broken, and love could no longer dominate in their hearts. And thus-

3. They must have at once become dead in sins and wholly corrupt. And 4. This corruption must have extended to all the faculties. It is not meant that Adam by this one sin became as bad as a man can be, or as he himself became afterward. But as death at the heart involves death in all the members, so the favor and communion of God being lost, (1) Original righteousness, the necessary principle of obedience, is lost. (2) Adam's apostasy from God is complete. God demands perfect obedience, and Adam is now a rebel. (3) A schism was introduced into his soul. Conscience uttered its condemning voice. This leads to fear, distrust, prevarication, and an endless series of sins. (4) Thus his entire nature became depraved. The will being at war with the conscience, the understanding became darkened, the passions roused, the affections alienated, the conscience calloused or deceitful, the appetites of the body inordinate, and its members instruments of unrighteousness.

SECTION 3: THEY being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed,(6) and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generations.(7)

SECTION 4: FROM this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good,(8) and wholly inclined to all evil,(9) do proceed all actual transgressions.(10)

(6) Genesis 1:27-28; Genesis 2:16-17; Acts 17:26; Romans 5:12, Romans 5:15-19; 1 Corinthians 15:21-22, 1 Corinthians 15:45, 1 Corinthians 15:49. (7) Psalms 51:5; Genesis 5:3; Job 14:4; Job 15:14. (8) Romans 5:6; Romans 8:7; Romans 7:18; Colossians 1:21. (9) Genesis 6:5; Genesis 8:21; Romans 3:10-12. (10) James 1:14-15; Ephesians 2:2-3; Matthew 15:19.

1. Adam was both the natural and federal head of all mankind, Christ of course excepted. The nature and provisions of that covenant which God made with Adam will be considered in its appropriate place, ch. 8:, s. 2. The point which demands our attention here is, that in making that covenant with Adam, God constituted him and treated with him as the moral representative of all his natural descendants. This is very explicitly taught in our Standards. Conf. Faith, ch. 7:, s. 2: "The first covenant made with man was a covenant of works, wherein life was promised to Adam, and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personal obedience." L. Cat., q. 22: "The covenant being made with Adam as a public person, not for himself only, but for his posterity, all

mankind, descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him, and fell with him, in his first transgression." S. Cat., q. 16: "The covenant being made with Adam, not only for himself, but for his posterity, all mankind, descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him, and fell with him, in his first transgression." As we have seen, it is God's general method of dealing with newly-created moral agents to create them holy, yet capable of falling, and then to put them on trial for a time, making their confirmed and permanent moral character and destiny to depend upon their own action. In the case of the angels, who were severally created independent individuals, they appear to have stood their trial severally, each in his own person. Some fell, and some were confirmed in holiness and blessedness. But in the case of a race to be propagated in a series, each individual to come into existence an unintelligent infant, thence to develop gradually into moral agency, like that of mankind, it is obvious that one of three plans must be adopted: (1) The whole race must be confirmed in holiness and happiness without any probation. (2) Each individual must stand his own probation while groping his way from infancy into childhood. (3) Or the whole race must have their trial in their natural head and root, Adam. We are not in a condition to judge of the propriety of the first of these plans, but we can easily see that the third is incomparably more rational, righteous, and merciful than the second. As a matter of fact, God did make our character and destiny to depend upon the conduct of Adam in his probation. This was right-(1) Because, as sovereign Creator, and infinitely wise, righteous, and merciful Guardian of the interests of all his creatures, it seemed right in his eyes. (2) Because it was more to our advantage than any other plan that can be imagined. Adam was most advantageously constituted and circumstanced in order that he should stand the trial safely. Incalculable benefits as well as risks were suspended upon his action. If he had maintained his integrity for a limited period, all his race would have been born into an indefeasible inheritance of glory. (3) Because the covenant headship of Adam is part of a glorious constitution which culminates in the covenant headship of Christ. That Adam was, as our Standards say, "a public person," and that the covenant was made with him "not for himself only, but for his posterity," is proved from the facts- (1) That he was called by a generic name, Adam-the Man.

(2) That everything that God commanded, promised, or threatened him related to his descendants as much as to himself personally. Thus, "obedience," "a cursed earth," "the reign of death," "painful child-bearing," and the subsequent promise of redemption through the Seed of the woman, were spoken with reference to us as much as with reference to our first parents.

(3) As a matter of fact, the very penalty denounced and executed upon Adam has been executed upon all of his descendants from birth upward. All are born spiritually dead, "by nature children of wrath." Also, from the fact that- 2. The guilt of that sin is imputed to all his descendants, and the penalty executed upon them at their birth. By the word "guilt" is meant, not the personal disposition which prompted the act, nor the personal moral pollution which resulted from it, but simply the just liability to the punishment which that sin deserved. By the term "impute" is meant to lay to the charge or credit of any one as a ground of judicial punishment or justification. This is the sense in which the phrase "to impute sin" or "righteousness" is used in the Bible. "David describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, . . . to whom the Lord will not impute sin. . . . Faith was imputed to Abraham for righteousness." (Romans 4:3-9.) "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." (2 Corinthians 5:19.) Our Standards expressly affirm that the "guilt," or just liability to the penalty, of

Adam’s apostatizing act is by God "imputed," or judicially laid to the charge of each of his natural descendants. Conf. Faith, ch. 6., s. 3: "This sin was imputed . . . to all their posterity." In L. q. 25, and S. Cat., q. 18, "the sinfulness of that estate into which the fall brought mankind" is declared to include each of the following elements:

"(1) The guilt of Adam’s first sin; (2) The want of original righteousness; (3) The corruption of his whole nature, which is commonly called original sin; together with all actual transgressions which proceed from it." The reason which our Standards give for this judicial charging the punishableness of Adam’s first sin to all his posterity is, that they really "sinned in him in his first transgression" (L. Cat., q. 22; S. Cat., q. 16); since he acted as "a public person," and the covenant was made with him "not for himself only, but for his posterity" (L. Cat., q. 22; S. Cat., q. 16). That is, Adam, by a divine constitution, so represented and acted for all his posterity that they are fairly responsible for his action, and are worthy of punishment on account of it. Since their destiny, as well as his own, was suspended upon Adam’s action, since they were justly to have part in his reward if he was faithful, so they justly have part in his punishment for his unfaithfulness. The Articles of the Synod of Dort affirm that moral depravity is inflicted upon all the descendants of Adam at birth "by the just judgment of God." Ch. 3., s. 2. This is also explicitly taught in Scripture. Paul teaches, in Romans 5:12-21, (1) That the law of death, spiritual and physical, under which we are born, is a consequent of Adam’s public disobedience; and (2) That it is a "judgment," a "condemnation"-that is, a penal consequent of Adam’s sin: "Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation." (3) That the punishment of Adam’s sin comes upon us upon the same principle upon which the righteousness of Christ is charged to the account of those who believe on him: "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." But the righteousness of Christ is imputed without works (Romans 4:6), before, and as the necessary condition of, good dispositions or actions upon our part. So the guilt of Adam’s sin is imputed to his posterity without personal works of their own, before, and as the cause of, their loss of original righteousness and acquisition of original sin. The only Sin of Adam which the Confession says was "imputed" to his descendants, and the Sin of his which they assert we "sinned in him," was his first sin or apostatizing act. The manifest reason of this is that he represented us, and we are responsible for him only in his trial for character and destiny. His first sin, by incurring the penalty, necessarily and instantly closed his probation and ours, and he immediately became a private person. The penalty denounced upon Adam and those whom he represented in his trial was the judicial withdrawment of the life-giving influences of the Holy Ghost, and the inevitable consequent moral and physical death. Hence every newly-created soul comes into existence judicially excluded from the life-giving influences of the Holy Spirit, and hence morally and spiritually dead. Other actual sins and miseries in time occur as the natural consequence of this birth-punishment. But the Scriptures and our own consciousness also affirm that these actual transgressions are our own personal sins, and that all the temporal and eternal punishments we suffer are on account of them.

3. It hence follows, that if the guilt of Adam’s apostasy is charged to all his natural descendants, and the Holy Spirit consequently judicially withdrawn from them at their birth, the same moral corruption which ensued from the same cause in the case of our first parents must, from their birth, follow in their descendants also. Of this "corrupted nature" this section proceeds to say-

4. That by it "we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil"; and,-

5. "From this original corruption" of nature "proceed all actual transgressions." It is here taught (1) That all men sin from the commencement of moral agency. (2) That back of this their nature is morally corrupt, indisposed to all good, and inclined to all evil. (3) That this moral corruption is so radical and inveterate that men are by nature "disabled" with respect to right moral action. (4) That this condition is innate from birth and by nature this representation agrees with universal experience. All the children of men, of all ages, nations, and circumstances, and how ever educated, invariably sin as soon as they become capable of moral action. A universal fact must have a cause universally present. This can only be found in the common depravity of our nature.

(2) With all the teachings of Scripture. (a) It declares that all men are sinners. (Romans 1:1-32, Romans 2:1-29, and Romans 3:1-19.) (b) That sinful actions proceed from sinful hearts or dispositions. (Matthew 15:19; Luke 6:43-45.) (c) That the disposition which prompts to sinful action is "sin," a moral corruption. (Romans 6:12, Romans 6:14, Romans 6:17; Romans 7:5-17; Galatians 5:17, Galatians 5:24; Ephesians 4:18-19.)

(d) That this corruption involves moral and spiritual blindness of mind, as well as hardness of heart and vile affections. (1 Corinthians 2:14-15; Ephesians 4:18.) (e) That this moral corruption and prevailing tendency to sin is in our nature from birth. (Psalms 51:5; Ephesians 2:3; John 3:6.) (f) That men in their natural state are "dead" in trespasses and sins. (Ephesians 2:1; John 3:4-5.) And (g) That consequently they can be restored by no "change of purpose" nor "moral reformation" upon their part, but only by an act of almighty power called "a new birth" "a new creation," "a begetting," "a quickening from the dead." (Ephesians 4:24, Ephesians 2:5, Ephesians 2:10; John 3:3; 1 John 5:18.)

What the Confession teaches of man’s sinful inability to do right, in consequence of the depravity of his nature, will be considered under its appropriate head, in Chapter 9.

SECTION 5: THIS corruption of nature, during this life, remain in those that are regenerated;(11) and although it be through Christ pardoned and mortified, yet both itself, and all the motions thereof, are truly and properly sin.(12)

SECTION 6: EVERY sin, both original and actual. being a transgression of the righteous law of God, and contrary thereunto,(13) doth, in its own nature, bring guilt upon the sinner,(14) whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God,(15) and curse of the law,(16) and so made subject to death,(17) with all miseries spiritual,(18) temporal,(19) and eternal.(20)

(11) 1 John 1:8, 1 John 1:10; Romans 7:14, Romans 7:17-18, Romans 7:23; James 3:2; Proverbs 20:9; Ecclesiastes 7:20. (12) Romans 7:5, Romans 7:7-8, Romans 7:25; Galatians 5:17. (13) 1 John 3:4. (14) Romans 2:15; Romans 3:9, Romans 3:19. (15) Ephesians 2:3. (16) Galatians 3:10. (17) Romans 6:23. (18) Ephesians 4:18. (19) Romans 8:20; Lamentations 3:39. (20) Matthew 25:41; 2 Thessalonians 1:9.

These sections speak of the corruption that remains in the regenerated, and of the guilt or just liability to punishment which attaches to all sin, and of the punishments God inflicts upon it.

I. Of the first, it is taught- 1. Original sin, or innate moral corruption, remains in the regenerate as long as they live.

2. That it is pardoned through the merits of Christ.

3. That it is gradually brought into subjection and mortified by the work of the Holy Spirit in sanctification.

4. That nevertheless all that remains of it, and all the feelings and actions to which it prompts, are truly of the nature of sin.

All of these points will be more appropriately treated under the heads of Justification, Conf. Faith, ch. 11.; and of Sanctification, Conf. Faith, ch. 13.

II. Of the second, it is taught-

1. Original sin-that is, the nature corrupt tendencies and affections of the soul- is truly a violation of God's law as actual transgression. The Catechisms. (L. Cat., q. 24; S. Cat., q. 14) define sin to be "any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God." This corresponds exactly with what the apostle teaches (1 John 3:4): "Sin is anouia "-any discrepancy of the creature or his acts with God's law. This is evident-

(1) Because from its very essence the moral law demands absolute perfection of character and disposition as well as action. Whatever is right is essentially obligatory; whatever is wrong is essentially worthy of condemnation. God requires us to be holy as well as to act rightly. God proclaims himself as "he which searcheth the reins and hearts." (Revelation 2:23.)

(2) The native corrupt tendencies which constitute original sin are called sin in Scripture. Sin and its lusts are said to "reign" in our mortal bodies; sin is said to have "dominion"; the unregenerate are called "the servants of sin." (Romans 6:12-17; Romans 7:5-17; Galatians 5:17, Galatians 5:24; Ephesians 4:18-19.)

(3) God condemns men for their corrupt natural dispositions, for their hardness of heart, spiritual blindness of mind. (Mark 16:14; Ephesians 2:3.)

(4) In all genuine conviction of sin, the great burden of pollution and guilt is felt to consist not in what we have done, but in what we are-our permanent moral condition rather than our actual transgressions. The great cry is to be forgiven and delivered from "the wicked heart of unbelief," "deadness to divine things, alienation from God as a permanent habit of soul." "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (Romans 7:24; Psalms 51:5-6.)

2. It hence necessarily follows that original sin, as well as actual transgressions, deserves the curse of the law. Everything which is condemned by the law is under its curse. This is evident From what we learned of the justice of God in ch. 2., ss. 1, 2. (2) From the fact that it is the universal judgment of men that sin is intrinsically ill-desert-that all that ought not to be is worthy of condemnation. (3) From the fact that the Holy Ghost, in convincing men of sin, always likewise convinces them of a judgment. (John 16:8.) (4) Men are "by nature children of wrath." Ephesians 2:3. (5) Even infants are redeemed by Christ. And in their case, as in all others, he redeemed them from the curse of the law, being made a curse for them. (Galatians 3:13.)

3. Consequently, the sinner guilty of original and of actual transgressions is, unless grace intervene, made subject to death, including temporal, spiritual, and eternal miseries. The temporal miseries indicted upon men, in the just displeasure of God for their sin, are summarily set forth in the Larger Catechism, q. 28, as "the curse of God upon the creatures for our sakes, and all other evils that befall us in our bodies, names, estates, relations, and employments; together with death itself." This, of course, applies only to the still unbelieving, unjustified sinner; for all the tribulations which are suffered by the justified believer in this life are chastisements, designed for his benefit, and expressive of his heavenly Father's love-not penal evils, expressive of his wrath and unsatisfied justice. The spiritual miseries which sin brings upon the unforgiven in this life are set forth "as blindness of mind, a reprobate sense, strong delusions, hardness of heart, horror of conscience, and vile affections.") Ephesians 4:18; Romans 1:28; 2 Thessalonians 2:11; Romans 2:5; Isaiah 33:14; Genesis 4:13; Matthew 27:4; Romans 1:26; L. Cat., q. 28.) The eternal miseries which are consequent upon unforgiven sin are set forth as "everlasting separation from the comfortable presence of God, and most grievous torments in soul and body, without intermission, in hell-fire forever." (2 Thessalonians 1:9; Mark 9:43-44, Mark 9:46, Mark 9:48; Luke 16:24.)

01.07. Of God's Covenant With Man

Chapter Seven

Of God’s Covenant With Man

SECTION 1: THE distance between God and the creature is so great, that although reasonable creatures do owe obedience unto him as their Creator, yet they could never have any fruition of him as their blessedness and reward, but by some voluntary condescension on God’s part, which he has been pleased to express by way of covenant.(1)

SECTION 2: THE first covenant made with man was a covenant of works,(2) wherein life was promised to Adam, and in him to his posterity,(3) upon condition of perfect and personal obedience.(4)

(1) Isaiah 40:13-17; Job 9:32-33; 1 Samuel 2:25; Psalms 113:5-6; Psalms 100:2-3; Job 22:2-3; Job 35:7-8; Luke 17:10; Acts 17:24-25. (2) Galatians 2:12. (3) Romans 10:5; Romans 5:12-20. (4) Genesis 2:17; Galatians 3:10.

Here we come to the duty which an intelligent creature owes its Creator, that it is essential and inalienable of the creature’s being. Moreover, the enjoyment of the creator by the creature is wholly a matter of sovereign grace, manifest to man through the conditional promises (covenants) of God-the first of which concerned Adam, wherein the promise was life and the condition perfect, personal obedience.

1. The duty which an intelligent creature owes to its Creator is inalienable, and springs necessarily,-(1) From the absolute, imperative obligation which is of the essence of all that is morally right-which exercises authority over the will, but does not receive authority from it; and (2) From the relation of dependence and obligation involved in the very fact of being created. To be a created, intelligent, moral agent, is to be under all the obligation of obeying the will and of living for the glory of the absolute Owner and Governor.

2. The very act of creation brings the creature under obligation to the Creator, but it cannot bring the Creator into obligation to the creature. Creation itself, being a signal act of grace, cannot endow the beneficiary with a claim for more grace. If God, for instance, has created a man with an eye, it may be eminently consistent with the divine attributes, and a ground of fair anticipation, that at some time he who has given eyes will also give light; but, surely, the creation of the first can lay the foundation of no right upon the part of man for the gift of the second. And, of course, far less can the fact that in creation God endowed men with a religious nature lay the foundation of any right on their part for the infinitely more precious gift of the personal communications of his own ineffable love and grace. God cannot be bound to take all creatures naturally capable of it into the intimacies of his own society. If he does so, it is a matter of infinite condescension and sovereign will.

3. In the case of men and angels, God has been pleased to promise this transcendent benefit upon certain conditions; which conditional promise is called a covenant. There can be no doubt that this amazing gift of God's personal love and life-giving society had been offered to angels, and at the beginning was offered to the first human pair, upon conditions. Some object that the conditional promise made to Adam in the garden is not explicitly called a covenant, and that it does not possess all the essential elements of a covenant, since it was a constitution sovereignly ordained by the Creator without consulting the will of the creature. It is a sufficient answer to these objections-(1) That although Adam's will was not consulted, yet his will was unquestionably cordially consenting to this divine constitution and all the terms thereof, and hence the transaction did embrace all the elements of a covenant. (2) That instances of analogous transactions between God and men are expressly styled covenants in the Bible. If God's transactions with Noah (Genesis 9:11, Genesis 9:12) and with Abraham (Genesis 17:1-21) were covenants, then was his transaction with Adam in the garden a covenant. The analysis of a covenant always gives the following elements: (a) Its parties. (b) Its promise. (c) Its conditions. (d) Its penalty. As to its parties, our Standards teach- In the first covenant that concerned mankind God dealt with Adam as the representative of all his descendants. The parties, therefore, are God and Adam, the latter representing the human race. That Adam did so act as the representative of his descendants, in such a sense that they were equally interested with himself in all the merit or the demerit, the reward or the penalty, attaching to his action during the period of probation, has already been proved to be the doctrine both of our Standards and of Scripture. (Ch. 6., ss. 3, 4.) As to the further nature of this covenant, our Standards teach-The promise of it was life, the condition of it perfect obedience, and the penalty of it death. (L. Cat., q. 20; S. Cat., q. 12.) This covenant is variously styled, from one or other of these several elements. Thus, it is called the "covenant of works," because perfect obedience was its condition, and to distinguish it from the covenant of grace, which rests our salvation on a different basis altogether. It is also called the "covenant of life," because life was promised on condition of the obedience. It is also called a "legal covenant," because it demanded the literal fulfillment of the claims of the moral law as the condition of God's favor. This covenant was also in its essence a covenant of grace, in that it graciously promised life in the society of God as the freely-granted reward of an obedience already unconditionally due. Nevertheless it was a covenant of works and of law with respect to its demands and conditions.

(1) That the promise of the covenant was life is proved-(a) From the nature of the penalty, which is recorded in terms. If disobedience was linked to death, obedience must have been linked to life. (b) It is taught expressly in many passages of Scripture. Paul says, Romans 10:5, "Moses describes the righteousness which is of the law, That the man which does those things shall live by them." (Matthew 19:16, Matthew 19:17; Galatians 3:12; Leviticus 18:5; Nehemiah 9:29.) That the life promised was not mere continuance of existence is plain-(a) From the fact that the death threatened was not the mere extinction of existence. Adam experienced that death the very day he ate the forbidden fruit. The death threatened was exclusion from the communion of God. The life promised, therefore, must consist in the divine fellowship and the excellence and happiness thence resulting. (b) From the fact that mere existence was not in jeopardy. It is the character, not the fact, of continued existence which God suspended upon obedience. (c) Because the terms "life" and "death" are used in the Scriptures constantly to define two opposite spiritual conditions, which depend upon the relation of the soul to God. (John 5:24; John 6:4; Romans 6:23; Romans 11:15; Ephesians 2:1-3; Ephesians 5:14; Revelation 3:1.)

(2) That the condition of the covenant was perfect obedience is plain from the fact-(a) That the divine law can demand no less. It is of the essence of all that is right that it is obligatory. James says, that "whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." James 2:10; Galatians 3:10; Deuteronomy 27:26. (b) That the command not to eat of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, relating to a thing indifferent in itself, was plainly designed to be a naked test of obedience, absolute and without limit.

(3) That the penalty of this covenant was death is distinctly stated: "In the day thou eatest thereof, dying thou shalt die." Genesis 3:17. This denoted a most lamentable state of existence, physical and moral, and not the cessation of existence or the dissolution of the union between soul and body, because-(a) It took effect in our first parents hundreds of years before the dissolution of that union. (b) Because the Scriptures constantly describe the moral and spiritual condition into which their descendants are born, and from which they are delivered by Christ, as a state of death. (Revelation 3:1; Ephesians 2:1-5; Ephesians 5:14; John 5:24.) This death is a condition of increasing sin and misery, resulting from excision from the only source of life. It involves the entire person, soul and body, and continues as long as the cause continues.

SECTION 3: MAN by his fall having made himself incapable of life by that covenant, the Lord was pleased to make a second,(5) commonly called the covenant of grace: whereby he freely offers unto sinners life and salvation by Jesus Christ, requiring of them faith in him, that they may be saved;(6) and promising to give unto all those that are ordained unto life his Holy Spirit, to make them willing and able to believe.(7)

SECTION 4: THIS covenant of grace is frequently set forth in the Scripture by the name of a testament, in reference to the death of Jesus Christ the testator, and to the everlasting inheritance, with all things belonging to it, therein bequeathed.(8)

(5) Galatians 3:21; Romans 8:3; Romans 3:20-21; Genesis 3:15; Isaiah 42:6. (6) Mark 16:15-16; John 3:16; Romans 10:6, Romans 10:9; Galatians 3:11. (7) Ezekiel 36:26-27; John 6:44-45. (8) Hebrews 9:15-17; Hebrews 7:22; Luke 22:20; 1 Corinthians 11:25.

Since Adam forfeited for himself and his entire race the original promise of life upon the condition of perfect obedience, and incurred the penalty of death attached to disobedience, it follows that, if the old constitution is left without supplement or modification, man is lost. If mankind is to be saved, there must be a new and gracious intervention on the part of God. And if God intervenes to save men, it must be upon a definite plan, and upon certain definitely proclaimed and accurately fulfilled conditions. That is, a new covenant must be introduced, rendering life attainable to those who are to be saved on conditions different from those offered in the preceding constitution. The question, then, relates to what is revealed in the Scriptures as to the parties to whom the promise is made, and the conditions upon which it is suspended. The Arminian view is, that Adam having lost the promise and incurred the penalty of the covenant which demanded perfect obedience, Christ’s death having made it consistent with the claims of absolute justice, God for Christ’s sake introduces a new covenant, styled the covenant of grace, offering to all men individually the eternal life forfeited by Adam on the lowered and graciously possible condition of faith and evangelical obedience. According to this view, the new covenant is just as much a covenant of works as the old one was; the only difference is that the works demanded are far less difficult, and we are graciously aided in our endeavors to accomplish them. According to this view, also, faith and

evangelical obedience secure eternal life in the new covenant in the same way that perfect obedience did in the old covenant. This view is plainly inconsistent with the nature of the gospel. The method of salvation presented in the gospel is no compromise of principle, no lowering of terms. Christ fulfills the old legal covenant absolutely; and then, on the foundation of what he has done, we exercise faith or trust, and through that trust we are made sharers in his righteousness and beneficiaries of his grace. Faith is not a work which Christ condescends in the gospel to accept instead of perfect obedience as the ground of salvation-it is only the hand whereby we clasp the person and work of our Redeemer, which is the true ground of salvation. The Calvinist view, therefore, is, that God having determined to save the elect out of the mass of the race fallen in Adam, appointed his Son to become incarnate in our nature; and as the Christ, or God-man Mediator, he appointed him to be the second Adam and representative head of redeemed humanity; and as such entered into a covenant with him and with his seed in him. In this covenant the Mediator assumes in behalf of his elect seed the broken conditions of the old covenant of works precisely as Adam left them. Adam had failed to obey, and therefore forfeited life; he had sinned, and therefore incurred the endless penalty of death. Christ therefore suffered the penalty, and extinguished in behalf of all whom he represented the claims of the old covenant; and at the same time he rendered a perfect vicarious obedience, which was the very condition upon which eternal life had been originally offered. All this Christ does as a principal party with God to the covenant, in acting as the representative of his own people.

Subsequently, in the administration and gracious application of this covenant, Christ the Mediator offers the blessings secured by it to all men on the condition of faith-that is, he bids all men to lay hold of these blessings by the instrumentality of faith, and he promises that if they do so they shall certainly enjoy them; and he, as the mediatorial Surety of his people, insures for them that their faith and obedience shall not fail. For the sake of simplicity, some Calvinist theologians have set forth the divine method of human redemption as embraced in two covenants The first, styled the "covenant of redemption," formed in eternity between the Father and Christ as principal, providing for the salvation of the elect; the second, styled the "covenant of grace," wherein life is offered to all men on the condition of faith, and secured to the elect through the agency of Him who, as "surety of the new covenant," insures the fulfillment of the condition in their case. Our Standards say nothing of two covenants. They do not mention the covenant of redemption as distinct from the covenant of grace. But evidently the several passages which treat of this subject (Conf. Faith, ch. 7., s. 3; L. Cat., q. 31; S. Cat., q. 20) assume that there is but one covenant, contracted by Christ in behalf of the elect with God in eternity, and administered by him to the elect in the offers and ordinances of the gospel and in the gracious influences of his Spirit. The Larger Catechism in the place referred to teaches how the covenant of grace was contracted with Christ for his people. The Confession of Faith in these sections teaches how that same covenant is administered by Christ to his people. The doctrine of our Standards and of Scripture may be stated in the following propositions:

1. At the basis of human redemption there is an eternal covenant or personal counsel between the Father, representing the entire Godhead, and the Son, who is to assume in the fullness of time a human element into his person, and to represent all his elect as their Mediator and Surety. The Scriptures make it very plain that the Father and the Son had a definite understanding (a) as to who were to be saved, (b) as to what Christ must do in order to save them, (c) as to how their

personal salvation was to be accomplished, (d) as to all the blessings and advantages involved in their salvation, and (e) as to certain official rewards which were to accrue to the Mediator in consequence of his obedience.

(1) The Scriptures expressly declare that the Father has promised the Mediator the salvation of his seed on condition of "the travail of his soul." (Isaiah 53:10-11; Isaiah 13:6-7; Psalms 89:3, Psalms 89:4.)

(2) Christ makes constant reference to a previous commission he had received of his Father (John 10:18; Luke 22:29), and claims a reward conditioned upon the fulfillment of that commission. (John 17:4-5.)

(3) Christ as Mediator constantly asserts that his people and his expected glory are given him as a reward by his Father. (John 17:2, John 17:24.)

2. The promise of this covenant was-(1) All needful preparation of Christ for his work. (Hebrews 10:5; Isaiah 13:1-7.) (2) Support in his work. (Luke 22:43.) (3) A glorious reward (a) In his own Theanthropic person as Mediator. (John 5:22; Psalms 110:1.) (b) In committing to his hand the universal administration of all the precious graces and blessings of the covenant. (Matthew 28:18; John 1:12; John 7:39; John 17:2; Acts 2:33.) (c) In the salvation of the elect, including all general and special provisions of grace, such as regeneration, justification, sanctification, perseverance, and glory. (Titus 3:5-6; Jeremiah 31:33; Jeremiah 32:40; Isaiah 35:10; Isaiah 53:10-11.)

3. The condition of this covenant was-(1) That he should be born of a woman, made under the law. (Galatians 4:4, Galatians 4:5.) (2) That he should assume and discharge, in behalf of his elect, all the broken conditions and incurred liabilities of the covenant of works (Matthew 5:17, Matthew 5:18),-(a) rendering that perfect obedience which is the condition of the promise of the old covenant (Psalms 40:8; Isaiah 13:21; John 8:29; John 9:4-5; Matthew 19:17), and (b) suffering the penalty of death incurred by the breaking of the old covenant, (Isaiah 53:1-12; 2 Corinthians 5:21; Galatians 3:13; Ephesians 5:2.)

4. Christ, as mediatorial King, administers to his people the benefits of his covenant; and by his providence, his Word, and his Spirit, he causes them to become severally recipients of these blessings, according to his will. These benefits he offers to all men in the gospel. He promises to grant them on the condition they are received. In the case of his own people, he works faith in them, and as their Surety engages for them and makes good all that is suspended upon or conveyed through their agency. In the whole sphere of our experience every Christian duty is a Christian grace; for we can fulfill the conditions of repentance and faith only as it is given to us by our Surety. All Christian graces also involve Christian duties. So that Christ at once purchases salvation for us, and applies salvation to us; commands us to do, and works in us to obey; offers us grace and eternal life on conditions, and gives us the conditions and the grace and the eternal life. What he gives us he expects us to exercise. What he demands of us he at once gives us. Viewed on God’s side, faith and repentance are the gifts of the Son. Viewed on our side, they are duties and gracious experiences, the first symptoms of salvation begun-instruments wherewith further grace may be attained. Viewed in connection with the covenant of grace, they are elements of the promise of the Father to the Son, conditioned upon his mediatorial work. Viewed in relation to salvation, they are indices of its commencement and conditions sine qua non of its completion.

The present administration of this covenant by Christ, in one aspect, evidently bears a near analogy to a testament or will executed only consequent upon the death of the testator. And so in one passage our translators were correct in so translating the word diaqhkh . (Hebrews 9:16, Hebrews 9:17.) But since Christ is an ever-living and constantly-acting Mediator, the same yesterday, today, and forever, this word, which expresses his present administration, should in every other instance have been translated "dispensation," instead of "testament." (2 Corinthians 3:6, 2 Corinthians 3:14; Galatians 3:15; Hebrews 7:22; Hebrews 12:24; Hebrews 13:20.)

SECTION 5: THIS covenant was differently administered in the time of the law, and in the time of the gospel;(9) under the law it was administered by promises, prophecies, sacrifices, circumcision, the paschal lamb, and other types and ordinances delivered to the people of the Jews, all foresignifying Christ to come,(10) which were for that time sufficient and efficacious, through the operation of the Spirit, to instruct and build up the elect in faith in the promised Messiah,(11) by whom they had full remission of sins, and eternal salvation; and is called the Old Testament.(12)

SECTION 6: UNDER the gospel, when Christ the substance(13) was exhibited, the ordinances in which this covenant is dispensed are, the preaching of the Word, and the administration of the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper;(14) which, though fewer in number, and administered with more simplicity and less outward glory, yet in them it is held forth in more fullness, evidence, and spiritual efficacy,(15) to all nations, both Jews and Gentiles;(16) and is called the New Testament.(17) There are not, therefore, two covenants of grace differing in substance, but one and the same under various dispensations.(18)

(9) 2 Corinthians 3:6-9. (10) Hebrews 8:1-13, Hebrews 9:1-28, Hebrews 10:1-39; Romans 4:11; Colossians 2:11-12; 1 Corinthians 5:7. (11) 1 Corinthians 10:1-4; Hebrews 11:13; John 8:56. (12) Galatians 3:7-9, Galatians 3:14. (13) Colossians 2:17. (14) Matthew 28:19-20; 1 Corinthians 11:23-25. (15) Hebrews 12:22-27; Jeremiah 31:33-34. (16) Matthew 28:19; Ephesians 2:15-19. (17) Luke 22:20. (18) Galatians 3:14, Galatians 3:16; Acts 15:11; Romans 3:21-23, Romans 3:30; Psalms 32:1; Romans 4:3, Romans 4:6, Romans 4:16-17, Romans 4:23-24; Hebrews 13:8.

These sections teach us concerning the covenant of grace as it has been manifest in both the old and new dispensations.

1. The Covenant adminstered has from the beginning remained in all essential repsects the same, in spite of all outward changes in its mode and adminsitration. (1) Christ was the Savior of men before his advent, and he saved them on the same principles then as now. He was "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," (Revelation 13:8); "a propitiation for the sins that are past," (Romans 3:25; Hebrews 9:15). He was promised to Adam and to Abraham as the Savior of the world. (Genesis 3:15; Genesis 17:7); Genesis 22:18. He was symbolically exhibited and typically prophesied by all the ceremonial and especially by the sacrificial system of the temple. (Colossians 2:17; Hebrews 10:1-10.) He was especially witnessed to as the Savior from sin by all the prophets. (Acts 10:43.) (2) Faith was the condition of salvation under the old dispensation in the same sense it is now. (Hebrews 2:4; Psalms 2:12.) The Old Testament believers are set up for an example to those who are called to exercise faith under the New Testament. (Romans 4:1-25, Hebrews 11:1-40) (3) The same gracious promises of spiritual grace and eternal blessedness were administered then as now. (Compare Genesis 17:7 with Matthew 22:32; and Genesis 22:18 with Galatians 3:16. See, also, Isaiah 43:25; Psalms 16:1-11, Psalms 51:1-19; Psalms 73:24-26;

Ezekiel 36:27; Job 19:25-27; Daniel 12:2-3.)

2. Under the old dispensatio the covenant of grace was administered chiefly by types and symbolic ordinances, signifying beforehand the coming of Christ, and thus administration was almost exclusively confined to the Jewish nation with consstantly increasing fulness and clearness- (1) From Adam to Abraham, in the promise to the woman (Genesis 3:15); the institution of bloody sacrifices; and the constant visible appearance and audible converse of Jehovah with his people. (2) From Abraham to Moses, the more definite promise given to Abraham (Genesis 17:7; Genesis 22:18), in the Church separated from the world, embraced in a special covenant, and sealed with the sacrament of Circumcision. (3) From Moses to Christ, the simple primitive rite of sacrifice developed into the elaborate ceremonial and significant symbolism of the temple service, the covenant enriched with new promises, the Church separated from the world by new barriers, and sealed with the additional sacrament of the Passover.

3. The present dispensation of the covenant is superior to the former one-(1) Because while it was formerly administered by Moses, a servant, it is now administered visibly and immediately by Christ, a son in his own house. Hebrews 3:5-6. (2) The truth was then partly hid, partly revealed, in the types and symbols; now it is revealed in clear history and didactic teaching. (3) That revelation has been vastly increased, as well as rendered more clear, by the incarnation of Christ and the mission of the Holy Ghost. (4) That dispensation was so encumbered with ceremonies as to be comparatively carnal; the present dispensation is spiritual. (5) That was confined to one people: the present dispensation, disembarrassed from all national organizations, embraces the whole Earth. (6) That method of administration was preparatory: the present is final, as far as the present order of the world is concerned. It will give way only to that eternal administration of the covenant which shall be executed by the Lamb in the new heavens and the new earth, when there shall "be gathered together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth." (Ephesians 1:10.) More than this is not yet made known.

01.08. Of Christ The Mediator

Chapter Eight

Of Christ The Mediator

SECTION 1: IT pleased God, in his eternal purpose, to choose and ordain the Lord Jesus, his only begotten Son, to be the Mediator between God and man;(1) the Prophet,(2) Priest,(3) and King;(4) the Head and Savior of his Church;(5) the Heir of all things;(6) and Judge of the world:(7) unto whom he did from all eternity give a people to be his seed,(8) and to be by him in time redeemed, called, justified, sanctified, and glorified.(9)

(1) Isaiah 42:1; 1 Peter 1:19-20; John 3:16; 1 Timothy 2:5. (2) Acts 3:22. (3) Hebrews 5:5-6. (4) Psalms 2:6; Luke 1:33. (5) Ephesians 5:23. (6) Hebrews 1:2. (7) Acts 17:31. (8) John 17:6; Psalms 22:30; Isaiah 53:10. (9) 1 Timothy 2:6; Isaiah 55:4-5; 1 Corinthians 1:30.

Having already established the doctrine of God's sovereign election and the doctrine of the covenant of grace between the Father and His Son, this section teaches that Christ as mediator is both God and man, exercising His authority as prophet, priest, and king. Moreover, He is Head and Savior of His Church, Heir of all things, and Judge of the world. 1. A mediator is one who intervenes between contesting parties for the sake of making reconciliation. The term is sometimes applied to independent and disinterested parties called in to arbitrate a difficulty; sometimes to a dependent messenger or agent of one of the parties to the contest employed to carry overtures to the other party. In this sense Moses was a mediator between God and the people of Israel. (Deuteronomy 5:5; Galatians 3:19.) Sometimes it is applied to an intercessor employed by the weaker party to influence the stronger. The Scriptures apply the term, in a higher sense than any of these, to Christ. They teach that he intervenes between God and man, not merely to sue for peace and to persuade to it, but, armed with plenipotentiary power, efficiently to make peace and to do all that is necessary to that end. The things necessary in order to this great end fall into two classes-(1) Those that respect God, and (2) Those that respect men.

(1) As it respects God, it is absolutely necessary, in order to reconciliation, that the Mediator should propitiate the just displeasure of God by expiating the guilt of sin, and that he should supplicate in our behalf, and that he should actually introduce our persons and services to the acceptance of the Father.

(2) As it respects men, it is absolutely necessary that the Mediator should reveal to them the truth concerning God and their relations to him, and the conditions of acceptable service; that he should persuade and enable them to receive and obey the truth so revealed; and that he should so direct and sustain them, and so control all the outward influences to which they are subjected, that their deliverance from sin and from the powers of an evil world shall be perfected.

2. Hence the mediatorial office involves all the three great functions of prophet, priest, and king; and Christ discharged them all, both in his estate of humiliation and exaltation. These are not three

distinct offices meeting accidentally in one office, but three functions inhering essentially in the one office of mediator. And they each so belong to the very essence of the office that the quality peculiar to each gives character to every mediatorial action. When he teaches, he is always a priestly and kingly prophet. When he offers sacrifice or intercession for sin, he is always a prophetical and royal priest.

(1) Christ is a Prophet. A prophet is a spokesman; one sent from God to man to make known the divine will. In this sense Moses and all inspired men were prophets. But Christ was the personal "Word of God" incarnate, he who had eternally been "in the bosom of the Father," and "known the Father"; and consequently as Mediatorial Prophet is that original fountain of revelation of which all other prophets are the streams. He is the Prophet of all prophets, the Teacher of all teachers.

"He executes the office of a prophet, in his revealing to the Church, in all ages, by his Spirit and Word, in divers ways of administration, the whole will of God, in all things concerning their edification and salvation." (L. Cat., q. 43.) That this representation is true is proved from the fact that the Scriptures-(a) Explicitly call him a prophet. (Compare Deuteronomy 18:15, Deuteronomy 18:18 and Acts 3:22; Acts 7:37; Hebrews 1:2.) (b) Teach that he executed the functions of a prophet before his incarnation. (Isaiah 9:6; Malachi 3:1; Job 33:23; 1 Peter 1:11.) (c) Teach that he executes the office of a prophet since his incarnation. (Matthew 11:27; John 3:2; John 6:68; Revelation 7:17; Revelation 21:3.)

(2) Christ is a Priest. A priest is (a) one taken from among men, (b) to appear in the presence of God and to treat in behalf of men; and (c), in order thereto, to make propitiation and intercession. It is declared to be essential to the priest-(a) That he be a man chosen to represent men before God. Aaron always bore before the Lord for a memorial a breastplate with the names of all the tribes of Israel engraved upon it. (Exodus 28:9, Exodus 28:12, Exodus 28:21, Exodus 28:29.) (b) He must be chosen of God, as his special election and property. (Numbers 16:5; Hebrews 5:4.) (c) He must be holy and consecrated to the Lord. (Leviticus 21:6-8; Exodus 39:30-31; Psalms 106:16.) (d) He must have a right both to draw near to Jehovah and to bring near-i.e., to offer sacrifices and intercessions. (Leviticus 16:3-15.) (e) He must have an acceptable sacrifice to offer. (Hebrews 8:3.) Christ is in this sense a true priest, and he executes this office "in his once offering himself a sacrifice without spot to God, to be a reconciliation for the sins of his people; and in making continual intercession for them." (L. Cat., q. 44.) That this is true is proved from the fact that the Scriptures declare-(a) That Christ possessed all the characteristic marks and qualifications of a priest. He became a man for this purpose. (Hebrews 2:16; Hebrews 4:15.) He was chosen of God, as was Aaron. (Hebrews 5:5-6.) He was perfectly holy, and had right of immediate approach to the Father. Hebrews 8:6. (b) He is declared to be a priest in the Old Testament. The entire order of priests and the ceremonial of sacrifice were typical of him. {Zechariah 6:13; Isaiah 53:10; Daniel 9:24-25.) (c) The Gospel history declares that he actually discharged all the functions of a priest. He has made propitiation by a sacrificial bearing of the penalty due to sin. (Ephesians 5:2; Hebrews 9:26; 1 John 2:2.) He has made intercession, and he ever lives to intercede. (Romans 8:34; Hebrews 7:25.) The work of Christ was the substance of which the entire ceremonial of the temple was the shadow. (Colossians 2:17.) His priesthood is said not to have been of the order of Aaron, because, although Aaron and his priesthood were types of Christ. and existed simply for the purpose of showing forth his work, yet they were inadequate to represent him fully and in all relations. They were inadequate chiefly-(a) With respect to the incomparable dignity and

excellence of his person. (John 1:1-4, John 1:14.) (b) The infinite value of his sacrifice. (Hebrews 10:1-14.) (c) The manner of their consecration. (Hebrews 7:20-22.) (d) They were constantly succeeding each other, as dying men. (Hebrews 7:23-24.) (e) He was a minister of a greater and more perfect tabernacle. (Hebrews 9:11, Hebrews 9:24.) (f) They were mere priests-he was a royal and prophetical priest. (Zechariah 6:13; Romans 8:34; Hebrews 8:1-2.) His priesthood is said to have been of the order of Melchizedek, because-(a) Like him he was a royal priest. (b) Like him, he had no predecessors or successors in office. He was the only one of his line. (c) Because he was an eternal priest: "Thou art a priest forever, of the order of Melchizedek." (Hebrews 7:17.)

(3) Christ is sovereign Head over all things to his Church. (Ephesians 1:22; Ephesians 4:15; Colossians 1:18; Colossians 2:19.) He executes the office of a king-(a) In calling out of the world a people to himself, and giving them offices, laws, and discipline, by which he visibly governs them; (b) In bestowing saving grace upon his elect, rewarding their obedience and correcting them for their sins, and preserving and supporting them under all their temptations and sufferings; (c) In restraining and overcoming all their enemies, and powerfully ordering all things for his own glory and their good; and also (d) In taking vengeance on the rest, who know not God and obey not the gospel. This lordship differs from that which belongs essentially to the Godhead-(a) Because it is given to him by the Father as the reward of his obedience and suffering. Php 2:6-11. (b) The object and design of this mediatorial kingship has special reference to the upbuilding and glory of the redeemed Church. (Ephesians 1:22-23.) (c) The dignity and authority belong not to his deity abstractly, but to his entire person as God-man. This power and lordship Christ already possesses, and it extends over all creatures in all worlds. (Matthew 28:18; Ephesians 1:17-23; Php 2:9-11; Jeremiah 23:5; Isaiah 9:6; Psalms 2:6; Acts 2:29-36.) And of this kingdom there shall be no end. (Daniel 2:44; Isaiah 9:7.) Thus Christ has been shown, as Mediator, to be-

3. Head and Savior of his Church, and Heir of all things; that is, sovereign ruler and disposer of all things throughout all worlds. (Ephesians 1:10.) That element of Christ's dominion which shall be exercised in his judging men and angels at the end will be considered under chapter 33.

SECTION 2: 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,(10) with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin;(11) being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin Mary of her substance.(12) So that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the Godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion.(13) Which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only Mediator between God and man.(14)

(10) John 1:1, John 1:14; 1 John 5:20; Php 2:6; Galatians 4:4. (11) Hebrews 2:14, Hebrews 2:16-17; Hebrews 4:15. (12) Luke 1:27, Luke 1:31, Luke 1:35; Galatians 4:4. (13) Luke 1:35; Colossians 2:9; Romans 9:5; 1 Peter 3:18; 1 Timothy 3:16. (14) Romans 1:3-4; 1 Timothy 2:5. The subject of this section is the constitution of the person of the Mediator as the God-man. Having proven (ch. 2., s. 3) that Jesus Christ is the one God; the second person of the Trinity, of one substance and equal with the Father, this section further dwells on the perssonality and natures of Christ. The most ancient and universally accepted statement of the Church doctrine as to the person of Christ is that which was formed by the fourth General Council, consisting of "six hundred

and thirty holy and blessed fathers," who were convened in Chalcedon A.D. 451: "We, then, following the holy Fathers, all with one consent, teach men to confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ; the same perfect in Godhead, and also perfect in manhood; truly God and truly man, of a reasonable soul and body; consubstantial with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the manhood; in all things like unto us without sin; begotten before all ages of the Father according to the Godhead, and in these latter days, for us and for our salvation, born of Mary, the Virgin Mother of God, according to the manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only Begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably, the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved and concurring in one Person and one Substance, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son and Only begotten, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ, as the prophets have from the beginning declared concerning him, and the Lord Jesus Christ himself has taught us, and the creed of the holy Fathers has delivered to us."-

1. Jesus of Nazareth was a true man, possessing all the essential properties of humanity, conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of her substance This includes two constituent propositions-(1) Jesus Christ vas a true and proper man, possessing all the essential properties of humanity. He is constantly and characteristically called the Man Christ Jesus, and the Son of Man. (Matthew 8:20; 1 Timothy 2:5.) He had a true body, for he ate, drank, slept, and increased in stature. (Luke 2:52.) Through his whole life he was in all public and private association recognized as a true man. He died in agony on the cross, was buried, rose again, and proved his identity by physical signs. (Luke 24:36-44.) He had a reasonable soul, for he increased in wisdom, loved, sympathized, wept and shrank from suffering as a man. (John 11:33-35; Matthew 26:36-46.) (2) The human nature of Jesus is not an independent creation merely. Like ours, but it was generated out of the common life of our race, of the very substance of the Virgin Mary, by the power of the Holy Ghost. The angels do not constitute a race produced by generation, but only a collection of individuals. This distinction is emphasized when it is declared of Christ, "He took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham." (Hebrews 2:16.) He is the seed of Eve (Genesis 3:15); the seed of David (Romans 1:3.) He was made of a woman (Galatians 4:4); conceived by her in her womb (Luke 1:31; Luke 2:5-7).

2. That Jesus, although tempted in all points like as we are, was yet absolutely without sin, is expressly declared in Scripture. (Hebrews 4:15.) Peter testifies of him that "he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." (1 Peter 2:22.) John testifies that "in him is no sin." (1 John 3:5; Hebrews 7:26; Luke 1:35.) The same is evident from the origin and constitution of his person as the Incarnate Word; from the nature of the work he came to perform as the deliverer of men from sin; and from the record of his holy life preserved by the evangelists, which remains, in the constrained acknowledgments of infidels as well as the faith of Christians, the great moral miracle of all ages.

3. That he was no less very God, the eternal Son of the Father, has been already proven. Ch. 2., s. 3.

4. That, nevertheless, this God and this man is one single person, is proven in every way that such a truth can be verified. (1) In all the record of his life there is no word spoken of him, no action

performed by him, no attribute predicated of him, that suggests the idea that he is not one single, indivisible person. (2) The personal pronouns are always used by him and applied to him as if he were a single person. Of the same subject and in the same connection divine attributes and actions and human attributes and actions are predicated. (3) To make the matter more certain and evident, there are passages in which the person is designated by a title proper to his divine nature, while the attribute or action predicated of him is proper to his human nature; e.g., "The Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood" (Acts 20:28); "Crucified the Lord of glory" (1 Corinthians 2:8.) (4) There are other passages in which the person is designated by a title proper to the human nature, while the attribute or action predicated of it is proper to the divine nature: "The Son of man, who is in heave," (John 3:13); "If Ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before" (John 6:62). (5) There are other passages in which divine and human attributes and actions are indiscriminately predicated of the same person: "Who hath . . . translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son: in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins: who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature . . . and having made peace through the blood of his cross," etc. (Colossians 1:13-20; Hebrews 1:3.)

5. This personality is that of the eternal Son of God, who in time took a human soul and body into personal union with himself. This remarkable person did not begin to exist, and therefore was not constituted, when he was conceived in the womb of the Virgin. "Before Abraham was, I am," he says. (John 8:58.) "The Word was made flesh." (John 1:14.) "God sent his only begotten Son into the world." (1 John 4:9.) The Son was "made of a woman, made under the law." (Galatians 4:4.) "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same." (Hebrews 2:14; Php 2:6-11.) Hence it is evident that the person of Christ is divine, and not human-eternal, and not formed in time. But in time this eternal divine person took a human nature (soul and body) into its personality. Just as the body, with its wonderful constitution of organs, nerves, senses, and passions, has no personality of its own, but, during its entire life in the womb, grows into the personality of the soul; so the human nature of Christ never for an instant had a separate personal existence of its own, but, from the instant of its conception, grew into the eternal personality of the Son of God. There are in Christ, therefore, two natures, but one person; a human as well as a divine nature, but only a divine person. His humanity began to exist in the womb of the Virgin, but his person existed from eternity. His divinity is personal, his humanity impersonal, and his divine nature and his human nature one person.

6. Although but one person, the divine and human natures in Christ are not mixed or confused in one, but remain two pure and distinct natures, divine and human, constituting one person forever.

It is impossible for us to explain philosophically how two self-conscious intelligences, how two self-determined free agents, can constitute one person; yet this is the precise character of the phenomenon revealed in the history of Jesus. In order to simplify the matter, some errorists have supposed that in the person of Christ there was no human soul, but that his divine spirit took the place of the human soul in his human body. Others have so far separated the two natures as to make him two persons-a God and a man intimately united. Others have so pressed the natures together that neither pure divinity nor pure humanity is left, but a new nature resulting from the mixing of both. That Christ’s two natures remain separate and unconfused, is self-evident. The very point proved in Scripture is that Christ always continued a true God and true man-not something else between the two. The essential properties of divinity cannot be communicated to

humanity-that is, humanity cannot be made to be infinite, self- eternal, and absolutely perfect; because, if it possessed these, it would cease to be human; and because even God himself cannot create divinity, and therefore cannot make humanity divine. The same is true with respect to Christ's divinity. If that should take on the limitations of humanity, it would cease to be divine, and even God is not able to destroy divinity. Hence, since Christ is both God and man, it follows that he cannot be a mixture of both, which is neither. Hence, while the Scriptures constantly affirm (as we have seen) of the one person whatsoever is true, without exception, of either nature, they never affirm of either nature that which belongs to the other. It is said that God-i.e., the person who is a God-gave his blood for his Church; but it is never said that his divinity died, or that his humanity came down from heaven.

SECTION 3: THE Lord Jesus, in his human nature thus united to the divine, was sanctified and anointed with the Holy Spirit above measure;(15) having in him all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge;(16) in whom it pleased the Father that all fullness should dwell;(17) to the end, that being holy, harmless, undefiled, and full of grace and truth,(18) he might be thoroughly furnished to execute the office of a Mediator and Surety.(19) Which office he took not unto himself, but was thereunto called by his Father;(20) who put all power and judgment into his hand, and gave him commandment to execute the same.(21)

SECTION 4: THIS office the Lord Jesus did most willingly undertake;(22) which that he might discharge he was made under the law,(23) and did perfectly fulfill it;(24) endured most grievous torments immediately in his soul,(25) and most painful sufferings in his body;(26) was crucified, and died;(27) was buried, and remained under the power of death, yet saw no corruption(28) On the third day he arose from the dead,(29) with the same body in which he suffered;(30) with which also he ascended into heaven, and there sitteth at the right hand of his Father,(31) making intercession;(32) and shall return to judge men and angels at the end of the world.(33)

(15) Psalms 45:7; John 3:34. (16) Colossians 2:3. (17) Colossians 1:19. (18) Hebrews 7:26, John 1:14. (19) Acts 10:38; Hebrews 12:24; Hebrews 7:22. (20) Hebrews 5:4-5. (21) John 5:22, John 5:27; Matthew 28:18; Acts 2:36. (22) Psalms 40:7-8; Hebrews 10:5-10; John 10:18; Php 2:8. (23) Galatians 4:4. (24) Matthew 3:15; Matthew 5:17. (25) Matthew 26:37-38; Luke 22:44; Matthew 27:46. (26) Matthew 26:1-75, Matthew 27:1-66. (27) Php 2:8. (28) Acts 2:23-24, Acts 2:27; Acts 13:37; Romans 6:9. (29) 1 Corinthians 15:3-5. (30) John 20:25, John 20:27. (31) Mark 16:19. (32) Romans 14:9-10; Hebrews 9:24; Hebrews 7:25. (33) Romans 14:9, Romans 14:10; Acts 1:11; Acts 10:42; Matthew 13:40-42; Jude 1:6; 2 Peter 2:4.

Now these sections proceed to addres the effect of Christ's hypostatical union upon his human nature; His unique function as Mediatorial God-Man, having been voluntarily appointed to this office by the Father; His discharging of Mediatorial functions in humiliation and in exaltation.

1. The effect of this hypostatical union upon the human nature of Christ was not to deify it, since, as we saw above, the human nature as well as the divine nature remains pure, separate, and unchanged, after as before. But the effect of this union was-(1) To exalt the human nature of Christ to a degree of dignity and honor greatly beyond that attained by any other creature. (2) To fill it with a perfection of intellectual and moral excellence beyond that of any other creature. The Father gave not the Spirit by measure unto him. (John 3:34.) "It pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell." (Colossians 1:19) His person, therefore, possessed all the properties belonging to

absolute divinity, and an all-perfect and incomparably exalted manhood, and was thoroughly furnished to execute the office of Mediator and Surety.

2. Hence Christ was Mediator, and discharged all the functions of that office, not as God, nor as man, but as God-man. As this point is more directly called up by the seventh section of this chapter, it will be considered in that place.

3. That Christ was appointed to this office by the Father, and acts in it upon an authority derived from the Father, is very prominently as well as clearly set forth in Scripture: "And no man takes this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest; but . . . he was called of God an high priest after the order of Melchizedek." (Hebrews 5:4-10.) Christ constantly affirms that he was "sent by the Father"; that the Father had given him "a commandment"; that the "works" which he performed and the "words" which he spoke were not his, but the Father's that sent him. "I can of mine own self do nothing: as I hear I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me." (John 5:30.) "Jesus answered them and said, My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." (John 7:16.) "If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father; for my Father is greater than I." (John 14:24, John 14:28, John 14:31; John 10:18; John 12:49; John 4:34.) The Eternal Word is of the same identical substance with and equal to the Father in power and glory. But the God-man, in his official relations and works, is officially, and as far as concerns these relations and actions alone, inferior to the Father-sent by his authority, acting for him, returning and accounting to him.

4. That nevertheless Christ took this office and all it involved upon himself voluntarily is very evident-(1) Because otherwise, being absolute God, it could never have been imposed upon him. (2) Because otherwise his obedience and suffering could not have vicariously availed for us. (3) Because otherwise the execution of the law upon him would have been outrageously unjust. (4) Because it is expressly declared. Speaking of his life, he said, "No man takes 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." (John 10:18.) The motive which impelled him to the self-sacrificing undertaking was a personal love for his people "which passes knowledge." (Galatians 2:20; Ephesians 3:19; Ephesians 5:2.) 5. Christ discharged the functions of the mediatorial office in his estate of humiliation, which consists-

(1) In his being born, and that in a low condition. It is evident that nothing could be added to the divine perfections by the assumption of a human nature into a personal relation. On the other hand it is an act of infinite condescension on the part of the Godhead of Jesus, and of transcendent and permanent benefit to the whole intelligent creation, that all the fullness of the Godhead should be contained in him bodily, and so revealed under the limitations of a finite nature. For it is only thus that the Infinite can be "seen and known," "tasted and handled," and that of "his fullness" we may all receive, and "grace for grace" (John 1:16, John 1:18; 1 John 1:1.)

(2) In his being made under the law, and rendering perfect obedience to it. The law lays its claims not upon natures, but upon persons. The person of Christ was eternal and divine. Personally, therefore, he was the norm, the Author and Lord of the law, his divine perfections being the necessary and supreme Law to himself and to the universe he had made. Therefore he owed nothing to the law, since the law was conformed to him, not he to the law.

But, as we have seen, chap. 7., s. 3, in the covenant of grace the Mediator assumes in behalf of his elect seed the broken conditions of the old covenant of works precisely as Adam left them. In that covenant punishment was conditioned upon disobedience, and life and blessedness upon obedience. Therefore it was necessary that the "second Adam" should render vicarious obedience in order to secure for his people the promised reward, as well as that he should suffer the penalty in order to secure for them the remission of sins. By Christ's suffering (passive obedience), our Confession teaches, he purchases for us reconciliation; while by his fulfilling the precepts of the law (active obedience) he purchases for us "an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven." Chap. 8., s. 5. Christ, therefore, was "made under the law" (Galatians 4:4-5), (a) Not as a rule of righteousness, but as a condition of blessedness, "to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." (b) Not for himself, but officially as our representative. (c) His whole obedience of that law was vicarious-instead of our obedience and for our sakes. "By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." (Romans 5:19.)

(3) His undergoing the miseries of this life, the wrath of God, and the cursed death of the cross. Christ was the representative of his people, and all his obedience and suffering was vicarious, from his birth until all the conditions of the covenant of life were fulfilled. All his earthly career was in one aspect suffering, in another aspect obedience. As suffering, it was a vicarious endurance of the penalty of sin. As obedience, it was the discharge in the stead and behalf of his people of that condition upon which their eternal inheritance is suspended. The two were never separated in fact. They are only the two legal aspects presented by the same life of suffering obedience. The essence of the penalty vicariously borne by Christ was "the wrath of God." The incidents of it were "the miseries of this life." The culmination of it was "the cursed death of the cross," (Genesis 2:17; Hebrews 9:22.)

(4) In his being buried, and continuing under the power of death for a time. In the Creed commonly called the Apostles' Creed, and adopted by all the Churches, this last stage of the humiliation of Christ is expressed by the phrase, "He descended into hell" (Hades, the invisible world). This means precisely what our Confession affirms, that while the body of Jesus remained buried in the sepulcher his soul remained temporarily divorced from it in the unseen world of spirits.

Some (as Pearson on the Creed, pp. 333-371) have held that as Christ died vicariously as a sinner, so, in order to fulfill the law of death, his soul went temporarily to the place where the souls of those who die for their own sins die the second death forever. The Lutherans teach that the descent of the God-man into hell, in order to triumph over Satan and his angels in the very citadel of his kingdom, was the first step in his exaltation. (Form. Of Concord, part 2., chap. 9.) The Romanists teach that Christ went, while his body was in the grave, to that department of Hades (invisible world) which they call the Limbus Patrum , where the believers under the old dispensation were gathered, to preach the gospel to them, and to take them with him to the heaven he had prepared for them. (Cat. of the Coun. of Trent, part 1., art. 5.) 6. He executed the functions of his mediatorial office also in his estate of exaltation, which consisted- In his rising from the dead on the third day. The fact of his resurrection is proved. (a) Predicted in the Old Testament. (Compare Psalms 16:10; Acts 2:24-31.) (b) Christ himself predicted it. Matthew 20:18-19; John 10:17-18. (c) The witness of the eleven apostles. (Acts 1:3.) (d) The separate testimony of Paul. (1 Corinthians 15:8; Galatians 1:12; Acts 9:3-8.) (e) He was seen by five hundred brethren at once. (1 Corinthians 15:6.) (f) The miracles wrought by the apostles in

attestation of the fact. (Hebrews 2:4.) (g) The witness of the Holy Ghost. (Acts 5:32.) (h) The change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. The importance of the fact is proved to be fundamental. (a) The resurrection of Christ is the pledge for the fulfillment of all the prophecies and promises of both Testaments. (b) It proved him to be the Son of God, because it authenticated his claims, and because he rose by his own power. (John 2:19; John 10:17.) (c) It was a public acceptance of his mediatorial work in our behalf by the Father. (Romans 4:25.) (d) Hence we have an advocate with the Father. (1 John 2:1; Romans 8:34.) (e) "If Christ lives, we shall live also." (John 14:19; 1 Peter 1:3-5; 1 Corinthians 15:21-22.) (f) His resurrection secures ours. (Romans 8:11; 1 Corinthians 6:15; 1 Corinthians 15:49; Php 3:21; 1 John 3:2.)

(2) In his ascending up into heaven. This took place forty clays after his resurrection, from a portion of the Mount of Olives near to Bethany, in the presence of the eleven apostles and possibly other disciples. He ascended as Mediator, triumphing over his enemies and giving gifts to his friends (Ephesians 4:8-12), to complete his mediatorial work, as the forerunner of his people (John 14:2-3; Hebrews 6:20), and to fill the universe with the manifestations of his power and glory. (Ephesians 4:10.)

(3) In his sitting at the right hand of God the Father, where he intercedes for, and reigns over all things in the behalf of, his people. The passages which speak of this session of the Mediator at the right hand of the Father are, Psalms 16:1l; Psalms 110:1; Daniel 7:13-14; Matthew 26:64; Mark 16:19; John 5:22; Romans 8:34; Ephesians 1:20, Ephesians 1:22; Php 2:9-11; Colossians 3:1; Hebrews 1:3-4; Hebrews 2:9; Hebrews 10:12; 1 Peter 3:22; Revelation 5:6. This right hand of God denotes the official exaltation of the Mediator to supreme glory, felicity, and dominion over every name that is named. It is, moreover, a definite place, since the finite soul and body of Christ must be in a definite place, and there his glory is revealed and his authority exercised. There he intercedes for his people, a priest upon his throne (Zechariah 6:13); and hence he effectually applies to his people, by his Spirit, that salvation which he had previously achieved for them in his estate of humiliation. With the presentation of "his own blood" (Hebrews 9:12, Hebrews 9:24) he pleads for those who are embraced in his covenant, and for those blessings in their behalf which in that covenant were conditioned upon his obedience and suffering. (John 17:9; Luke 22:32; see John 17:1-26) His intercession is always prevalent and successful. (John 11:42; Psalms 21:2.) (4) In his coming to judge the world at the last day. This will be discussed in its proper place, under chapter 33.

SECTION 5: THE Lord Jesus, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which he through the eternal Spirit once offered up unto God, has fully satisfied the justice of his Father,(34) and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father has given to him.(35)

SECTION 6: ALTHOUGH the work of redemption was not actually wrought by Christ until after his incarnation, yet the virtue, efficacy, and benefits thereof, were communicated to the elect in all ages successively from the beginning of the world, in and by those promises, types, and sacrifices, wherein he was revealed and signified to be the Seed of the woman, which should bruise the serpent’s head, and the Lamb slain from the beginning of the world, being yesterday and today the same, and forever.(36)

(34) Romans 5:19; Hebrews 9:14, Hebrews 9:16; Hebrews 10:14; Ephesians 5:2; Romans 3:25-26. (35) Daniel 9:24, Daniel 9:26; Colossians 1:19-20; Ephesians 1:11, Ephesians 1:14; John 17:2; Hebrews 9:12, Hebrews 9:15. (36) Galatians 4:4-5; Genesis 3:15; Revelation 13:8; Hebrews 13:8.

Compare chapter 11., s. 3: "Christ, by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to his Father's justice in their behalf."

These sections teach us of the effects of Christ's mediatorial work on earth:

1. That Christ made satisfaction for those whom he represented, both by his obedience and by, his sacrifice of himself, has been shown above (chap. 7., s. 3, and 8., s. 4). This truth is taught in the Confessions of all the Churches, Lutheran and Reformed. The Heidelberg Catechism, one of the most generally adopted of all the Reformed Confessions, says, question 60: "God, without any merit of mine but only of mere grace, grants and imputes to me the perfect satisfaction, righteousness, and holiness of Christ, . . . as if I had fully accomplished all that obedience which Christ hath accomplished for me." The Formula of Concord, a Lutheran Confession, says: "Since Christ was not only man, but God and man in one undivided person, so he was not subject to the law, nor obnoxious to suffering and death, because he was the Lord of the law. On which account his obedience is imputed to us; so that God on account of that whole obedience (which Christ by his acting and by his suffering, in his life and in his death, for our sake rendered to his Father who is in heaven) remits our sins, reputes us as good and just, and gives us eternal salvation."

2. Christ thus has, in strict rigor, fully satisfied all the demands of divine justice upon those whom he represents. Jesus Christ has met the divine demand that the original covenatn of works be fulfilled through the sorrow of His life and death, and he has met the divine demand for essential justice in the punishment of sin through the obedience unto death. Christ suffered as the representative of sinners. Our sins were laid upon him. He, "hath redeemed us from the curse of the law by being made a curse for us." He died, "the just for the unjust." "He is the propitiation (expiation) for our sins." He "gave his life a ransom for many." We are "bought with a price." (Galatians 3:13; 1 Peter 3:18; 1 John 2:2; Matthew 20:28; 1 Corinthians 6:20.) Christ suffered only in his single human soul and body, and only for a time. Nevertheless, his person was the infinite and transcendently glorious person of the eternal Son of God. Consequently his sufferings were precisely, both in kind and in degree, what the infinitely righteous wisdom of God saw to be in strict rigor a full equivalent, in respect to the demands of legal justice, for the eternal sufferings of all for whom he suffered. This is the doctrine of the whole Christian Church. The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, say, Art. 31: "The offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual." The Catechism of the Council of Trent, 2.5, 63: "Whatever is due by us to God on account of our sins has been paid abundantly, although he should deal with us according to the strictest rigor of his justice. . . . For it we are indebted to Christ alone, who, having paid the price of our sins on the cross, most fully satisfied God."

3. That thus he has, according to the terms of the everlasting covenant, not only secured in behalf of those whom he represented remission of sins and propitiation of divine wrath, but also an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of glory. The sufferings of Christ secure the remission of the

penalty; and by his active obedience, according to the terms of the covenant made with Adam and assumed by Christ, he purchases a right to life and eternal blessedness. That he has so purchased eternal life for all those in whose stead he rendered obedience, is proved from the fact that the Scriptures habitually set forth the truth that the "adoption of sons" and "eternal life" are given to the believer freely for Christ's sake, as elements of that purchased possession of which the Holy Spirit is the earnest. (Ephesians 1:11-14; Romans 8:15-17; Galatians 1:4; Galatians 3:13-14; Galatians 4:4-5; Ephesians 5:25-27; Titus 3:5-6; Revelation 1:5, Revelation 1:6; Revelation 5:9-10.) This proves, therefore-(1) That Christ did not die simply to make the salvation of those for whom he died possible-i.e., to remove legal obstructions to their salvation-but that he died with the design and effect of actually securing their salvation and of endowing them gratuitously with an inalienable title to heaven. (2) It proves, in the second place, that the vicarious sufferings of Christ must have been, in design and effect, personal and definite as to their object. Salvation must be applied to all those for whom it was purchased. Since not the possibility or opportunity for reconciliation, but actual reconciliation itself was purchased; since not only reconciliation, but a title to an eternal inheritance was purchased, it follows (a) That "to all those for whom Christ hath purchased redemption, he doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same." (Conf. Faith, ch. 8. s. 8.) And (b) That he who never receives the inheritance, and to whom the purchased grace is never applied, is not one of the persons for whom it was purchased.

4. That although this satisfaction was rendered by Christ only after his incarnation yet the full benefits thereof had been applied to each of the elect severally in their successive generations from the beginning, by the Holy Ghost, through the various forms of truth to them made known. This has been proved at length and illustrated (chap. 7. ss. 5, 6).

SECTION 7: CHRIST, in the work of mediation, acts according to both natures; by each nature doing that which is proper to itself;(37) yet by reason of the unity of the person, that which is proper to one nature is sometimes in Scripture attributed to the person denominated by the other nature.(38) (37) Hebrews 9:14; 1 Peter 3:18. (38) Acts 20:28; John 3:13; 1 John 3:16.

Under section 2. we saw-(1) That Jesus of Nazareth was a true man. (2) That he was true God. (3) That he was nevertheless one single person. (4) That his personality is eternal and divine, his human nature having been generated into the pre-existent person of the Son. (5) That these two natures remain one person, yet distinct and unchanged divinity and humanity, without mixture or confusion. This section proceeds to state:

1. That all Christ's mediatorial actions involve the concurrent activities of both natures, each nature contributing that which is proper to itself.

Thus the divine nature of Christ is that fountain from which his revelation as prophet is derived. Other prophets reflect his light, or transmit what they receive from him. He is the original source of all divine knowledge. At the same time his humanity is the form through which his Godhead is revealed, his flesh the veil through which its glory is transmitted. His person as incarnate God is the focus of all revelations-the subject as well as the organ of all prophetical teaching.

Thus, also, the human nature of Christ was necessary in order that his person should be "made under the law"; and it is the subject of his vicarious sufferings, and the organ of his vicarious obedience and intercession as our representative Priest and Intercessor. At the same time, it is

only the supreme dignity of his divine person which renders his obedience supererogatory and therefore vicarious, and the temporary and finite sufferings of his humanity a full equivalent in justice-satisfying efficacy for the eternal sufferings of all the elect. Thus, also, the activities of his divinity and humanity are constantly and beautifully blended in all his administrative acts as King. The last Adam, the second Man, the Head of a redeemed and glorified race, the First-born among many brethren, he has dominion over all creatures; and with a human heart acting out through the energies of divine wisdom and power, he makes all things work together for the accomplishment of his purposes of love.

All mediatorial acts are therefore to be attributed to the entire person of the Theanthropos-God-man. And in the whole or his glorious person is he to be obeyed and worshipped by angels and men.

2. Because of the unity of both natures in one person, that which is proper to either nature belongs of course to that one person; and sometimes in Scripture that which is proper to one nature is attributed to the person denominated by the other nature. Thus, as shown above under section 2., the Scriptures often say that God shed his blood for his Church, or that the Son of man came down from heaven, while they never say that the human nature of Christ came down from heaven, or that his divine nature suffered for his Church.

SECTION 8: TO all those for whom Christ has purchased redemption, he certainly and effectually applies and communicates the same;(39) making intercession for them;(40) and revealing to them, in and by the Word, the mysteries of salvation;(41) effectually persuading them by his Spirit to believe and obey; and governing their hearts by his Word and Spirit;(42) overcoming all their enemies by his almighty power and wisdom, in such manner and ways as are most consonant to his wonderful and unsearchable dispensation.(43)

(39) John 6:37, John 6:39; John 10:15-16. (40) 1 John 2:1-2; Romans 8:34. (41) John 15:13, John 15:15; Ephesians 1:7-9; John 17:6. (42) John 14:16; Hebrews 12:2; 2 Corinthians 4:13; Romans 8:9, Romans 8:14; Romans 15:18-19; John 17:17. (43) Psalms 110:1; 1 Corinthians 15:25-26; Malachi 4:2-3; Colossians 2:15. This section teaches:

1. That Christ, as mediatorial King, seated at the right hand of God, applies the redemption he had effected as Priest to the proper subjects of it. This point has been already discussed under chap. 7., s. 4, and chap. 8. ss. 1, 4, when we were treating of Christ, the Head and Surety of the covenant and mediatorial King, and of his session at the right hand of God.

2. That he proceeds in the effectual application of redemption in the use of each of the four following methods: (1) By making intercession for the persons concerned. (2) By the revelation of the mysteries of salvation to them in his Word. (3) By the effectual operation of his Spirit on their hearts. (4) By all necessary dispensations of his providence. The discussion of these points must be looked for under the several heads of "The Holy Scripture," "Providence," "God’s Covenant with Man," "Christ the Mediator," "Effectual Calling," "Justification," etc.

3. That Christ doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate redemption to ALL THOSE for whom he has purchased it. Our Standards, it will be observed, very explicitly teach that Christ, as mediatorial Priest, made expiation and purchased salvation for certain definite persons. Thus, in chap. 3. s. 6, it is said: "As God has appointed the elect unto glory, so has he by the eternal and

most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they who are elected being fallen in Adam, are redeemed by Christ. . . . Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, . . . but the elect only." Here it is expressly affirmed (1) That Christ died upon the cross on purpose to carry out the eternal purpose of God in the election of certain individuals to eternal life. (2) That Christ died for the purpose of saving no other than the elect. In chap. 8., s. 5: "The Lord Jesus, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, . . . purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father has given to him." Here it is expressly taught-(1) That the design of Christ in dying was not simply to make the salvation of all men possible, but actually to purchase reconciliation for those given to him by the Father. (2) That for the same persons Christ actually purchases, and consequently infallibly secures, an eternal inheritance in heaven. In chapter 8., s. 8, it is said: "TO ALL THOSE for whom Christ has purchased redemption, he certainly and effectually applies and communicates the same." L. Cat., q. 59: "Redemption is certainly applied, and effectually communicated, to all those for whom Christ has purchased it." When this Confession was written, the phrase "to purchase redemption" was used in the sense in which we use the phrase "make atonement for sin." So it was so used by Baxter in his work, "Universal Redemption of Mankind by the Lord Jesus Christ"; and by Dr. Isaac Barrow in his sermon entitled "The Doctrine of Universal Redemption Asserted and Explained." Dr. Henry B. Smith, in his edition of Hagenbach, vol. 2., pp. 356, 357, says that our Confession uses the phrase in the same sense. The entire truth upon this subject, as set forth in our Standards, may be stated summarily in the following propositions:

1. God has acted from the beginning, in all his works, according to one changeless, all-comprehensive plan. Being infinitely wise and powerful, his design is always fully executed, and therefore is fully revealed in the event. God, therefore, intended to accomplish by the vicarious obedience and sufferings of Christ precisely what he does accomplish-nothing more, and nothing less.

2. The satisfaction rendered by Christ is amply sufficient for all men who can possibly be created.

3. It is exactly adapted to the legal relations and wants of every man-of one man as well as of another.

4. Hence it has forever removed out of the way all legal obstacles to God’s saving any man he wills to save.

5. That it is freely, authoritatively, and in good faith offered to every man to whom the gospel comes.

6. Hence it follows-(1) This redemption is rightfully the possession of any man whatsoever who accepts. (2) It is objectively available to one hearer of the gospel as much as to another, upon the single condition of acceptance.

7. But, since all men are dead in trespasses and sins, no man accepts it except those to whom it is effectually applied by the Holy Ghost.

8. It is effectually applied precisely to those persons to whom the Father and the Son will to apply it.

9. Since God’s purposes are all eternal and immutable, the Father and the Son will to apply it now precisely to those to whom they designed to apply it when Christ hung upon the cross, and they willed to apply it then precisely to those to whom they had designed to apply it from eternity.

10. Hence it follows-(1) Christ died with the purpose of executing the decree of election. (2) His design in making atonement was definite, having respect to certain definite persons-the elect, and none others. (3) He designed to secure the salvation of those for whose sake he rendered satisfaction; not merely to make their salvation possible, but to purchase for them inalienably faith and repentance, actual reconciliation and the adoption of sons, etc., etc. (4) He in time applies it effectually and certainly to all those for whom he purchased it.

01.09. Of Free Will

Chapter Nine

Of Free Will

SECTION 1: God hath endued the will of man with that natural liberty, that it is neither forced, nor, by any absolute necessity of nature, determined to good, or evil.(1) (1) James 1:13-14; James 4:7; Deuteronomy 30:19; Isaiah 7:11-12; Matthew 17:12; John 5:40 This section teaches the great fundamental truth of consciousness and. revelation, which renders moral government possible -- that man, in virtue of his creation, is endowed with an inalienable faculty of self-determination, the power of acting or not acting, and of acting in the way which the man himself, upon the whole view of the case, desires at the time. There are only three generically different views upon this subject possible: --

1. That which regards the actions of men as caused directly by outward circumstances and occasions, under the same great law of necessity which governs the movements of all material agents.

2. That affected by the Arminians and others, which regards the will in man, or his bare faculty of volition, as possessing o, mysterious capacity of self-determination, irrespective of all the judgments of the understanding and the affections of the heart and the entire state of the man's soul it the time.

3. That which is taught in this section -- namely, that the human soul, including all its instincts, ideas, judgments, affections, and tendencies, has the power of self-decision; that is, the soul decides in every case as, upon the whole, it pleases. That the first-stated view is not true is proved -- (1.) From the universal consciousness of men with respect to their own action, and observation of the action of other men. We are all conscious of possessing the power of determining our own action irrespective of any or of all external influences. In every case of deliberate choice we are conscious that we might have chosen the opposite if we had wished to do so, all outward circumstances remaining unchanged. We see that all material substances act only as they are acted upon, and in the same conditions invariably act in the same way. But, on the other hand, we see that our fellow-men, like ourselves, possess without exception the power of originating action; and that, if they please, they act very variously under the same circumstances. Circumstances, including the sum total of conditions and relations, control the action of all material agents, while personal agents control circumstances.

(2.) The same is proved by the fact that man is held responsible alike by his own conscience and by God for his own action. This evidently could not be the case if his action were caused by circumstances, and not freely by the man himself. That the second view, which supposes that a man possesses the power to choose without respect to his judgments or inclinations is not true; and that the third view, which supposes that a man possesses the inalienable faculty of choosing as upon the whole he judges right or desirable, is true, are proved --

(1.) From the consideration that while we are conscious, in every deliberate act of choice, that we might have chosen otherwise, all the external conditions being the same, we always feel that our choice was determined by the sum-total of our views, feelings, and tendencies at the time. A man freely chooses what he wants to choose. He would not choose freely if he chose in any other way. But his desire in the premises is determined by his whole intellectual and emotional state at the time.

(2.) It is plain that if the human will decided in any given case in opposition to all the views of the reason and all the desires of the heart, however free the will might be, the man would be a most pitiful slave to a mere irrational and immoral power of willing.

(3.) All men judge that the rational and moral character of any act results from the purpose or desire, the internal state of mind or heart, which prompted the act. If the man wills in any given case in opposition to all his judgments and to all his inclinations of every kind, his act in that case would obviously be neither rational nor moral; and the man himself, in respect to that act, would be neither free nor responsible.

(4.) If the human soul had the power to act thus irrespective of its entire interior intellectual and emotional condition at the time, such action could neither be foreseen nor controlled by God, nor influenced by men, and such exercise of volitional power would be absolutely fortuitous. It would sustain no certain relation to the character of the agent. Christ taught, in opposition to this, that human action is determined by the character of the agent as certainly as the nature of the fruit is determined by the nature of the tree from which it springs; and that the only way to change the character of the action is to change the permanent character or moral tendency and habit of the heart of the agent. Matthew 7:16-20; Matthew 12:33-35.

SECTION 2: Man, in his state of innocency, had freedom, and power to will and to do that which was good and well pleasing to God;(2) but yet, mutably, so that he might fall from it.(3) (2) Ecclesiastes 7:29; Genesis 1:26, Genesis 1:31; Colossians 3:10 (3) Genesis 2:16-17; Genesis 3:6, Genesis 3:17

SECTION 3: Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation:(4) so as, a natural man, being altogether averse from that good,(5) and dead in sin,(6) is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto.(7)

(4) Romans 5:5; Romans 8:7-8; John 6:44, John 6:65; John 15:5 (5) Romans 3:9-10, Romans 3:12, Romans 3:23 (6) Ephesians 2:1, Ephesians 2:5; Colossians 2:13 (7) John 3:3, John 3:5-6; John 6:44, John 6:65; 1 Corinthians 2:14; Titus 3:3-5

SECTION 4: When God converts a sinner, and translates him into the state of grace, he freeth him from his natural bondage under sin;(8) and, by his grace alone, enables him freely to will and to do that which is spiritually good;(9) yet so, as that by reason of his remaining corruption, he doth not perfectly, nor only, will that which is good, but doth also will that which is evil.(10)

(8) Colossians 1:13; John 8:34, John 8:36; Romans 6:6-7 (9) Php 2:13; Romans 6:14, Romans 6:17-19, Romans 6:22 (10) Galatians 5:17; Romans 7:14-25; 1 John 1:8, 1 John 1:10 SECTION 5: The will of man is made perfectly and immutably free to good alone, in the state of glory only.(11)

(11) Hebrews 12:23; 1 John 3:2; Jude 1:24; Revelation 21:27

These sections briefly state and contrast the various conditions which characterize the free agency of man in his four different estates of innocency, hereditary sin, grace, and glory. In all these estates man is unchangeably a free, responsible agent, and in all cases choosing or refusing as, upon the whole, he prefers to do. A man's volition is as his desires are in the given case. His desires in any given case are as they are determined to be by the general or permanent tastes, tendencies, and habitudes of his character. He is responsible for his desires, because they are determined by the nature and permanent characteristics of his own soul. He is responsible for these, because they are the tendencies and qualities of his own nature. If these are immoral, he and his actions are immoral. If these are holy, he and his actions are holy. When we say that man is a free agent, we mean (1.) That he has the power of originating action; that he is self-moved, and does not only move as he is moved upon from without. (2.) That he always wills that which, upon the whole view of the case presented by his understanding at the time, he desires to will. (3.) That man is furnished with a reason to distinguish between the true and the false, and a conscience to distinguish between the right and the wrong, in order that his desires and consequent volitions may be both rational and righteous; and yet his desires are not necessarily either rational or righteous, but they are formed under the light of reason and conscience, either conformable or contrary to them, according to the permanent habitual disposition or moral character of the soul itself.

1. Adam in his estate of innocency was a free agent, created with holy affections and moral tendencies; yet with a character as yet unconfirmed, capable of obedience, yet liable to be seduced. by external temptation, and by the inordinate excitement of the propensions of his animal nature, such as in their proper degree and due subordination are innocent. Of this state of a holy yet fallible nature we have no experience, and consequently very imperfect comprehension.

2. As to man's present estate, our Standards teach -- (1.) That man is still a free agent, and able to will as upon the whole he desires to will. (2.) That he has likewise ability to discharge many of the natural obligations which spring out of his relations to his fellow-men. (3.) That his soul by reason of the fall being morally corrupted and spiritually dead, his understanding being spiritually blind, and his affections perverted, he is "utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil " (Conf. Faith, ch. 6., section 4, and ch. 16., section 3; L. Cat., q. 25); and hence he "hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation;" so that he "is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself," or even " to prepare himself thereunto." Conf. Faith, ch. ix., section 8. The same view is taught in all the Protestant Confessions, Lutheran and Reformed.

Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, Art. 10: " The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith, and calling upon God: wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will."

Articles of Synod of Dort, chap. 3., Art. 3: "All men are conceived in sin, and born children of wrath, indisposed to all saving good, propense to evil, dead in sins and the slaves of sin; and without the grace of the regenerating Holy Spirit they are neither willing nor able to return to God, to correct

their depraved nature, or to dispose themselves to the correction of it."

Form of Concord, p. 579, Hase's Collection (Lutheran): " Therefore we believe that as it is impossible for a dead body to revive itself, or to communicate animal life to itself, in the same degree is it impossible for a man, spiritually dead by reason of sin, to recall spiritual life within himself." Ib. p. 653: "We believe that neither the intellect, heart, nor will of the unregenerate man, is able of its own natural strength either to understand, believe, embrace, will, begin, perfect, perform, operate, or cooperate anything, in things divine and spiritual; but man is so far dead and corrupt in respect to good, that in the nature of man since the fall, and before regeneration, there is not even a scintilla of spiritual strength remaining whereby he can prepare himself for the grace of God, or apprehend that grace when offered, or is able in whole or in half, or in the least part, to apply or accommodate himself to that grace, or to confer or to act, or to operate or to co-operate anything for his own conversion." By liberty we mean the inalienable prerogative of the human soul of exercising volition as it pleases. In this sense man is as free now as before the fall. By ability we mean the capacity either to will in opposition to the desires and affections of the soul at the time, or by a bare exercise of volition to make oneself desire and love that which one does not spontaneously desire or love. We affirm that liberty is, and that ability in this sense is not, an element of the constitution of the soul. A man always wills as upon the whole he pleases, but he cannot will himself to please differently from what he does please. The moral condition of the heart determines the act of the will, but the act of the will cannot change the moral condition of the heart. This inability is -- (1.) Absolute. Man has no power, direct or indirect, to fulfill the moral law, or to accept Christ, or to change his nature so as to increase his power; and so can neither do his duty without grace, nor prepare himself by himself for grace. (2.) It is purely moral, because man possesses since the fall as much as before all the constitutional faculties requisite to moral agency, and his inability has its ground solely in the wrong moral state of those faculties. It is simply the evil moral disposition of the soul. (3.) It is natural, because it is not accidental, but innate and inheres in the universal and radical moral state of our souls by nature; that is, as that nature is naturally propagated since the fall. (4.) It is not natural in the sense of belonging to the nature of man as originally formed by God, or as resulting from any constitutional deficiency, or development of our natural moral faculties as originally given by God. That this doctrine is true is proved -- (1.) From direct declarations of Scripture: "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." Jeremiah 13:23. "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him.....No man can come unto me, except it be given unto him of my Father." John 6:44, John 6:65; Romans 9:16; 1 Corinthians 2:14. (2.) From what the Scriptures say of man's state by nature. It is declared to be a state of " blindness " and "darkness " and of " spiritual death." Ephesians 4:18; Colossians 2:13. The unregenerate are the "servants of sin" and "subject to Satan." Romans 6:16, Romans 6:20; 2 Timothy 2:26; Matthew 12:33-36. (3.) From what the Scriptures say of the nature and the universal and absolute necessity of regeneration: " Except a man be born again, he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven." John 3:3. It is called a new birth, a new creation, a begetting anew, a giving a new heart. John 3:3, John 3:7; Ephesians 2:10; 1 John 5:18; Ezekiel 36:26. In this work God is the agent, man is the subject. It is so great that it requires the "mighty power" of God. Ephesians 1:18-20. All Christian duties are declared to be " the fruits of the Spirit." Galatians 5:22-23. (4.) From the experience of every true Christian. (5.) From the consciousness of every convinced sinner. The great burden of all true conviction is not chiefly the sins committed, but the sinful

deadness of heart and aversion to divine things, which is the root of actual transgression, and which remains immovable in spite of all we do. (6.) From the universal experience of the human race. If any man has ever naturally possessed ability to perform his spiritual duties, it is certain that no one has ever exercised it.

3. As to the estate into which the regenerate are introduced by grace, our Standards affirm -- (1.) The regenerated Christian remains, as before, a free agent, willing always as upon the whole he desires to will. (2.) In the act of regeneration the Holy Spirit has implanted a new spiritual principle, habit, or tendency in the affections of the soul, which, being subsequently nourished and directed by the indwelling Spirit, frees the man from his natural bondage under sin, and enables him prevailingly to will freely that which is spiritually good. And yet, because of the lingering remains of his old corrupt moral habit of soul, there remains a conflict of tendencies, so that the Christian does not perfectly nor only will that which is good, but doth also will that which is evil. These points will be discussed under chapters 10. and 13.

4. As to the estate of glorified men in heaven, our Confession teaches that they continue, as before, free agents, but that, all the remains of their old corrupt moral tendencies being extirpated for ever, and the gracious dispositions implanted in regeneration being perfected, and the whole man being brought to the measure of the stature of perfect manhood in the likeness of Christ's glorified humanity, they remain for ever perfectly free and immutably disposed to perfect holiness. Adam was holy and unstable. Unregenerate men are unholy and stable; that is, fixed in unholiness. Regenerate men have two opposite moral tendencies contesting for empire in their hearts. They are cast about between them, yet the tendency graciously implanted gradually in the end perfectly prevails. Glorified men are holy and stable. All are free, and therefore responsible.

01.10. Of Effectual Calling

Chapter Ten

Of Effectual Calling

SECTION 1: All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only, he is pleased, in his appointed and accepted time, effectually to call,(1) by his Word and Spirit,(2) out of that state of sin and death, in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation, by Jesus Christ;(3) enlightening their minds spiritually and savingly to understand the things of God,(4) taking away their heart of stone, and giving unto them a heart of flesh;(5) renewing their wills, and, by his almighty power, determining them to that which is good,(6) and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ:(7) yet so, as they come most freely, being made willing by his grace.(8)

(1) Acts 13:48; Romans 4:28, Romans 4:30; Romans 11:7; Ephesians 1:5, Ephesians 1:11; 2 Timothy 1:9-10 (2) 2 Thessalonians 2:13-14; James 1:18; 2 Corinthians 3:3, 2 Corinthians 3:6; 1 Corinthians 2:12 (3) 2 Timothy 1:9-10; 1 Peter 2:9; Romans 8:2; Ephesians 2:1-10 (4) Acts 26:18; 1 Corinthians 2:10, 1 Corinthians 2:12; Ephesians 1:17-18; 2 Corinthians 4:6 (5) Ezekiel 36:26 (6) Ezekiel 11:19; Ezekiel 36:27; Deuteronomy 30:6; John 3:5; Titus 3:5; 1 Peter 1:23 (7) John 6:44-45; Acts 16:14 (8) Psalms 110:3; John 6:37; Matthew 11:28; Revelation 22:17; Romans 6:16-18; Ephesians 2:8; Php 1:29

SECTION 2: This effectual call is of God’s free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen in man,(9) who is altogether passive therein, until, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit,(10) he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it.(11)

(9) 2 Timothy 1:9; Ephesians 2:8-9; Romans 9:11 (10) 1 Corinthians 2:14; Romans 8:7-9; Titus 3:4-5 (11) John 6:37; Ezekiel 36:27; 1 John 3:9; 1 John 5:1

THERE is an outward call of God’s Word, extended to all men to whom the gospel is preached, which is considered under the fourth section of this chapter. The first and second sections treat of the internal effectual call of God’s Spirit, which effects regeneration, and which is experienced only by the elect. Of this internal call it is affirmed: -- 1. That there is such an internal call, and that it is necessary to salvation.

2. As to the subjects of it, that they embrace all the elect, and only the elect.

3. As to the agent of it -- (1.) That the sole agent of it is the Holy Ghost, who uses (2.) The revealed truth of the gospel as his instrument; (3.) That the subjects of it, while they have freely resisted all those common influences of the Holy Ghost which they have experienced before regeneration, are entirely passive with respect to that special act of the Spirit it whereby they are regenerated; nevertheless, in consequence of the change wrought in them in regeneration, they obey the call, and subsequently more or less perfectly co-operate with grace.

4. As to the nature of it, it is taught that it is an exercise of the almighty and effectual power of the Holy Ghost acting immediately upon the soul of the subject, determining him and effectually drawing, yet in a manner perfectly congruous to his nature, so that he comes most freely, being made willing.

5. As to the effect of it, it is taught that it works a radical and permanent change in the entire moral nature of the subject, spiritually enlightening his mind, sanctifying his affections, renewing his will, and giving a new direction to his action.

1. That there is such an, internal call of the Spirit, distinct from the external call of the Word, and that it is necessary to salvation, are proved --

(1.) from what the Scriptures teach concerning man's state by nature as a state of spiritual death, blindness, insensibility, and absolute inability with respect to all action spiritually good, as has been sufficiently shown under chapter ix., section 8.

(2.) The Scriptures distinguish between the Spirit's influence and that of the Word alone. 1 Corinthians 2:14-15; 1 Corinthians 3:6; 1 Thessalonians 1:5-6.

(3.) A spiritual influence is declared to be necessary to dispose and enable men to receive the truth. John 6:45; Acts 16:14; Ephesians 1:17.

(4.) All that is good in man is referred to God as its author. Ephesians 2:8; Php 2:13; 2 Timothy 2:25; Hebrews 13:21.

(5.) The working of the Spirit upon the hearts of the regenerated is represented as far more direct, powerful, and efficient, than the mere moral influence of the truth upon the understanding and affections. Ephesians 1:19; Ephesians 3:7.

(6.) The result effected in regeneration is different from an effect proper to the simple truth. It is "a new birth," "a new creation," etc. John 3:3, John 3:7; Ephesians 4:24.

(7.) The Scriptures explicitly distinguish between the two calls. Of the subjects of the one it is said, "Many are called, but few are chosen." Matthew 22:14. Of the subjects of the other it is said, "Whom he called, them he also justified." Romans 8:30. Comp. Proverbs 1:24, and John 6:45.

All these arguments conspire to prove that this spiritual influence is essential to salvation. Whatever is the necessary condition of regeneration is the necessary condition of salvation, because "except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." John 3:3.

2. That this spiritual call embraces all the elect, and only the elect, is proved -- (1.) From what has been already proved, (a.) Chapter 3. sections 3 -- 5, that God has from eternity definitely and unchangeably determined who shall be saved; and (b.) Chapter 3., section 6, that God, having "appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto." Effectual calling being the actual saving of a soul from the death of sin by the mighty power of God, it is obvious that it must be applied to all who are to be saved, and that it cannot be applied to any who are not to be saved. (2.) The same is proved from the fact that the Scriptures represent the "called" as the "elect," and the " elect" as the "called." Romans 8:28, Romans 8:30. Those with Christ in heaven are "called, elect, and faithful."

Revelation 17:14. (3.) The Scriptures, moreover, declare that the " calling" is based upon the " election:" "who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." 2 Timothy 1:9; 2 Thessalonians 2:13-14; Romans 11:7.

3. That the sole agent in this effectual calling is the Holy Ghost; that he uses Gospel truth as his instrument; and that, while all sinners are active in resisting the common influences of grace before regeneration, and all believers in co-operating with sanctifying grace after regeneration, nevertheless every new-created soul is passive with respect to that divine act of the Holy Spirit whereby he is regenerated, may all be proved under the following distinct heads: --

(1.) There are certain influences of the Spirit in the present life which extend to all men in a greater or less degree; which tend to restrain or to persuade the soul; which are exerted in the way of heightening the natural moral effect of the truth upon the understanding, the heart, and the conscience. They involve no change of principle and permanent disposition, but only an increase of the natural emotions of the heart in view of sin, of duty, and of self-interest. These influences, of course, may be resisted, and are habitually resisted, by the unregenerate. The fact that such resistible influences are experienced by men is proved -- (a.) From the fact that the Scriptures affirm that they are resisted. Genesis 6:3; Hebrews 10:29. (b.) Every Christian is conscious that anterior to his conversion he was the subject of influences impressing him with serious thoughts, convincing him of sin, tending to draw him to the obedience of Christ, which he for the time resisted. We observe the same to be true of many men who are never truly converted at all.

(2.) The distinction between regeneration and conversion is obvious and necessary. Under chapter ix. we saw that the voluntary acts of the human soul are determined by, and derive their character from, the affections and desires which prompt them; and that these affections and desires derive their character from the permanent moral state of the soul in which they arise. In the unregenerate this permanent moral state and disposition of the soul is evil, and hence the action is evil. Action positively holy is impossible except as the consequence of a positively holy disposition. The infusion of such a disposition must therefore precede any act of true spiritual obedience. Effectual calling, according to the usage of our Standards, is the act of the Holy Spirit effecting regeneration. Regeneration is the effect produced by the Holy Spirit in effectual calling. The Holy Spirit, in the act of effectual calling, causes the soul to become regenerate by implanting a new governing principle or habit of spiritual affection and action. The soul itself, in conversion, immediately acts under the guidance of this new principle in turning from sin unto God through Christ. It is evident that the implantation of the gracious principle is different from the exercise of that principle, and that the making a man willing is different from his acting willingly. The first is the act of God solely; the second is the consequent act of man, dependent upon the continued assistance of the Holy Ghost. That God is the sole agent in the act which effects regeneration is plain -- (a.) From the nature of the case, as shown above. The making an unwilling man willing cannot be co-operated with by the man while unwilling. (b.) From what was proved under chapter ix., section 3, as to man’s absolute inability with respect to spiritual things. (c.) From what the Scriptures say as to the nature of the change. They call it "a new birth," " a begetting," "a quickening," "a new creation." "God begetteth, the Spirit quickeneth;" " We are born again," " We are God’s workmanship." John 3:3, John 3:5-7; 1 John 5:18; Ephesians 2:1, Ephesians 2:5, Ephesians 2:10. See also Ezekiel 11:19; Psalms 51:10; Ephesians 4:23; Hebrews 8:10. That, after

regeneration, the new-born soul at once begins and ever continues more or less perfectly to co-operate with sanctifying grace, is self-evident. Faith, repentance, love, good works, are one and all at the same time "fruits of the Spirit" and free actions of men. We are continually conscious, moreover, that we are subject to divine influences, which we are either resisting or obeying, and which we are free to resist or obey as we please, while through grace we do prevailingly please to obey.

(3.) That the Holy Spirit uses the "truth" as his instrument in effectual calling is plain -- (a.) Because he never acts in this way where the knowledge of the truth is entirely wanting; (b.) Because the Scriptures assert that we are begotten by the truth, sanctified by the truth, grow by it, etc. John 17:19; James 1:18; 1 Peter 2:2.

4. That this divine action is in its nature at once omnipotent and certainly efficacious, and yet perfectly congruous to the rational and voluntary nature of man, follows certainly from the fact that it is the act of the all-wise and all-powerful God in executing his self-consistent and immutable decrees. What God does directly to accomplish his own changeless purposes must be certainly efficacious and powerful. Ephesians 1:18-19. Besides, the very thing done is to make us willing, to work faith in us; and that is indubitably connected with salvation. Php 2:13. That it is effectual is also asserted. Ephesians 3:7, Ephesians 3:20; Ephesians 4:16. That this Divine influence is perfectly congruous to our nature is plain -- (1.) From the fact that it is the influence of an all-wise Creator upon the work of his own hand. It is not conceivable either that God is unable or indisposed to control the actions of his creatures in a manner perfectly consistent with their nature. (2.) The influence he exerts is called in Scripture " a drawing," "a teaching," "an enlightening," etc. John 6:44-45; Ephesians 1:18. (3.) By nature the mind is darkened and the affections perverted and the will enslaved by sin. Regeneration restores these faculties to their proper condition. It cannot be inconsistent with a rational nature to let in the light, nor to a free will to deliver it from bondage. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." 2 Corinthians 3:17; Php 2:13; Psalms 110:3. Every regenerated man is conscious -- (a.) That no constraint has been laid upon the spontaneous movement of his faculties; and (b.) That, on the other hand, none of his faculties ever acted so freely and consistently with the law of their nature before.

5. That this change is radical is proved from the fact that, as shown above, it consists in the implantation of a new governing principle of life; from the fact that it is a "new birth," a "new creation," wrought by the mighty power of God in execution of his eternal purpose of salvation; and that it is as necessary for the most moral and amiable as for the morally abandoned. That this change is permanent will be shown under chapter xvii., on the Perseverance of the Saints. That it affects the entire man -- intellect, affections, and will -- is evident -- (1.) From the essential unity of the soul. It is the one indivisible "I" which thinks, feels, and wills. If the permanent moral state of the soul is corrupt, all its functions must be perverted. We can have no desire for an object unless we perceive its loveliness; nor can we perceive intellectually the loveliness of that which is wholly uncongenial to our inherent tastes and dispositions. (2.) The Scriptures expressly affirm that sin is essentially deceiving, that innate depravity involves moral blindness, and that the natural man cannot receive the tidings which are spiritually discerned. 1 Corinthians 2:14; 2 Corinthians 4:4; John 16:3. (3.) The Scriptures expressly affirm that all the "new-born" are the subjects of a spiritual illumination of the understanding as well as renewal of the affections. John 17:3; 1 Corinthians 2:12-13; 2 Corinthians 4:6; Ephesians 1:18; 1 John 4:7; 1 John 5:20. (4.) In the Bible the phrase "

to give a new heart" is equivalent to effect regeneration; and the phrase "heart" is characteristically used for the entire interior man -- intellect, affections, and, will. Observe such phrases as "counsels of the heart," 1 Corinthians 4:5; "imaginations of the heart," Luke 1:51; "thoughts and intents of the heart," Hebrews 4:12.

SECTION 3: Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated, and saved by Christ, through the Spirit,(12) who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth:(13) so also are all other elect persons who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word.(14)

(12) Genesis 17:7; Luke 1:15; Luke 18:15-16; Acts 2:39; John 3:3, John 3:5; 1 John 5:12

(13) John 3:8 (14) John 16:7-8; 1 John 5:12; Acts 4:12 The outward call of God's Word, and all the "means of grace" provided in the present dispensation, of course presuppose intelligence upon the part of those who receive them. The will of God, also, is revealed only as far as it concerns those capable of understanding and profiting by the revelation. His purposes with respect to either persons or classes not thus addressed are not explicitly revealed.

If infants and others not capable of being called by the gospel are to be saved, they must be regenerated and sanctified immediately by God without the use of means. If God could create Adam holy without means, and if he can new-create believers in righteousness and true holiness by the use of means which a large part of men use without profit, he can certainly make infants and others regenerate without means. Indeed, the natural depravity of infants lies before moral action, in the judicial deprivation of the Holy Ghost. The evil is rectified at that stage, therefore, by the gracious restoration of the soul to its moral relation to the Spirit of God. The phrase "elect infants" is precise and fit for its purpose. It is not intended to suggest that there are any infants not elect, but simply to point out the facts -- (1.) That all infants are born under righteous condemnation; and (2.) That no infant has any claim in itself to salvation; and hence (3.) The salvation of each infant, precisely as the salvation of every adult, must have its absolute ground in the sovereign election of God. This would be just as true if all adults were elected, as it is now that only some adults are elected. It is, therefore, just as true, although we have good reason to believe that all infants are elected. The Confession adheres in this place accurately to the facts revealed. It is certainly revealed that none, either adult or infant, is saved except on the ground of a sovereign election; that is, all salvation for the human race is pure grace. It is not positively revealed that all infants are elect, but we are left, for many reasons, to indulge a highly probable hope that such is the fact. The Confession affirms what is certainly revealed, and leaves that which revelation has not decided to remain, without the suggestion of a positive opinion upon one side or the other.

SECTION 4: Others, not elected, although they may be called by the ministry of the Word,(15) and may have some common operations of the Spirit,(16) yet they never truly come unto Christ, and therefore cannot be saved:(17) much less can men, not professing the Christian religion, be saved in any other way whatsoever,(17) be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, and the laws of that religion they do profess.(18) And, to assert and maintain that they may, is very pernicious, and to be detested.(19)

(15) Matthew 13:14-15; Matthew 22:14; Acts 13:48; Acts 28:24 (16) Matthew 7:22; Matthew 13:20, Matthew 13:21; Hebrews 6:4-5 (17) John 6:37, John 6:64-66; John 8:44; John 13:18; cf. John 17:12 (18) Acts 4:12; 1 John 4:2-3; 2 John 1:9; John 4:22; John 14:6; John 17:3; Ephesians

2:12-13; Romans 10:13-17 (19) 2 John 1:9-12; 1 Corinthians 16:22; Galatians 1:6-8 This section, taken in connection with the parallel passage in L. Cat., q. 60, teaches the following propositions: --

1. That the non-elect will certainly fail of salvation, not because a free salvation is not made available to them if they accept Christ, but because they never accept Christ; and they all refuse to accept him, because, although they may be persuaded by some of the common influences of the Holy Ghost, their radical aversion to God is never overcome by effectual calling. It has already been proved under sections 1 and 2 that the grace of effectual calling extends to all the elect, and only to the elect; hence the truth of this proposition follows.

2. That the diligent profession and honest practice of neither natural religion, nor of any other religion than pure Christianity, can in the least avail to promote the salvation of the soul, is evident from the essential principles of the gospel. If any person perfectly conformed to the amount of spiritual truth known to him in every thought and act from birth upward, however little that knowledge might be, he would of course need no salvation. But all men, as we have seen, are born under condemnation, and begin to act as moral agents with natures already corrupt. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Romans 3:23. Hence it follows that an atonement is absolutely necessary, and consequently a personal interest in the redemption of Christ is absolutely necessary to salvation; for if a law, conformity to which could have given life, could have been given, Christ is dead in vain. Galatians 2:21; Galatians 3:21. To admit that men may be saved irrespectively of Christ is virtually to deny Christ.

3. That in the case of sane adult persons a knowledge of Christ and a voluntary acceptance of him is essential in order to a personal interest in his salvation is proved --

(1.) Paul argues this point explicitly. If men call upon the Lord they shall be saved; but in order to call upon him, they must believe; and in order to believe, they must hear; and that they should hear, the gospel must be preached unto them. Thus the established order is -- salvation cometh by faith, faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. Romans 10:13-17; Matthew 11:27; John 14:6; John 17:3; Acts 4:12.

(2.) God has certainly revealed no purpose to save any except those who, hearing the gospel, obey; and he requires that his people, as custodians of the gospel, should be diligent in disseminating it as the appointed means of saving souls. Whatever lies beyond this circle of sanctified means is unrevealed, unpromised, uncovenanted.

(3.) The heathen in mass, with no single definite and unquestionable exception on record, are evidently strangers to God, -- and going down to death in an unsaved condition. The presumed possibility of being saved without a knowledge of Christ remains, after eighteen hundred years, a possibility illustrated by no example.

01.11. Of Justification

Chapter Eleven

Of Justification

SECTION 1: THOSE whom God effectually calls he also freely justifies,(1) not by infusing righteousness into them but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous, not for anything wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone; not by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience, to them, as their righteousness, but by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them,(2) they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith, which faith they have not of themselves; it is the gift of God.(3)

SECTION 2: FAITH, thus receiving and resting on Christ and his righteousness is the sole instrument of justification;(4) yet it is not alone in the person justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving graces, and is no dead faith, but works by love.(5)

(1) Romans 8:30; Romans 3:24. (2) Romans 4:5-8; 2 Corinthians 5:19, 2 Corinthians 5:21; Romans 3:22, Romans 3:24-25, Romans 3:27-28; Titus 3:5, Titus 3:7; Ephesians 1:7; Jeremiah 23:6; 1 Corinthians 1:30-31; Romans 5:17-19. (3) Acts 10:44; Galatians 2:16; Php 2:9; Acts 13:38-39; Ephesians 2:7-8. (4) John 1:12; Romans 3:28; Romans 5:1. (5) James 2:17, James 2:22, James 2:26; Galatians 5:6.

We come now to the sections which instruct us on the nature and reality of justification.

1. All those, aned only those, whom God has effectually called he also freely justifies, that this is so is proven by the following: (1) From the express declarations of Scripture: "Whom he did predestinate, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified." Romans 8:30. (2) From the fact that effectual calling and justification are both necessary in order to salvation, and are both essential steps in the execution by God of his own immutable and infallibly efficacious decree of election. (3) From the fact that only those who truly believe are justified, and only those who are regenerate can truly believe.

2. As to its nature, this justification is a purely judicial act of God as judge, whereby he pardons all the sins of a believer, and accounts, accepts, and treats him as a person righteous in the eye of the divine law. This includes two subordinate propositions: (1) Justification is a judicial act of God, whereby he declares us to be conformed to the demands of the law as the condition of our life; it is not an act of gracious power, making us holy or conformed to the law as a standard of moral character. The Romanists use the term "justification" in a vague and general sense, as including at once the forgiveness of sins and the infusion of grace. Socinians, and those who teach the moral influence theory of the atonement, regard justification as meaning the same as sanctification; that is, the making a man personally holy. The true sense of Justification, stated above, is, when taken in its connection with faith, the grand central principle of the Reformation, brought out and

triumphantly vindicated by Luther. That it is true is proved-

(a) From the universal meaning of the English word to justify, and of the equivalent Greek word in the New Testament. They both are alike always used to express an act declaring a man to be square with the demands of law, never to express an act making him holy. (Galatians 2:16; Galatians 3:11.)

(b) In Scripture, justification is always set forth as the opposite of condemnation. The opposite of "to sanctify" is "to pollute" but the opposite of "to justify" is "to condemn." (Romans 8:30-34; John 3:18.)

(c) The true sense of the phrase "to justify" is clearly proved by the terms used in Scripture as equivalent to it. For example: "To impute righteousness without works"; "To forgive iniquities"; "To cover sins." (Romans 4:6-8.) "Not to impute transgression unto them." (2 Corinthians 5:19.) "Not to bring into condemnation." (John 5:24.)

(d) In many passages it would produce the most obvious nonsense to substitute sanctification (the making holy) for justification (the declaring legally just); as, for instance: "For by the works of the law shall no flesh be sanctified"; or, "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are sanctified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." (Galatians 2:16; Galatians 5:4.)

(e) Justification and sanctification are set forth in Scripture as distinct graces-inseparable, alike necessary, yet distinct in their nature, grounds and ends. 1 Corinthians 6:11.

(2) Justification is not mere pardon; it includes pardon of sin, and in addition the declaration that all the claims of law are satisfied with respect to the person justified, and that consequently he has a right to all the immunities and rewards which in the covenant of life are suspended upon perfect conformity to the demands of law. Pardon (a) Relaxes the claims of law, or waives their exaction in a given case. (b) It is an act of a sovereign in the exercise of pure prerogative. (c) It is free, resting upon considerations of mercy or of public policy. (d) It simply remits the penalty of sin; it secures neither honors nor rewards. On the other hand, justification (a) Is the act of a judge, not of a sovereign. (b) It rests purely upon the state of the law and of the facts, and is impossible where there is not a perfect righteousness. (c) It pronounces the law not relaxed, but fulfilled in its strictest sense. (d) It declares the person justified to be justly entitled to all the honors advantages suspended upon perfect conformity to all the demands of law. The truth of this proposition is proved-

(a) From the uniform and obvious meaning of the words "to justify." No one ever confounds the justification of a person with his pardon.

(b) Justification rests upon the full satisfaction of divine justice Christ has worked for the elect. It is a judicial declaration that the law is satisfied- not a sovereign waiving of the penalty.

(c) The Scriptures declare that our justification proceeds upon the ground of a perfect righteousness. "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." (Romans 10:3-9; 1 Corinthians 1:30.) The essence of pardon is that a man is forgiven without righteousness. The essence of Justification is that a man is pronounced to be possessed of righteousness, which satisfies the law. We are "made the righteousness of God in him." (2 Corinthians 5:21.) Justification is paraphrased as "not imputing sin"; as "imputing righteousness

without works." (Romans 4:6-8.)

(d) The effects of justification are much more than those of pardon. The justified have "peace with God," assurance of salvation (Romans 5:1-10); "inheritance among them which are sanctified" (Acts 26:18).

3. Justification proceeds upon the imputation or crediting to the believer by God of the righteousness of his great Representative and Surety, Jesus Christ. L. Cat., q. 70: "Justification is an act of God's free grace unto sinners, in which he pardons all their sins, accepts and accounts their persons righteous in his sight; not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but only for the perfect obedience and full satisfaction of Christ, by God imputed to them, and received by faith alone." (Compare also L. Cat., q. 77; and S. Cat., q. 33.)

Arminians hold that for Christ's sake the demands of the law are graciously lowered, and faith and evangelical obedience accepted in the place of perfect obedience as the ground of justification. Our Standards and all the Reformed and Lutheran Confessions teach that the true ground of justification is the perfect righteousness (active and passive) of Christ, imputed to the believer, and received by faith alone. S. Cat., q. 33. This is proved-

(1) Because the Scriptures insist everywhere that we are not justified by works. This is affirmed of works in general-of all kinds of works, natural or gracious, without distinction. (Romans 4:4-8; Romans 11:6.)

(2) Because the Scriptures declare that good works, of whatever kind, instead of being the ground of justification, are possible only as its consequences: "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace"; "But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of the Spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." (Romans 6:14; Romans 7:6.)

(3) Because the Scriptures declare that the obedience and suffering-i.e., perfect righteousness or fulfillment of the law-by Christ, our Representative, is the true ground of Justification: "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; Romans 10:4; 1 Corinthians 1:30; 2 Corinthians 5:21; Php 3:9.)

(4) Because the Scriptures affirm that this righteousness is imputed to the believer in the act of justification. The phrase "to impute sin" or "righteousness," in its scriptural usage, signifies simply to set to one's account, to lay to one's charge or credit as the ground of judicial process. Our sins are said to have been laid upon Christ (Isaiah 53:6, Isaiah 53:12; Galatians 3:13; Hebrews 9:28; 1 Peter 2:24), because their guilt was so charged to his account that they were justly punished in him. In like manner Christ's righteousness is imputed, or its rewardableness is so credited to the believer that all the covenanted honors and rewards of a perfect righteousness henceforth rightly belong to him. (Romans 4:4-8; 2 Corinthians 5:19-21.) For the usage of the Hebrew and Greek equivalents of "imputation" (see Genesis 31:15; Leviticus 7:18; Numbers 18:27-30; Mark 15:28; Luke 22:37; Romans 2:26; Romans 4:3-9; 2 Corinthians 5:19). This doctrine of our Standards is that of the whole Protestant body of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches.

Calvin says in his Institutes, b. 3., ch. 11., s. 2: "A man will be justified by faith when, excluded from the righteousness of works, he by faith lays hold of the righteousness of Christ, and, clothed in it, appears in the sight of God, not as a sinner, but as righteous." The Heidelberg Cat., q. 60: "How art thou justified in the sight of God? Only by a true faith in Jesus Christ; so that, though my conscience accuse me that I have grossly transgressed all the commandments of God, and kept none of them, and am still inclined to all evil, notwithstanding, God, without any merit of mine, but only of mere grace, grants and imputes to me the perfect satisfaction, righteousness, and holiness of Christ."

Lutheran Form. of Concord: "That righteousness which before God is of mere grace imputed to faith, or to the believer, is the obedience, suffering, and resurrection of Christ, by which he for our sakes satisfied the law and expiated our sins. . . . On which account his obedience . . . is imputed to us; so that God, on account of that whole obedience . . . remits our sins, reputes us as good and just, and gives us eternal salvation."

4. That the essential and sole condition upon which this gracious imputation of the righteousness of Christ to the believer proceeds is, that he exercises faith in or on Christ as his righteousness, or ground of acceptance and justification. Faith is here called the "condition" of justification, because it is an essential requisite, and necessary instrument whereby the soul, always treated as a free agent, appropriates the righteousness of Christ, which is the legal ground of justification. That faith in or on Christ, and no other grace, is always represented in Scripture as the necessary instrument or means of justification, is proved, (Galatians 2:16; Romans 4:9; Acts 16:31.) That faith is the instrument whereby the soul apprehends the true ground of justification in the righteousness of Christ, and is not itself, as Arminians pretend, that ground, is proved- (1) Because, as above shown, the vicarious obedience and suffering of Christ is that ground.

(2) Because faith is "a work," and Paul asserts that justification on the ground of works is impossible. (Romans 3:20-28; Galatians 2:16.)

(3) Because faith in or on Christ evidently rests upon that which is without itself, and from its very nature is incapable of laying the foundation for a legal justification.

(4) Because the Scriptures constantly affirm that we are justified "through"or by means of faith, but never on account of or for the sake of faith. Romans 5:1; Galatians 2:16.

5. This faith itself is not our own, but a gracious gift of God. (Ephesians 2:7-8; Acts 14:27.)

6. While it is faith alone, unassociated with any other grace, which is the sole instrument of justification, yet it is never alone in the justified person, but when genuine is always accompanied with all other Christian graces. To our doctrine of justification the famous passage in James 2:14 is often objected. But Paul and James are speaking of different things. Paul teaches that faith alone justifies. He is arguing against Pharisees and legalists. James teaches that a faith which is alone-that is, a dead faith-will not justify. He is arguing against nominal Christians, who would hold the truth in unrighteousness. Paul uses the word "justify" in the sense of God’s justification of the sinner; to which faith, and not works, is prerequisite. James uses the word to "justify" in the sense of prove true, or real; in which sense faith is justified or proved genuine by works. Consequently, orthodox theologians have always acknowledged that while faith alone justifies, a faith which is alone, or unassociated with other graces and fruitless in good works, will not justify. "Works," says

Luther, "are not taken into consideration when the question respects justification. But true faith will no more fail to produce them than the sun can cease to give light."

SECTION 3: CHRIST, by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are thus justified, and did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction, to his Father's justice in their behalf.(6) Yet, inasmuch as he was given by the Father for them,(7) and his obedience and satisfaction in their stead,(8) and both freely, not for anything in them, their justification is only of free grace;(9) that both the exact justice and rich grace of God might be glorified in the justification of sinners.(10)

(6) Romans 5:8-10, Romans 5:19; 1 Timothy 2:5-6; Hebrews 10:10, Hebrews 10:14; Daniel 9:24, Daniel 9:26; Isaiah 53:4-6, Isaiah 53:10-12. (7) Romans 8:32. (8) 2 Corinthians 5:21; Matthew 3:17; Ephesians 5:2. (9) Romans 3:24; Ephesians 1:7. (10) Romans 3:26; Ephesians 2:7. The first truth asserted in this section is, that Christ, by his obedience and death, has fully paid the debt of those who are Justified; and that he made for them a proper, real, and full satisfaction to his Father's justice. In connection with the above, the second truth that is taught here is, that this justification is, as it respects the persons justified, from beginning to end a stupendous manifestation of the free grace of God. The fact that Christ's righteousness is the ground of justification, and that his righteousness in strict rigor fully satisfies all the demands of the divine law, instead of being inconsistent with the perfect freedom and graciousness of justification, vastly enhances its grace. It is evident that God must either sacrifice his law, his elect, or his Son (Galatians 2:21; Galatians 3:21). It is no less plain that it is a far greater expression of love and free grace to save the elect at the expense of such a sacrifice than it would be to save them either at the sacrifice of principle or in case no sacrifice of any kind was needed. The cross of Christ is the focus in which the most intense rays alike of divine grace and justice meet together, in which they are perfectly reconciled. This is the highest reach of justice, and at the same time and for the same reason the highest reach of grace the universe can ever see. The self-assumption of the penalty upon the part of the eternal Son of God is the highest conceivable vindication of the absolute inviolability of justice, and at the same time the highest conceivable expression of infinite love. Justice is vindicated in the vicarious suffering of the very penalty in strict rigor. Free grace is manifested-(1) In the admittance of a vicarious sufferer. (2) In the gift of God's beloved Son for that service. (3) In the sovereign election of the persons to be represented by him. (4) In the glorious rewards which accrue to them on condition of that representation.

SECTION 4: GOD did, from all eternity, decree to justify all the elect;(11) and Christ did, in the fullness of time, die for their sins, and rise again for their justification.(12) Nevertheless, they are not justified, until the Holy Spirit in due time actually applies Christ unto them.(13)

(11) Galatians 3:8; 1 Peter 1:2, 1 Peter 1:19-20; Romans 8:30. (12) Galatians 4:4; 1 Timothy 2:6; Romans 4:25. (13) Colossians 1:21-22; Galatians 2:16; Titus 3:4-7.

It has been objected to our doctrine by some Arminians, and held as a part of it by some Antinomians, that if Christ literally paid the debt of his elect in his obedience and suffering when on earth, it must follow that the elect have been justified from the moment that debt was paid. The Scriptures, on the contrary, as well as all Christian experience, make it certain that no one is justified until the moment that God gives him saving faith in Christ.

Christ paid the penal, not the money debt of his people. It is a matter of free grace that his substitution was admitted. The satisfaction, therefore, does not liberate ipso facto , like the payment of a money debt, but sets the real criminal free only on such conditions and at such times as had been previously agreed upon between God, the gracious sovereign, on the one hand, and Christ, their representative and substitute, on the other hand. Christ died for his people in execution of a covenant between himself and his Father, entered into in eternity. The effects of his death, therefore, eventuate precisely as and when it is provided in the covenant that it should do so.

SECTION 5: GOD continues to forgive the sins of those who are justified;(14) and although they can never fall from the state of justification,(15) yet they may by their sins fall under God's fatherly displeasure, and not have the light of his countenance restored unto them until they humble themselves, confess their sins, beg pardon, and renew their faith and repentance.(16)

(14) Matthew 6:12; 1 John 1:7, 1 John 1:9; 1 John 2:1-2. (15) Luke 22:32; John 10:28; Hebrews 10:14. (16) Psalms 89:31-33; Psalms 51:7-12; Psalms 32:5; Matthew 26:75; 1 Corinthians 11:30, 1 Corinthians 11:32; Luke 1:20. This section teaches that justification changes radically and permanently the relation which the subject of it sustains both to God and to the demands of the divine law viewed as a condition of favor. Before justification, God is an angry judge, holding the sentence of the condemning law for a season in suspense.

After justification, the law instead of condemning acquits, and demands that the subject be regarded and treated like a son, as is provided in the eternal covenant; and God, as a loving Father, proceeds to execute all the kind offices which belong to the new relation. This requires, of course, discipline and correction, as well as instruction and consolation. All suffering is either mere calamity, when viewed aside from all intentional relation to human character; or penalty, when designed to satisfy justice for sin; or chastisement, when designed to correct and improve the offender. Irrespective of the economy of redemption, all suffering is to the reprobate installments of the eternal penalty. After justification, all suffering to the justified, of whatever kind, is fatherly chastisement, designed to correct their faults and improve their graces. And as they came, in the first instance, to God in the exercise of repentance and faith in Christ, so must they always continue to return to him after every partial wandering and loss of his sensible favor in the exercise of the same repentance and faith; and thus only can they hope to have his pardon sensibly renewed to them. Examine the proof-texts appended above to the text of this section of the Confession.

SECTION 6: THE justification of believers under the Old Testament was, in all these respects, one and the same with the justification of believers under the New Testament.(17) (17) Galatians 3:9, Galatians 3:13-14; Romans 4:22-24; Hebrews 13:8. The truth taught in this section has already been fully proved above, under chapter 7., ss. 4-6; and chapter 8., s. 6.

01.12. Of Adoption

Chapter Twelve

Of Adoption

All those that are justified, god vouchsafes, in and for his only son jesus christ, to make partakers of the grace of adoption,(1) by which they are taken into the number, and enjoy the liberties and privileges of the children of god;(2) have his name put upon them,(3) receive the spirit of adoption;(4) have access to the throne of grace with boldness;(5) are enabled to cry, abba, father;(6) are pitied,(7) protected,(8) provided for,(9) and chastened by him as by a father;(10) yet never cast off,(11) but sealed to the day of redemption,(12) and inherit the promises,(13) as heirs of everlasting salvation.(14)

(1) Ephesians 1:5; Galatians 4:4-5. (2) Romans 8:17; John 1:12. (3) Jeremiah 14:9; 2 Corinthians 6:18; Revelation 3:12. (4) Romans 8:15. (5) Ephesians 3:12; Romans 5:2. (6) Galatians 4:6. (7) Psalms 103:13. (8) Proverbs 14:26. (9) Matthew 6:30, Matthew 6:32; 1 Peter 5:7. (10) Hebrews 12:6. (11) Lamentations 3:31. (12) Ephesians 4:30. (13) Hebrews 6:12. (14) 1 Peter 1:3-4; Hebrews 1:14. The instant a believer is united to Christ in the exercise of faith, there is accomplished in him simultaneously and inseparably two things: (1) A total change of relation to God, and to the law as a covenant of life; and (2) A change of his inward spiritual nature. The change of relation is represented by justification-the change of nature by regeneration. REGENERATION is an act of God, originating, by a new creation, a new spiritual life in the heart of the subject. The first and instant act of that new creature, consequent upon his regeneration, is FAITH, or a believing, trusting embrace of the person and work of Christ. Upon the exercise of faith by the regenerated soul, JUSTIFICATION is the instant act of God, on the ground of that perfect righteousness which the sinner’s faith has apprehended, declaring him to be free from all condemnation, and to have a legal right to the relations and benefits secured by the covenant which Christ has fulfilled in his behalf. SANCTIFICATION is the progressive growth toward the perfect maturity of that new life which was implanted in regeneration. ADOPTION presents the new creature in his new relations-his new relations entered upon with a congenial heart, and his new life developing in a congenial home, and surrounded with those relations which foster its growth and crown it with blessedness. Justification effects only a change of relations. Regeneration and sanctification effect only inherent moral and spiritual states of soul. Adoption includes both. As set forth in Scripture, it embraces in one complex view the newly-regenerated creature in the new relations into which he is introduced by justification. This divine sonship, into which the believer is introduced by adoption, includes the following principal elements and advantages-

1. Derivation of spiritual nature from God: "That ye might be partakers of the divine nature." (2 Peter 1:4; John 1:13; James 1:18; 1 John 5:18.)

2. The being born in the image of God, the bearing his likeness: "And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge, after the image of him that created him." (Colossians 3:10; Romans 8:29; 2 Corinthians 3:18.) 3. The bearing his name. (1 John 3:1; Revelation 2:17; Revelation 3:12.)

4. The being made the objects of his peculiar love: "That the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me." (John 17:23; Romans 5:5-8.)

5. The indwelling of the Spirit of his Son (Galatians 4:6), who forms in us a filial spirit, or a spirit becoming the children of God-obedient (1 Peter 1:14; 2 John 1:6), free from sense of guilt, legal bondage, and fear of death (Romans 8:15-21; Galatians 5:1; Hebrews 2:15), and elevated with a holy boldness and royal dignity. (Hebrews 10:19, Hebrews 10:22; 1 Peter 2:9; 1 Peter 4:14.)

6. Present protection, consolation, and abundant supplies. (Psalms 125:2; Isaiah 66:13; Luke 12:27-32; John 14:18; 1 Corinthians 3:21-23; 2 Corinthians 1:4.)

7. Present fatherly chastisements for our good, including both spiritual and temporal afflictions. (Psalms 51:11, Psalms 51:12; Hebrews 12:5-11.)

8. The certain inheritance of the riches of our Father’s glory, as "heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ" (Romans 8:17; James 2:5; 1 Peter 1:4; 1 Peter 3:7), including the exaltation of our bodies in fellowship with the Lord. (Romans 8:23; Php 3:21.)

01.13. Of Sanctification

Chapter Thirteen

Of Sanctification

SECTION 1: They, who are once effectually called, and regenerated, having a new heart, and a new spirit created in them, are further sanctified, really and personally, through the virtue of Christ's death and resurrection,(1) by his Word and Spirit dwelling in them:(2) the dominion of the whole body of sin is destroyed,(3) and the several lusts thereof are more and more weakened and mortified;(4) and they more and more quickened and strengthened in all saving graces,(5) to the practice of true holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.(6)

(1) 1 Thessalonians 5:23-24; 2 Thessalonians 2:13-14; Ezekiel 36:22-28; Titus 3:5; Acts 20:32; Php 3:10; Romans 6:5-6 (2) John 17:17, John 17:19; Ephesians 5:26; Romans 8:13-14; 2 Thessalonians 2:13 (3) Romans 6:6, Romans 6:14 (4) Galatians 5:24; Romans 8:13 (5) Colossians 1:10-11; Ephesians 3:16-19

(6) 2 Corinthians 7:1; Colossians 1:28, Colossians 4:12; Hebrews 12:14

SECTION 2: This sanctification is throughout, in the whole man;(7) yet imperfect in this life, there abiding still some remnants of corruption in every part;(8) whence ariseth a continual and irreconcilable war, the flesh lusting against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh.(9) (7) 1 Thessalonians 5:12; Romans 12:1-2 (8) 1 John 1:8-10; Romans 7:14-25; Php 3:12 (9) Galatians 5:17

SECTION 3: In which war, although the remaining corruption, for a time, may much prevail;(10) yet, through the continual supply of strength from the sanctifying Spirit of Christ, the regenerate part doth overcome;(11) and so, the saints grow in grace,(12) perfecting holiness in the fear of God.(13)

(10) Romans 7:23 (11) Romans 6:14; 1 John 5:4; Ephesians 4:15-16; see Romans 8:2 (12) 2 Peter 3:18; 2 Corinthians 3:18 (13) 2 Corinthians 7:1 This chapter teaches the following propositions: --

1. All of those in whom God has by regeneration created a new spiritual nature continue under his gracious influence, his Word and Spirit dwelling in them, and thus have the grace implanted in them developed more and more.

2. This work of sanctification involves both the gradual destruction of the old body of sin, and the quickening and strengthening of all the graces of the new man, and the inward purification of the heart and mind, as well as all those holy actions which proceed from them.

3. This work of sanctification involves the entire man -- intellect, affections and will, soul and body.

4. It is never perfect in this life, but in every case, as in that of Paul, there remains more or less of the old "law in our members," warring against the law of our mind.

5. That nevertheless, from a constant supply of strength from the sanctifying Spirit of Christ, the gracious element in the believer's nature prevails, and he gradually advances in holiness until he is made perfect at death.

1. God, having implanted in regeneration a new spiritual nature in the subject of his grace, always continues to foster and develop that principle, by the indwelling of his word and Spirit, until it attains full perfection. The word "to sanctify" is used in two different senses in Scripture. (1.) To consecrate, or set apart from a common to a sacred use. John 10:36; Matthew 23:17. (2.) To render morally pure or holy. 1 Corinthians 6:11; Hebrews 13:12. In the latter sense of the word, regeneration is the commencement of sanctification, and sanctification is the completion of the work commenced in regeneration. As regeneration is an act of God's free grace, so sanctification is a gracious work of God, and eminently of the Holy Spirit. It is attributed to God absolutely (1 Thessalonians 5:23); to the Son (Ephesians 5:25-26); and pre-eminently to the Holy Spirit (2 Thessalonians 2:13), whose especial office in the economy of redemption it is to apply the grace secured through the mediation of the Son. The means of sanctification are of two distinct orders -- (a.) inward and (b.) outward. The inward means of sanctification is faith. Faith is the instrument of our justification -- and hence of our deliverance from condemnation and communion with God -- the organ of our union with Christ an fellowship with his Spirit. Faith, moreover, is that act of the regenerated soul whereby it embraces and experiences the power of the truth, and whereby the inward experiences of the heart and the outward actions of the life are brought into obedience to the truth. The outward mean of sanctification are --

(1.) The truth as revealed in the inspired Scriptures: "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." John 17:17, John 17:19. "As new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby." 1 Peter 1:22; 1 Peter 2:2. The truth, as the outward means of sanctification, stands in correlation to faith, the inward means of it. Conf. Faith, chap. xiv., section 2: This faith " acteth differently upon that which every particular passage thereof containeth; yielding obedience to the commands, trembling at the threatenings, and embracing the promises of God for this life and that which is to come." By this means the truth nourishes and exercises the principles of grace implanted in the soul.

(2.) The sacraments. Matthew 3:11; 1 Corinthians 12:13; 1 Peter 3:21.

(3.) Prayer is a means of sanctification -- (a.) as the act in which the soul engages in communion with God; and (b.) since God has promised to answer believing prayer with the donation of spiritual gifts. John 14:13-14.

(4.) The gracious discipline of God's providence. John 15:2; Romans 5:3-4; Hebrews 12:5-11.

It must be remembered that while the subject is passive with respect to that Divine act of grace whereby he is regenerated, after he is regenerated he co-operates with the Holy Ghost in the work of sanctification. The Holy Ghost gives the grace, and prompts and directs in its exercise, and the soul exercises it. Thus, while sanctification is a grace, it is also a duty; and the soul is both bound and encouraged to use with diligence, in dependence upon the Holy Spirit, all the means for its spiritual renovation, and to form those habits of resisting evil and of right action in which

sanctification so largely consists. The fruits of sanctification are good works. An action to be good must have its origin in a holy principle in the heart, and must be conformed to the law of God. Although not the ground of our acceptance, good works are absolutely essential to salvation, as the necessary consequences of a gracious state of soul and perpetual requirements of the divine law. Galatians 5:22-23; Ephesians 2:10; John 14:21.

2. This work of sanctification involves the destruction of the old body of sin, as well as the development of the grace implanted in regeneration: it is also first inward and spiritual, and then outward and practical. That the whole body of death is not immediately destroyed in the instant of regeneration is plainly taught in the sixth and seventh chapters of Romans, in the recorded experience of many Biblical characters, and in the universal experience of Christians in modern times. It hence necessarily follows that the tendencies graciously implanted and sustained must come in conflict with the tendencies to evil which remain. They can co-exist only in a state of active antagonism, and as the one gains in prevalence the other must lose. "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts." Galatians 5:24. " Mortify, therefore, your members which are upon the earth." Colossians 3:5. That this work begins in the state of the heart, and governs the life by previously governing the heart, is evident -- (1.) From the known fact of human nature that the moral character of all actions is derived from the inward moral dispositions and affections which prompt to them. (2.) The same is asserted in the Scriptures. Luke 6:45. As the character of the fruit is determined by the character of the tree which produces it, so the moral character of actions depends upon the heart from which they proceed: " Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt, and his fruit corrupt." Matthew 12:33. (3.) Truly good works can be produced only by a heart in living union with Christ: "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; so more can ye, except ye abide in me." John 15:4.

3. This work of sanctification involves the entire man -- intellect, affections, and will, soul and body. This is proved -- (1.) From the necessity of the case. Our natural, sinful condition, involves blindness of mind, as well as hardness or perverseness of heart. (2.) From the fact that we are sanctified by means of the truth. (3.) It is explicitly asserted in Scripture that sanctification involves spiritual illumination: "That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him: the eyes of your understanding being en- lightened; that ye may know," etc. Ephesians 1:17-18; Colossians 3:10; 2 Corinthians 4:6; 1 Thessalonians 5:23. As our bodies are integral parts of our persons, their instincts and appetites act immediately upon the passions of our souls; and hence they must be brought subject to the control of the sanctified will, and all the members of the body, as organs of the soul, made instruments of righteousness unto God. Romans 6:13; 1 Thessalonians 4:4.

4. This work of sanctification is never perfected in this life.

Different parties of Perfectionists maintain that perfection is possible in this life, in different senses. Pelagians maintain -- (1.) That the law of God respects only the voluntary exercises and actions, and not the states of the soul. (2.) That obligation is always limited by ability -- that the law of God can demand no more than its subject is fully able to render. Hence from the very limits of moral obligation it follows that every man is always perfectly able to do all that is required of him. Hence he can be perfect whenever he pleases.

Arminian and Papist Perfectionists hold -- (1.) That men can do nothing morally right without divine grace; and (2.) That even with this grace no man is able perfectly to keep the original Adamic law of absolute perfection. They maintain, however, that God for Christ's merits' sake has graciously lowered the demands of the law, in the case of believers, from absolute perfection to faith and evangelical obedience. They hold that it is the privilege and duty of all men in this life to attain to a state of perfect love and sincere obedience to the gospel law, which they call gracious or Christian perfection. The Papists make a distinction between voluntary transgressions of known law, and concupiscence, or the involuntary first movements of the remains of corruption within the regenerate. The latter they deny to be properly of the nature of sin. John Wesley teaches the same. Methodist Doctrinal Tracts, pp. 294-312. But that concupiscence, or the first movement and tendencies of evil desire in the hearts of regenerated men, is of the nature of sin, is distinctly affirmed in our Standards. Conf. Faith, ch. vi., section 5. That this is true is proved: --

(1.) All men judge that the mora1 state of the soul which determines, or tends to determine, evil action, is itself essentially evil, and indeed the true source of the evil in the action.

(2.) All genuine Christians experience involves the same practical judgment. The main element in all genuine conviction of sin is, not simply that the thoughts, words, and feelings are wrong, but that, lying far below all exercises or volitions, the nature is morally corrupt. It is his deadness to divine things -- blindness, hardness, aversion to God -- which he is helpless to change, that chiefly oppresses the truly convicted man with a sense of sin; and in some degree the same conviction remains until death. (3.) It is of the essence of the moral law that it demands all that ought to be. Every even the least deficiency from the whole measure of moral excellence that ought to be is of the nature of sin. Therefore nothing short of absolute conformity to the Adamic law of absolute holiness is of the nature of sinless perfection, or ought to be called by that name.

(4.) All the prayers and hymns and devotional literature of the Wesleyan, and other evangelical Churches which profess a sort of perfectionism, acknowledge sin in the believer. Dr. Peck admits that the workings of concupiscence, or remaining spontaneous tendency to evil in the heart of the perfect Christian, are an occasion for self-abhorrence and confession, that they need forgiveness and the constant application of the atoning blood of Christ. We agree with this; and maintain, therefore, that these remains of corruption in all Christians are of the nature of sin; and that consequently the Christians in whom they remain are not perfect.

(5.) Paul expressly calls concupiscence, sin: " I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known concupiscence, except the law had said, Thou shalt not experience concupiscence." Romans 7:7. The sin that dwelt in Paul wrought in him against his will, and wrought in him all manner of concupiscence. Romans 7:14-25. And yet this evil tendency, this law in his members warring against the law of his spirit, is expressly called " sin;" and in other passages it is called the " old man," the "body of sin." Colossians 2:11; Colossians 3:9.

(6.) The biographies and recorded testimonies of all the Scripture saints make it impossible to attribute sinless perfection to any one of them. Paul disclaims it. Romans 7:14-25; Php 3:12-14. John disclaims it in his own behalf and that of all Christians. 1 John 1:8. The word " perfect" is applied to some men in Scripture either to mark comparative excellence, or to assert genuine sincerity in profession and service. But the inspired biographies of the men themselves -- such as of David, Acts 13:22; Noah, Genesis 6:9; and Job, Job 1:1 -- prove very clearly that the perfection

intended was not a sinless one.

(7.) Perfectionism is in conflict with the universal experience and observation of God’s people. The personal profession of it is generally judged to be just ground for serious suspicions as to the claimant’s mental soundness or moral sincerity.

5. Nevertheless, from a constant supply of strength from the sanctifying Spirit of Christ, the gracious element in the believer’s nature, upon the whole, prevails, and he gradually advances in holiness until he is rendered perfect at death. This precious truth follows necessarily from the fact, already shown, that sanctification is a work of God’s free grace in execution of his eternal purposes of salvation. Wherefore v e are "confident of this very thing, that He which hath begun a good work in us will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ," Php 1:6; the certainty of which will be further discussed under chapter 17.

01.14. Of Saving Faith

Chapter Fourteen

Of Saving Faith

SECTION 1: The grace of faith, whereby the elect are enabled to believe to the saving of their souls,(1) is the work of the Spirit of Christ in their hearts,(2) and is ordinarily wrought by the ministry of the Word,(3) by which also, and by the administration of the sacraments, and prayer, it is increased and strengthened.(4)

(1) Titus 1:1; Hebrews 10:39 (2) 1 Corinthians 12:3; John 3:5; John 6:44-45, John 6:65; Titus 3:5; Ephesians 2:8; Php 1:29; 2 Peter 1:1; see 1 Peter 1:2 (3) Matthew 28:19-20; Romans 10:14, Romans 10:17; 1 Corinthians 1:21 (4) 1 Peter 2:2; Acts 20:32; Romans 1:16-17; Matthew 28:19; see Acts 2:38; 1 Corinthians 10:16; 1 Corinthians 11:23-29; Luke 17:5; Php 4:6-7

Faith, in the most general sense of the word, is the assent of the mind to the truth of that of which we have not an immediate cognition; knowledge is the perception of the truth of that of which we have an immediate cognition. Yet faith demands and rests upon evidence just as absolutely as does knowledge. It does not differ from reason as rational differs from irrational, nor from knowledge as the conviction of that which is proved differs from the presumption of that which is unproved. Faith, like knowledge itself, demands evidence, and differs in accordance with the evidence in different cases from the barest probability up to the most assured certainty. We have direct knowledge that the book we have in our hands fills a certain portion of space; we have faith that space still stretches illimitable beyond the most distant telescopic star. The one is knowledge and the other faith, but the faith is just as certain as the knowledge. We know the existence and attributes of the city in which we dwell; we believe the existence and attributes of ancient Athens or modern Yeddo from the testimony of men. We know the properties of human nature; we believe the properties of the several persons of the Trinity on the testimony of God. In each case the faith is just as rational and as certain as the knowledge. Faith in many thousands of its forms is spontaneously exercised by all men. The commonest processes of thought and of human action, individual or associated, would be impossible without it. When grounded on legitimate evidence, it leads to absolute assurance. It has its root in the reason, to which it always, when legitimate, conforms. But it reaches beyond reason, and elevates the mind to the contemplation of the highest and-most ennobling truths.

Religious faith, in the most general sense of that word, is the assent of the mind to the general truths of religion, such as the being and attributes of God, and the religious obligations of men, such as is common to all religions, true or false. This religious faith has its ground in our common religious nature, while on the other hand that SAVING FAITH which is the subject of this chapter of the Confession is that spiritual discernment of the excellence and beauty of divine truth, and that cordial embrace and acceptance of it, which are wrought in our hearts by the Holy Ghost. Of this saving faith it is alarmed in this section: --

1. That it is wrought in our hearts by the Holy Ghost.

2. That it is ordinarily wrought by the means of the Word of God, or through the instrumentality of divine truth.

3. That it is strengthened by the use of the sacraments and prayer.

1. That faith is the work of the Holy Ghost has been proved already under the head of Effectual Calling. In addition it may be argued -- (1.) Saving faith must be a moral act, and must have its ground in the spiritual congeniality of the believer with the truth. Unbelief is always denounced as a sin, and not as the consequence of intellectual weakness. The Scriptures unconditionally demand instant faith alike of the ignorant and of the intelligent. (2.) By nature, men are spiritually blind, in--capable of discerning spiritual things. 1 Corinthians 2:14; 2 Corinthians 4:4. That form of spiritual apprehension which is an essential element in saving faith must be wrought in the soul by the Holy Spirit. (3.) Men believe because they are taught of God (John 6:44-45), as they are enlightened to discern the things of the Spirit. Acts 13:48; 2 Corinthians 4:6; Ephesians 1:17-18. Faith is the gift of God. Ephesians 2:8.

2. That faith is ordinarily wrought by the Spirit through the ministry of the Word is plain -- (1.) From the direct assertion of Scripture: "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? ..... So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." Romans 10:12-17. (2.) The preaching of the gospel is the ordinary way in which its truth is most effectually brought to bear upon the hearts and consciences of men. Faith is the act of the regenerated soul, and, as we have seen (ch. 10., sections 1, 2 and 4), the Spirit uses the revealed truth of God as his instrument in regeneration and sanctification, and sane adult men never come to the experience of the benefits of Christ's salvation who are destitute of some knowledge of his person and world.

3. We have seen above, under chapter xiii., that sanctification is a progressive work of the Holy Spirit, and that the inward means whereby it is advanced is faith, and the outward means are the truth, prayer, the sacraments, and the gracious discipline of divine providence. Whatever tends to promote sanctification must promote the strength of faith, which is its main root. Therefore, faith must be nourished by the truth, prayer, the sacraments, and every means of grace.

SECTION 2: By this faith, a Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the Word, for the authority of God himself speaking therein;(5) and acteth differently upon that which each particular passage thereof containeth; yielding obedience to the commands,(6) trembling at the threatenings,(7) and embracing the promises of God for this life, and that which is to come.(8) But the principal acts of saving faith are accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal life, by virtue of the covenant of grace.(9)

(5) 2 Peter 1:20-21; John 4:42; 1 Thessalonians 2:13; 1 John 5:9-10; Acts 24:14 (6) Psalms 119:10-11, Psalms 119:48, Psalms 119:97-98, Psalms 119:167-168; John 14:15 (7) Ezra 9:4; Isaiah 66:2; Hebrews 4:1 (8) Hebrews 11:13; 1 Timothy 4:8 (9) John 1:12; Acts 15:11, Acts 16:31; Galatians 2:20; 2 Timothy 1:9-10

This section teaches:-- 1. That saving faith rests upon the truth of the testimony of God speaking in his Word.

2. That it respects as its object all the contents of God’s Word, without exception.

3. That the complex state of mind to which the epithet "faith" is applied in Scripture varies with the nature of the particular passage of God’s Word which is its object.

4. That the specific act of saving faith which unites us to Christ, and is the sole condition or instrument of justification, involves two essential elements: (1.) Assent to what the Scriptures reveal to us concerning the person, offices, and work of Christ; and (2.) Trust or implicit reliance upon Christ, and upon Christ alone, for all that is involved in a complete salvation.

1. Saving faith rests upon the truth of the testimony of God speaking in his Word. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, having been given by inspiration, are in the strictest and most direct sense God’s Word to us. They are absolutely divine, both as to their infallible truth and supreme authority. Christ when on earth rested his claims to recognition as Messiah upon the testimony borne to him by the Father. John 5:31-37. "He that hath received the testimony (of Christ) hath set to his seal that God is true." John 3:33. "He that believeth not God hath made him a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son." 1 John 5:10. " This is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son." 1 John 5:9. The gospel which Paul preached to the Corinthians he calls "the testimony of God." 1 Corinthians 2:1. God corroborated the truths of the apostles’ preaching, "bearing them witness both with signs and wonders," etc. Hebrews 2:4, The Holy Ghost bears direct witness to the soul of the believer. Romans 8:16; Hebrews 10:15.

2. Saving faith receives as true all the contents of God’s Word, without exception. After we have settled the preliminary questions as to what book belong to the inspired canon of Scripture, and as to what is the original text of those books, then the whole must be received as equally the Word of God, and must in all its parts be accepted with equal faith. The same illumination of the understanding and renewal of the affections which lays the foundation for the soul’s acting faith in any one portion of God’s testimony, lays the same foundation for its acting faith in every other portion. The whole Word of God, therefore, as far as known to be individual, to the exclusion of all traditions, doctrines of men, or pretended private revelation, is the object of saving faith.

3. The complex state of mind to which the epithet "faith" is applied in Scripture varies with the nature of every particular passage of God’s Word which is its object. The common quality which is the reason of the application of the same term to all these various states of mind, is cordial, realizing assent to the truth presented. But the state of mind which fully realizes the, truth of a threatening must, in some respects, be different from that which realizes the truth of a promise. The realization of the truth of God’s glory as it shines in the face of Jesus Christ cannot be an experience in all respects the same with the believing recognition of a duty or of the truth of a fact of history.

It was debated largely between the Romanists and the Reformers whether saving faith included trust or not. The true answer is, that trust is an integral and inseparable element of every act of saving faith in which trust is appropriate to the nature of the object believed. It is plain that many of the propositions of Scripture are not the proper objects of trust. In all such cases faith includes recognition, assent, acquiescence, submission, as the case may be. But in all cases in which the nature of the truth believed renders the exercise of trust legitimate, and especially in that specific act of saving faith called justifying faith, which unites to Christ and is the root and organ of the

whole spiritual life, trust is certainly an element of the very essence of that state of mind called in Scripture faith. This will be proved under the next head.

4. That specific act of saving faith which unites to Christ, and is the sole condition and instrument of justification, involves two essential elements: --

(1.) Assent to whatever the Scriptures reveal to us as to the person, offices, and work of Christ. (a.) The Scriptures expressly say that we are justified by that faith of which Christ is the object. Romans 3:22, Romans 3:25; Galatians 2:16; Php 3:9. (b.) Rejection of Christ in Scripture is declared to be the ground of reprobation. John 3:18-19; John 8:24. Assent includes an intellectual recognition and a cordial embrace of the object at the same time. It is an act of the whole man -- intellect, affection, and will -- embracing the truth. This especial act of faith in Christ, which secures salvation, is constantly paraphrased by such phrases as "coming to Christ," John 6:35; "looking to him," Isaiah 45:22; "receiving him," John 1:12; "fleeing to him for refuge," Hebrews 6:18; -- all of which manifestly involve an active assent to and cordial embrace, as well as an intellectual recognition of the truth.

(2.) The second element included in that act of faith that saves the soul is trust, or implicit reliance upon Christ, and upon Christ alone, for all that is involved in a complete salvation. (a.) The single condition of salvation demanded in the Scriptures is that we should " believe in " or " on " Christ Jesus. And salvation is promised absolutely and certainly if this command is obeyed. John 7:38; Acts 10:43; Acts 16:31; Galatians 2:16. To believe in or on a person, implies trust as well as credence. (b.) We are constantly said to be saved "by faith in" or "on Christ." Acts 26:18; Gal; 3:26; 2 Timothy 3:15. " Faith is the substance of things hoped for." Hebrews 11:1. Trust rests upon the foundation upon which expectation is based. Hope reaches forward to the object upon which desire and expectation meet. Hope, therefore, rests upon trust, and trust gives birth to hope, and faith must include trust in order to give reality or substance to the things hoped for. (c.) The same is proved by what are said to be the effects or fruits of faith. By faith the Christian is said to be " persuaded of the promises; " "to obtain them; " " to embrace them;" " to subdue kingdoms;" " to work righteousness;" "to stop the mouths of lions." Hebrews 11:1-40. All this plainly presupposes that faith is not a bare intellectual conviction of the truth of truths revealed in the Scriptures, but that it includes a hearty embrace of and a confident reliance upon Christ, his meritorious work and his gracious promises.

SECTION 3: This faith is different in degrees, weak or strong;(10) may be often and many ways assailed, and weakened, but gets the victory:(11) growing up in many to the attainment of a full assurance, through Christ,(12) who is both the author and finisher of our faith.(13)

(10) Hebrews 5:13-14; Romans 4:19-20; Romans 14:1-2; Matthew 6:30; Matthew 8:10 (11) Luke 22:31-32; Ephesians 6:16; 1 John 5:4-5 (12) Hebrews 6:11-12; Hebrews 10:22; Colossians 2:2

(13) Hebrews 12:2 In this section it is affirmed: --

1. That this faith, although always as to essence the same, is often different in degrees in different persons, and in the same person at different times.

2. That it is exposed to many enemies, and may be often and in many ways assailed and weakened, but that, through divine grace, it always in the end gains the victory.

3. That in many it grows up to the measure of a full assurance through Christ. As all the points made in this section are taken up again and discussed at length in chapter xviii., on " Assurance of Grace and Salvation," we will defer what we have to say upon the subject until we come to that place.

01.15. Of Repentance Unto Life

Chapter Fifteen

Of Repentance Unto Life

SECTION 1: REPENTANCE unto life is an evangelical grace,(1) the doctrine whereof is to be preached by every minister of the gospel, as well as that of faith in Christ.(2)

SECTION 2: BY it a sinner, out of the sight and sense, not only of the danger, but also of the filthiness and odiousness of his sins, as contrary to the holy nature and righteous law of God, and upon the apprehension of his mercy in Christ to such as are penitent, so grieves for and hates his sins, as to turn from them all unto God,(3) purposing and endeavoring to walk with him in all the ways of his commandments.(4)

(1) Zechariah 12:10; Acts 11:18. (2) Luke 24:47; Mark 1:15; Acts 20:21. (3) Ezekiel 18:30-31; Ezekiel 36:31; Isaiah 30:22; Psalms 51:4; Jeremiah 31:18-19; Joel 2:12-13; Amos 5:15; Psalms 119:128; 2 Corinthians 7:11. (4) Psalms 119:6, Psalms 119:59, Psalms 119:106; Luke 1:6; 2 Kings 23:25. The Confession now approaches the important doctrine of repentance. Here we shall illuminate the basis and essence of repentance.

1. The grounds of repentance are-(1) A true sense of sin. That spiritual illumination and renewal of the affections which are effected in regeneration brings the believer to see and appreciate the holiness of God as revealed alike in the law and in the gospel (Romans 3:20; Job 13:5, Job 13:6); and in that light to see and feel the exceeding sinfulness of all sin, and the utter sinfulness of his own nature and conduct. This sense of sin corresponds precisely to the actual facts of the case, and the man apprehends himself to be just as God has always seen him to be. It includes-(a) Consciousness of guilt; i.e., exposure to merited punishment, as opposed to the justice of God. (Psalms 51:4, Psalms 51:9.) (b) Consciousness of pollution, as opposed to the holiness of God. (Psalms 51:5, Psalms 51:7, Psalms 51:10.) And (c) Consciousness of helplessness. (Psalms 51:11; Psalms 109:21-22.) The grounds of repentance are-(2) A bright apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ. This is necessary in order to true repentance-(a) Because the awakened conscience echoes God’s law, and can be appeased by no less a propitiation than that demanded by divine justice itself; and until this is realized in a believing application to the merits of Christ either indifference will stupefy or remorse will torment the soul. (b) Because out of Christ God is "a consuming fire," and an inextinguishable dread of his wrath repels the soul. (Deuteronomy 4:24; Hebrews 12:29.) (c) A sense of the amazing goodness of God to us in the gift of his Son, and of our ungrateful requital of it, is the most powerful means of bringing the soul to genuine repentance for sin as committed against God. (Psalms 51:4.) (d) This is proved by the examples of repentance recorded in Scripture (Psalms 51:1; Psalms 130:4), and by the universal experience of Christians in modern times.

2. As to its essence, true repentance consists-(1) In a sincere hatred of sin, and sorrow for our own sin (Psalms 119:128, Psalms 119:136). Sin is seen to be exceeding sinful in the light of the

divine holiness, of the law of God, and especially of the cross of Christ. The more we see of God in the face of Christ, the more we abhor ourselves and repent in dust and ashes. (Job 13:5, Job 13:6; Ezekiel 36:31). "Godly sorrow worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of." (2 Corinthians 7:10.) "By the law is the knowledge of sin" (Romans 3:20); and hence "the law is our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ." (Galatians 3:24.) The essence of repentance consists-(2) In our actual turning from all sin unto God. This is that practical turning, or "conversion" from sin unto God, which is the instant and necessary consequence of regeneration. It is a voluntary forsaking of sin as evil and hateful, with sincere sorrow, humiliation, and confession; and a turning unto God as our reconciled Father, in the exercise of implicit faith in the merits and assisting grace of Christ. This is marked by the meaning of the Greek word used by the Holy Spirit to express the idea of repentance-"a change of mind," including evidently a change or thought, feeling, and purpose, corresponding to our new character as the children of God. If this be sincere, it will of course lead to the element of practical repentance, namely, (3) A sincere purpose of, and a persevering endeavor after, new obedience. (Acts 26:20.) By these marks it may be seen that repentance unto life can only be exercised by a soul after, and in consequence of, its regeneration by the Holy Spirit. God regenerates; and we, in the exercise of the new gracious ability thus given, repent. Repentance and conversion, therefore, are terms applying often to the same gracious experience. The Scriptural usage of the two words differs in two respects-(1) Conversion is the more general term, including all the various experiences involved in our commencing the divine life. It especially emphasizes that experience as a turning unto God. Repentance is more specific, giving prominence to the work of the law upon the conscience, and especially emphasizing the experiences attending the new birth as a turning from sin. (2) Conversion is generally used to designate only the first actings of the new nature at the commencement of a religious life, or the first steps of a return to God after a notable backsilding (Luke 22:32); while repentance is a daily experience of the Christian as long as the struggle with sin continues in his heart and life. (Psalms 19:12-13; Luke 9:23; Galatians 6:14; Galatians 5:24.)

There is a false repentance experienced before regeneration, and by those never regenerated, which arises simply from the common operations of the truth and the Spirit upon the natural conscience, exciting simply a sense of guilt and pollution, leading neither to the hatred of sin, nor to the apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, nor to the practical turning from sin unto God. The genuineness of true repentance is proved (a) By its being conformed perfectly to the requirements and teachings of Scripture, and (b) By its fruits. If genuine, it infallibly springs from regeneration and leads to eternal life.

3. As thus defined, repentance is, like faith, an evangelical grace, given to us for Christ’s sake, as well as a duty obligatory upon us. What is here said of repentance is equally true of every characteristic experience of the subject of regeneration and sanctification. Christ is the vine; we are the branches. But we see also free, accountable agents. Every Christian duty is therefore a grace; for without him we can do nothing. (John 15:5). And equally every Christian grace is a duty; because the grace is given to us to exercise, and it finds its true result and expression only in the duty. That it is thus a gift of God is evident-(1) From its nature. It involves true conviction of sin; a holy hatred of sin; faith in the Lord Jesus and his work, which faith is God’s gift. (Galatians 5:22; Ephesians 2:8. (2) It is directly affirmed in Scripture. Zechariah 12:10; Acts 5:31; Acts 11:18; 2 Timothy 2:25.)

4. That it should be diligently preached by every minister of the gospel is (1) Self-evident from the essential nature of the duty. (2) Because such preaching was included in the commission Christ gave to the apostles. (Luke 24:47-48.) (3) Because of the example of the apostles. (Acts 20:21.)

SECTION 3: ALTHOUGH repentance be not to be rested in, as an, satisfaction for sin, or any cause of the pardon thereof,(5) which is the act of God's free grace in Christ;(6) yet is it of such necessity to all sinners, that none may expect pardon without it.(7)

SECTION 4: AS there is no sin so small but it deserves damnation;(8) so there is no sin so great, that it can bring damnation upon those who truly repent.(9)

SECTION 5: Men ought not to content themselves with a general repentance, but it is every man's duty to endeavor to repent of his particular sins particularly.(10)

(5) Ezekiel 36:31-32; Ezekiel 16:61, Ezekiel 16:63. (6) Hosea 14:2, Hosea 14:4; Romans 3:24; Ephesians 1:7. (7) Luke 13:3, Luke 13:5; Acts 17:30-31. (8) Romans 6:23; Romans 5:12; Matthew 12:36. (9) Isaiah 55:7; Romans 8:1; Isaiah 1:16, Isaiah 1:18. (10) Psalms 19:13; Luke 19:8; 1 Timothy 1:13, 1 Timothy 1:15.

These sections teach the following propositions:

1. Repentance is not to be rested in, as any satisfaction for sin, or any cause of the pardon thereof. This directly contradicts the opinion of Socinians, the advocates of the moral-influence theory of the atonement, and Rationalists generally, to the effect that the repentance of the sinner is the only satisfaction the law requires, and hence the only condition God demands, as prerequisite to full pardon and restoration to divine favor.

It also contradicts the Roman doctrine of penance. Romanists distinguish penance-(1) As a virtue, which is internal, including sorrow for sin and a turning from sin unto God. (2) As a sacrament, which is the external expression of the internal state. This sacrament consists of (a) Contrition-i.e., sorrow and detesting of past sins, with a purpose of sinning no more; (b) Confession or self-accusation to a priest having jurisdiction and the power of the keys; (c) Satisfaction or some painful work, imposed by the priest and performed by the penitent, to satisfy divine justice for sins committed; and (d) Absolution, pronounced by the priest judicially, and not merely declaratively. They hold that the element of satisfaction included in this sacrament makes a real satisfaction for sin, and is an efficient cause of pardon, absolutely essential-the only means whereby the pardon of sins committed after baptism can be secured. (Cat. Rom., part 2., ch. 5., qs. 12, 13.) That repentance is no cause whatever of the pardon of sin is proved by all that the Scriptures teach us-(1) As to the justice of God, which inexorably demands the punishment of every sin;

(2) As to the necessity for the satisfaction rendered to the law and justice of God by the obedience and suffering of Christ; (3) As to the fact that he has rendered a full satisfaction in behalf of all for whom he died; (4) As to the impossibility of any man's securing justification by works of any kind; and (5) As to the fact that the believer is justified solely on the ground of the righteousness of Christ, imputed to him and received by faith alone. All these points have already been discussed under their appropriate heads; and they are more than sufficient to prove-(a) That pardon is secured entirely on a different basis; (b) That the external penance of the Romanist is an impertinent attempt to supplement the perfect satisfaction of Christ; and (c) That internal

repentance, when genuine, is itself a gracious gift of God, without merit in itself; and of value only because it springs from the application of Christ's grace to the soul, and leads to the application by the soul to Christ's grace.

2. Nevertheless, repentance is of such necessity to all sinners that none may expect pardon without it. This is evident-(1) Because the giving of pardon to a non-repentant sinner would be in effect to sanction his sin, to confirm him in his sinful state, and to encourage others therein. Although Scripture and the moral sense of men teach that repentance is no adequate satisfaction for sin, nor an equivalent for the penalty, they just as clearly teach that it would be inconsistent in every sense with good morals to pardon a person cherishing an unrepentant spirit. (2) Repentance is the natural and instant sequence of the grace of regeneration. It also embraces an element of faith in Christ; and that faith is, as we have seen, the instrument of justification. He that repents believes. He that does not repent does not believe. He that does not believe is not justified. Regeneration and justification are never separated. (3) The design of Christ's work is to "save his people from their sins." Matthew 1:21. He frees them from the guilt of their sins by pardon, and he brings them clear from the power of their sins through repentance. "Him hath God exalted . . . to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins." (Acts 5:31.) (4) Repentance, like faith, is a duty as well as a grace, and ministers are commanded to preach it as essential to forgiveness. (Luke 24:47; Acts 20:21.)

3. That the least sin deserves punishment is obvious. The moral law is moral in every element, and it is of the essence of that which is moral that it is obligatory, and that its violation is deserving of reprobation. Hence "whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, is guilty of all." (James 2:10.) That there is no sin so great that it can bring condemnation upon those that truly repent is also evident, because true repentance, as we have seen, is the fruit of regeneration, and no man is regenerated who is not also justified. Besides, true repentance includes faith, and faith unites to Christ and secures the imputation of his righteousness, and the righteousness of Christ of course cancels all possible sin. (Romans 8:1; Romans 5:20.)

4. That men ought to repent not only in general of the corruption of their hearts and sinfulness of their lives, but also of every particular sinful action of which they are conscious, and that when possible they should redress the wrong done by their actions, is a dictate alike of natural conscience and scripture. (Luke 19:8; 1 John 1:9.) No man has any right to presume that he hates sin in general unless he practically hates every sin in particular; and no man has any right to presume that he is sorry for and ready to renounce his own sins in general unless he is conscious of practically renouncing and grieving for each particular sin into which he falls.

SECTION 6: AS every man is bound to make private confession of his sins to God, praying for the pardon thereof;(11) upon which, and the forsaking of them, he shall find mercy;(12) so he that scandalizes his brother, or the Church of Christ, ought to be willing by private or public confession and sorrow for his sin, to declare his repentance to those that are offended;(13) who are thereupon to be reconciled to him, and in love to receive him.(14)

(11) Psalms 51:4-5, Psalms 51:7, Psalms 51:9, Psalms 51:14; Psalms 32:5-6. (12) Proverbs 28:13; 1 John 1:9. (13) James 5:16; Luke 17:3-4; Joshua 7:19; Ps. 51 (14) 2 Corinthians 2:8. This section teaches:

1. That every man should make private confession of all his sins to God, and that God will certainly pardon him when his sorrow and his renunciation of his sins are sincere. "If we confess our sins, he (God) is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (1 John 1:9.)

2. That when a Christian has personally injured a bother, or scandalized by his unchristian conduct the Church of Christ, he ought to be willing, by a public or a private confession, as the case may be, to declare his repentance to those that are offended, is also a dictate alike of natural reason and of Scripture. If we have done wrong, we stand in the position of one maintaining a wrong until, by an expressed repentance and, where possible, redress of the wrong, we place ourselves on the side of the right. The wrong-doer is plainly in debt to the man he has injured, to make every possible restitution to his feelings and interests; and the same principle holds true in relation to the general interests of the Christian community. The duty is expressly commanded in Scripture. (Matthew 5:23-24; James 5:16; Matthew 18:15-18.)

3. That it is the duty of the brethren, or of the Church, when offended, to forgive the offending party and restore him fully to favor upon his repentance, is also a dictate of natural conscience and of Scripture. All honorable men feel themselves bound to act upon this principle. The Christian is, in addition, brought under obligations to forgive others by his own infinite obligation to his Lord, who not only forgave us upon repentance, but died to redeem us while we were unrepentant. As to public scandals, the Church is bound to forgive them when the Lord has done so. As genuine repentance is the gift of Christ, its evident exercise is a certain indication that the person exercising it is forgiven by Christ and is a Christian brother. (Luke 17:3-4; 2 Corinthians 2:7-8; Matthew 6:12.) The Roman Catholic Church has historially taught that, as an element of penance and evidence of true repentance, the Christian must confess all his sins without reserve, in all their details and qualifying circumstances, to a priest having jurisdiction; and that if any mortal sin is unconfessed it is not forgiven; and if the omission is willful, it is sacrilege, and greater guilt is incurred. (Cat. Rom., part 2., ch. 5., qs. 33, 34, 42.) And they maintain that the priest absolves judicially, not merely declaratively, from all the penal consequences of the sins confessed, by the authority of Jesus Christ. This is an obvious perversion of the Scriptural command to confess. They bid us simply to confess our faults one to another. There is not a word said about confession to a priest in the Bible. The believer, on the contrary, has immediate access to Christ, and to God through Christ (1 Timothy 2:5; John 14:6; John 5:40; Matthew 11:28), and is commanded to confess his sins immediately to God. (1 John 1:9.) No priestly function is ever ascribed to the Christian ministry in the New Testament. The power of absolute forgiveness of sin belongs to God alone (Matthew 9:26), is incommunicable in its very nature, and has never been granted to any class of men as a matter of fact. The authority to bind or loose which Christ committed to his Church was understood by the apostles, as is evident from their practice, as simply conveying the power of declaring the conditions on which God pardons sin; and, in accordance with that declaration, of admitting or of excluding men from sealing ordinances.

01.16. Of Good Works

Chapter Sixteen

Of Good Works

SECTION 1: Good works are only such as God hath commanded in his holy Word,(1) and not such as, without the warrant thereof, are devised by men, out of blind zeal, or upon any pretense of good intention.(2)

(1) Micah 6:8; Romans 12:2; Hebrews 13:21 (2) Matthew 15:9; Isaiah 29:13; 1 Peter 1:18; John 16:2; Romans 10:2; 1 Samuel 15:21-23; Deuteronomy 10:12-13; Colossians 2:16-17, Colossians 2:20-23

SECTION 2: These good works, done in obedience to God's commandments, are the fruits and evidences of a true and lively faith:(3) and by them believers manifest their thankfulness,(4) strengthen their assurance,(5) edify their brethren,(6) adorn the profession of the gospel,(7) stop the mouths of the adversaries,(8) and glorify God,(9) whose workmanship they are, created in Christ Jesus thereunto,(10) that, having their fruit unto holiness, they may have the end, eternal life.(11)

(3) James 2:18, James 2:22 (4) Psalms 116:12-14; Colossians 3:15-17; 1 Peter 2:9 (5) 1 John 2:3, 1 John 2:5; 2 Peter 1:5-10 (6) 2 Corinthians 9:2; Matthew 5:16; 1 Timothy 4:12 (7) Titus 2:5, Titus 2:9-12; 1 Timothy 6:1 (8) 1 Peter 2:15 (9) 1 Peter 2:12; Php 1:11; John 15:8 (10) Ephesians 2:10 (11) Romans 6:22

THESE sections teach the following propositions: --

I. In order that any human action should be truly a good work, it must have the following essential characteristics: --

(1.) It must be something directly or implicitly commanded by God. (2.) It must spring from an inward principle of faith and love in the heart. Works not commanded by God, but invented and gratuitously performed by men, are utterly destitute of moral character, and if offered in the place of the obedience required, they are offensive.

2. The effects and uses of good works in the Christian life are manifold, and are such as -- (1.) They express the gratitude of the believer, and manifest the grace of God in him, and so adorn the profession of the gospel. (2.) They glorify God. (3.) They develop grace by exercise, and so strengthen the believer's assurance. (4.) They edify the brethren. (5.) They stop the mouths of adversaries. (6.) They are necessary to the attainment of eternal life.

1. In order that a work may be good, (1.) It must be an act performed in conformity to God's revealed will. The law of absolute moral perfection to which we are held in subjection is not the law of our own reasons or consciences, but it is an all-perfect rule of righteousness, having its ground in the eternal nature of God, and its expression and obliging authority to us in the divine will. Not

self-development, not the realization of an ideal end, but obedience to a personal authority without and above us, is precisely what reason, conscience, and Scripture require. The good man is the obedient man. The sinner in every transgression of virtue is conscious that he is guilty of disobedience to the Supreme Lawgiver. David says in his repentance, "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight" Psalms 51:4. God has given in the inspired Scriptures a perfect rule of faith and practice. Every principle, every motive, and every end of right action, according to the will of God, may there be easily learned by the devout inquirer. God says to his Church: "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." Deuteronomy 12:32; Revelation 22:18-19. And God very energetically declares his abhorrence of uncommanded services, of " voluntary humility " and "will-worship." Isaiah 1:11-12; Colossians 2:16-23. In order that a work may be truly good, (2.) It must spring from a principle of faith and love in the heart. All men recognize that the moral character of an act always is determined by the moral character of the principle or affection which prompts to it. Unregenerate men perform many actions, good so far as their external relations to their fellow-men are concerned. But love to God is the foundation-principle upon which all moral duties rest, just as our relation to God is the fundamental relation upon which all our other relations rest. If a man is alienated from God, if he is not in the present exercise of trust in him and love for him, any action he can perform will lack the essential element which makes it a true obedience. Good works, according to the Scriptures, are the fruits of sanctification, having their root in regeneration: " For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Ephesians 2:10. James says that faith is shown by works; which of course implies that the kind of works of which he speaks springs only from a believing heart. James 2:18, James 2:22.

2. The effects and uses of good works in the Christian life are manifold, and are such as -- (1.) They express the gratitude of the believer, and manifest the grace of God in him, and so adorn the profession of the gospel. "Faith worketh by love." Galatians 5:6. Christ says that we are to express our love for him by keeping his commandments. John 14:15, John 14:23. As they are the fruits of the Spirit, they render manifest the excellent working of the Spirit. 1 Timothy 2:10; Titus 2:10. (2.) They glorify God. Since God is their author (Ephesians 2:10), they manifest the excellency of his grace, and excite all who behold them to appreciate and proclaim his glory. Matthew 5:16; 1 Peter 2:12. (3.) As they spring from grace, so the performance of them exercises grace in general, and each grace severally according to the nature of the work performers. Thus by the universal law of habit grace grows by its exercise. And the assurance as to our own gracious state naturally increases with the strength and evidence of those graces unto which the promise of salvation is attached. (4.) They edify the brethren. Good works edify others, both as confirmatory evidence of the truth of Christianity and the power of divine grace, and by the force of example inducing men to practice the same. 1 Thessalonians 1:7; 1 Timothy 4:12; 1 Peter 5:3. (5.) For the same reasons good works disprove the cavils and render nugatory the opposition of wicked men. 1 Peter 2:15. (6.) They are necessary to the attainment of salvation, not in any sense as a prerequisite to justification, nor in any stage of the believer’s progress meriting the divine favour, but as essential elements of that salvation, the consubstantial fruits and means of sanctification and glorification. A saved soul is a holy soul, and a holy soul is one whose faculties are all engaged in works of loving obedience. Grace in the heart cannot exist without good works as their consequent. Good works cannot exist without the increase of the graces which are exercised in them. Heaven could not

exist except as a society of holy souls mutually obeying the law of love in all the good works that law requires. Ephesians 5:25-27; 1 Thessalonians 4:6-7; Revelation 21:27.

SECTION 3: Their ability to do good works is not at all of themselves, but wholly from the Spirit of Christ.(12) And that they may be enabled thereunto, beside the graces they have already received, there is required an actual influence of the same Holy Spirit, to work in them to will, and to do, of his good pleasure:(13) yet are they not hereupon to grow negligent, as if they were not bound to perform any duty unless upon a special motion of the Spirit; but they ought to be diligent in stirring up the grace of God that is in them.(14)

(12) John 15:4-6; Romans 8:4-14; Ezekiel 36:26-27 (13) Php 2:13; Php 4:13; 2 Corinthians 3:5; Ephesians 3:16 (14) Php 2:12; Hebrews 6:11-12; 2 Peter 1:3, 2 Peter 5, 2 Peter 10-11; Isaiah 64:7; 2 Timothy 1:6; Acts 26:6-7; Jude 1:20-21 As we have seen under chapter 10., in regeneration the Holy Spirit implants a permanent holy principle or habit in the soul, which ever continues the germ or seed from which all gracious affections and holy exercises do proceed. In respect to the implantation of this permanent holy principle by the Holy Spirit the soul is passive. But, the instant this new moral disposition or tendency is implanted in the soul, as a matter of course the moral character of its exercises is changed, and the soul becomes active in good works, as before it had, been in evil ones. But, as we also saw under chapter xiii., sanctification is a work of God's free grace, wherein he continues graciously to sustain, nourish, and guide the exercise of the permanent habit of grace which he had implanted in regeneration. The regenerated man depends upon the continued indwelling, the prompting, and the sustaining and the enabling power of the Holy Spirit, in every act of obedience in the exercise of grace; nevertheless as the acts of obedience to the performance of which the Spirit prompts and enables him are his own acts, it follows that he, while seeking the guidance and support of grace, must actively co-operate with it, acting, like every free agent, under the influence of motives and a sense of personal responsibility. Hence this section asserts: --

1. That the ability of the Christian to do good works is not at all from himself, but wholly from the Spirit of Christ.

2. That in order thereto, in addition to the grace implanted in regeneration, there is needed a continual influence of the Holy Ghost upon all the faculties of the renewed soul, whereby the Christian is enabled to will and to do of his good pleasure.

3. That this doctrine of the absolute dependence of the soul is not to be perverted into an occasion to indolence, or to abate in any degree our sense of personal obligation. God's will is exhibited to us objectively in the written Word. The obligation to voluntary obedience binds our consciences. The Holy Spirit does not work independently of the Word, but through the Word; nor does he work irrespectively of our constitutional faculties of reason, conscience, and free will, but through them. It hence follows that we can never honour the Holy Spirit by waiting for his special motions, but that we always yield to and co-work with him when we, while seeking his guidance and assistance, use all the means of grace, and all our own best energies, in being and doing all that the law of God requires. It is never the waiters for grace, but always the active seekers for grace and doers of his word, whom God approves. Luke 11:19-13; James 1:22-23.

SECTION 4: They who, in their obedience, attain to the greatest height which is possible in this life, are so far from being able to supererogate, and to do more than God requires, as that they fall short of much which in duty they are bound to do.(15) (15) Luke 17:10; Nehemiah 13:22; Romans 8:21-25; Galatians 5:17

SECTION 5: We cannot by our best works merit pardon of sin, or eternal life at the hand of God, by reason of the great disproportion that is between them and the glory to come; and the infinite distance that is between us and God, whom, by them, we can neither profit, nor satisfy for the debt of our former sins,(16) but when we have done all we can, we have done but our duty, and are unprofitable servants:(17) and because, as they are good, they proceed from his Spirit;(18) and as they are wrought by us, they are defiled, and mixed with so much weakness and imperfection, that they cannot endure the severity of God's judgment.(19)

(16) Romans 3:20; Romans 4:2, Romans 4:4, Romans 4:6; Romans 8:18, Romans 8:22-24; Ephesians 2:8-9; Titus 3:5-7; Psalms 16:2; Job 22:2-3, Job 35:7-8 (17) Luke 17:10

(18) Romans 8:13-14; Galatians 5:22-23 (19) Isaiah 64:6; Galatians 5:17; Romans 7:15, Rom. 18; Psalms 130:3; Psalms 143:2

SECTION 6: Notwithstanding, the persons of believers being accepted through Christ, their good works also are accepted in him;(20) not as though they were in this life wholly unblamable and unreprovable in God's sight;(21) but that he, looking upon them in his Son, is pleased to accept and reward that which is sincere, although accompanied with many weaknesses and imperfections.(22)

(20) Ephesians 1:6; 1 Peter 2:5; see Exodus 28:38; Genesis 4:4; Hebrews 11:4 (21) Job 9:20; Psalms 143:2; 1 John 1:8 (22) Hebrews 6:10; Hebrews 13:20-21; 2 Corinthians 8:12; Matthew 25:21, Matthew 25:23; 1 Corinthians 3:14; 1 Corinthians 4:5

These sections teach: --

1. That works of supererogation are so far from being possible, even for the most eminent saint, that in this life it is not possible for the most thoroughly sanctified one fully to discharge all his positive obligations.

2. That, for several reasons assigned, the best works of believers, so far from meriting either the pardon of sin or eternal life at the hands of God, cannot even endure the scrutiny of his holy judgment.

3. That, nevertheless, the works of sincere believers are, like their persons, in spite of their imperfections, accepted because of their union with Christ Jesus, and rewarded for his sake.

1. The phrase " supererogation" means "more than is demanded." Works of supererogation are in their own nature impossible under the moral law of God. In man's present state even the most eminent saint is incapable of fully discharging all his obligations -- much more, of course, of surpassing them. The Romish Church teaches the ordinary Arminian theory of perfectionism. In addition to this error, they teach, (a.) that good works subsequent to baptism merit increase of grace and eternal felicity (Council of Trent, sess. vi., ch. xvi., can. 24, 32);. and (b.) they distinguish between the commands and the counsels of Christ. The former are binding upon all classes of the

people, and their observance necessary in order to salvation. The latter, consisting of advice, not of commands -- such as celibacy, voluntary poverty, obedience to monastic rule, etc. -- are binding only on those who voluntarily assume them, seeking a higher degree of perfection and a more exalted reward.

We have already, under chapter 13., seen that a state of sinless perfection is never attained by Christians in this life; and it, of course, follows that much less is it possible for any to do more than is commanded. That works of supererogation are always and essentially impossible to all creatures in all worlds is also evident -- (1.) From the very nature of the moral law. That which is right under any relation is intrinsically obligatory upon the moral agent standing in that relation. If it be moral, it is obligatory. If it be not obligatory, it is not moral. If it is not moral, it is, of course, of no moral value or merit. If it is obligatory, it is not supererogatory. When men do what it is their duty to do, they are to claim nothing for it. Luke 17:10. (2.) The doing of that which God has not made it man's duty to do -- all manner of will-worship and commandments of men -- God declares is an abomination to him. Colossians 2:18-23; 1 Timothy 4:3; Matthew 15:9. (3) Christ has given no "counsels," as distinct from his commands. His absolute and universal command to love God with the whole soul, and our neighbor as ourselves, covers the whole ground of possible ability or opportunity on earth or in heaven. Matthew 22:37-40. (4.) Increase of grace and eternal felicity, and all else which the believer needs or is capable of, is secured for him by the purchase of Christ's blood, and either given freely now without price, or is reserved for him in that eternal inheritance which he is to receive as a joint-heir with Christ. (5.) The working of the Romish system of celibacy, voluntary poverty, and monastic vows, has produced such fruits as prove the principle on which they rest radically immoral and false.

2. The best works of believers, instead of meriting pardon of sin and eternal life, cannot endure the scrutiny of God's holy judgment. The reasons for this assertion are -- (1.) As above shown, from the nature of the moral law. What is not obligatory is not moral, and what is not moral can have no moral desert. (2.) The best works possible for man are infinitely unworthy to be compared in value with God's favour, and the rewards which men who trust to works seek to obtain through them. (3.) God's infinite superiority to us, his absolute proprietorship in us as our Maker, and sovereignty over us as our moral Governor, necessarily exclude the possibility of our actions deserving any reward at his hand. No action of ours can profit God or lay him under obligation to us. All that is possible to us is already a debt we owe him as our Creator and Preserver. When we have done our utmost we are only unprofitable servants. Much less, then, can any possible obedience at one moment atone for any disobedience in another moment. (4.) As already proved under chapter 13., on Sanctification, our works, which could merit nothing even if perfect, are in this life, because of remaining imperfections, most imperfect. They therefore, the best of them, need to be atoned. for by the blood, and presented through the mediation, of Christ, before they can find acceptance with the Father.

3. Nevertheless, the good works of sincere believers are, like their persons, in spite of their imperfections, accepted, because of their union with Christ Jesus, and rewarded for his sake. All our approaches to God are made through Christ. It is only through him that we have access to the Father by the Spirit. Ephesians 2:18. Whatever we do, "in word or deed," we are commanded to "do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." Colossians 3:17. As to the relation of good works to rewards, it may be observed --

(1.) The word "merit," in the strict sense of the term, means that common quality of all actions or services to which a reward is due, in strict justice, on account of their intrinsic value or worthiness. It is evident that, in this strict sense, no work of any creature can in itself merit any reward from God; because -- (a.) All the faculties he possesses were originally granted and are continuously sustained by God, so that he is already so far in debt to God that he can never bring God in debt to him. (b.) Nothing the creature can do can be a just equivalent for the incomparable favour of God and its consequences.

(2.) There is another sense of the word, however, in which it may be affirmed that if Adam had in his original probation yielded the obedience required, he would have "merited" the reward conditioned upon it, not because of the intrinsic value of that obedience, but because of the terms of the covenant which God had graciously condescended to form with him. By nature, the creature owed the Creator obedience, while the Creator owed the creature nothing. But by covenant the Creator voluntarily bound himself to owe the creature eternal life, upon the condition of perfect obedience.

It is evident that in this life the works of God's people can have no merit in either of the senses above noticed. They can have no merit intrinsically, because they are all imperfect, and therefore themselves worthy of punishment rather than of reward. They can have no merit by covenant concession on God's part, because we are not now standing in God's sight in the covenant of works, but of grace, and the righteousness of Christ, received by faith alone, constitutes the sole meritorious ground upon which our salvation, in all of its stages, rests. See chapter. xi., on Justification. In the dispensation of the gospel, the gracious world of the believer and the gracious reward he receives from God are branches from the same gracious root. The same covenant of grace provides at once for the infusion of grace in the heart, the exercise of grace in the life, and the reward of the grace so exercised. It is all of grace -- a grace called a reward added to a grace called a work. The one grace is set opposite to the other grace as a reward, for these reasons: (a.) To act upon us as a suitable stimulus to duty. God promises to reward the Christian just as a father promises to reward his child for doing what is its duty, and what is for its own benefit alone. (b.) Re- cause a certain gracious proportion has been established between the grace given in the reward and the grace given in the holy exercises of the heart and life; but both are alike given for Christ's sake. This proportion has been established -- the more grace of obedience, the more grace of reward -- the more grace on earth, the more glory in heaven -- because God so wills it, and because the grace given and exercised in obedience prepares the soul for the reception of the further grace given in the reward. Matthew 16:27; 1 Corinthians 3:8; 2 Corinthians 4:17.

SECTION 7: Works done by unregenerate men, although for the matter of them they may be things which God commands; and of good use both to themselves and others:(23) yet, because they proceed not from an heart purified by faith;(24) nor are done in a right manner, according to the Word;(25) nor to a right end, the glory of God,(26) they are therefore sinful, and cannot please God, or make a man meet to receive grace from God:(27) and yet, their neglect of them is more sinful and displeasing unto God.(28)

(23) 2 Kings 10:30-31; 1 Kings 21:27, 1 Kings 21:29; Luke 6:32-34; Luke 18:2-7; see Romans 13:4 (24) Hebrews 11:4, Hebrews 11:6; see Genesis 4:3-5 (25) 1 Corinthians 13:3; Isaiah 1:12

(26) Matthew 6:2, Matthew 6:5, Matthew 6:16; 1 Corinthians 10:31 (27) Proverbs 21:27; Haggai 2:14; Titus 1:15; Amos 5:21-22; Mark 7:6-7; Hosea 1:4; Romans 9:16; Titus 3:5 (28) Isaiah 14:4; Isaiah 36:3; Matthew 23:23; Matthew 25:41-45; see Romans 1:21-32 This section teaches: --

1. That unregenerate men may perform many actions which, for the matter of them, are such as God commands, and are of good use both to themselves and others. The truth of this is verified in the experience and observation of all men, and we believe it is not called in question by any party.

2. Nevertheless, they are at best, all of them, not only imperfect works, morally considered, but ungodly works religiously considered. They are, therefore, not in the Scriptural sense good works, nor can they satisfy the requirements of God, nor merit grace, nor make the soul fit for the reception of grace. The distinction is plain between an action in itself considered, and considered in its motives and object. A truly good work is one which springs from a principle of divine love, and has the glory of God as its object and the revealed will of God as its rule. None of the actions of an unregenerate man are of this character.

There is also an obvious distinction between an act viewed in in itself abstractly, and the same action viewed in relation to the person performing it and his personal relations. A rebel against sovereign authority may do many amiable things, and many acts of real virtue, as far as his relations to his fellow-rebels are concerned. It is nevertheless true that a rebel, during the whole period of his rebellion, is in every moment of time and every action of his life a rebel with reference to that supreme authority which through all he continues to defy. In this sense the ploughing of the wicked is said to be sin. Proverbs 21:4. And thus as long as men stay away from Christ, and refuse to submit to the righteousness of God, all their use of the means of grace and all their natural virtues are sins in God’s sight.

3. Nevertheless God is more displeased with their neglecting to do these commanded duties at all than he is with their doing them sinfully as sinners. These works done by unregenerate men are commanded by God, and hence are their bounden duties. Their sin lies not in their doing them, but in their personal attitude of rebellion, and in the absence of the proper motives and objects. If they neglected to do them, the neglect would he added to the other grounds of condemnation, which would remain all the same. These ought they to do, but not to leave the weightier matters of the law undone. The amiable acts of a rebel must involve elements of rebellion, and yet he would be more to be condemned without them than with them.

01.17. Of the Perseverance of the Saints

Chapter Seventeen

Of the Perseverance of the Saints

SECTION 1: They, whom God hath accepted in his Beloved, effectually called, and sanctified by his Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace, but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved.(1) (1) Php 1:6; 2 Peter 1:10; Romans 8:28-30; John 10:28-29; 1 John 3:9; 1 John 5:18; 1 Peter 1:5, 1 Peter 1:9

SECTION 2: This perseverance of the saints depends not upon their own free will, but upon the immutability of the decree of election, flowing from the free and unchangeable love of God the Father;(2) upon the efficacy of the merit and intercession of Jesus Christ,(3) the abiding of the Spirit, and of the seed of God within them,(4) and the nature of the covenant of grace:(5) from all which ariseth also the certainty and infallibility thereof.(6)

(2) Psalms 89:3-4, Psalms 89:28-33; 2 Timothy 2:18-19; Jeremiah 31:3 (3) Hebrews 7:25; Hebrews 9:12-15; Hebrews 10:10, Hebrews 10:14; Hebrews 13:20-21; Hebrews 17:11, Hebrews 17:24; Romans 8:33-39; Luke 22:32 (4) John 14:16-17; 1 John 2:27; 1 John 3:9 (5) Jeremiah 32:40; Psalms 89:34-37; see Jeremiah 31:31-34 (6) John 6:38-40; John 10:28; 2 Thessalonians 3:3; 1 John 2:19

SECTION 3: Nevertheless, they may, through the temptations of Satan and of the world, the prevalency of corruption remaining in them, and the neglect of the means of their preservation, fall into grievous sins;(7) and, for a time, continue therein:(8) whereby they incur God's displeasure,(9) and grieve his Holy Spirit,(10) come to be deprived of some measure of their graces and comforts,(11) have their hearts hardened,(12) and their consciences wounded;(13) hurt and scandalize others,(14) and bring temporal judgments upon themselves.(15)

(7) Exodus 32:21; Jonah 1:3, Jonah 10; Psalms 51:14; Matthew 26:70, Matthew 26:72, Matthew 26:74 (8) 2 Samuel 12:9, 2 Samuel 12:13; Galatians 2:11-14 (9) Numbers 20:12; 2 Samuel 11:27; Isaiah 64:7, Isaiah 64:9 (10) Ephesians 4:30 (11) Psalms 51:8, Ps. 10, Psalms 12:1-8; Revelation 2:4; Matthew 26:75 (12) Isaiah 63:17 (13) Psalms 32:3-4; Psalms 51:8 (14) Genesis 12:10-20; 2 Samuel 12:14; Galatians 2:13 (15) Psalms 89:31-32; 1 Corinthians 11:32 This chapter teaches the following propositions: --

1. The true believer, having been once regenerated and justified by God, can never afterward totally nor finally fall away from grace, but shall certainly persevere therein to the end. 2. That the principle of this certain perseverance is not in any degree in the free will of the saints, but altogether -- (1.) In the inherent immutability of the eternal decree of election; (2.) In the provisions of the eternal covenant of grace; (3.) In the merits and intercession of Christ; and. (4.) In the constant indwelling and preserving power of the Holy Ghost.

3. The true believer may nevertheless fall into grievous sins, and for a time continue therein. The occasions of which falls are -- (1.) The temptations of the world; (2.) The seductions of Satan; (3.) The remaining corruptions of their own nature; (4.) The neglect of the means of grace. The effects of which falls are -- (a.) God is displeased and the Holy Ghost grieved; (6.) They are themselves to a degree deprived of their graces and comforts, their hearts being hardened and their consciences wounded, and their persons visited with temporal judgments; (a.) Their conduct is a stumbling-block to all who see them, and an occasion of sorrow to their fellow-Christians.

It is obvious that adherents of the Arminian and Calvinistic systems must take opposite sides on this question. The Arminian, as we have seen, holds -- (1.) That God elects persons to eternal life only on condition of their voluntary reception of grace and perseverance therein till death, as foreseen by him. (2.) That Christ died to render the salvation of all men indifferently possible, and not as the substitute of certain persons definitely, to discharge all their legal obligations, and to secure for them all the rewards of the covenant. (3.) That all men have the same gracious influence of the Holy Ghost operating upon them, and that the reason why one believes and is regenerated, and that another continues reprobate, is that the former voluntarily cooperates with grace and that the other resists it. Thus, in the personal application of redemption the Arminian makes everything to depend upon the free will of the creature. Since, then, neither the decree of God, nor the atonement of Christ, nor the grace of the Holy Ghost determines the certain salvation of any individual -- since the application and effect of the atonement and of the renewing and sanctifying influences of the Spirit depend, in their view, upon the free will of every man in his own case -- it necessarily follows that the perseverance of any man in the grace once received must also depend entirely upon his own will. And since the human will is essentially fallible and capable of change, and in this life exposed to seduction, it follows, of course, that the believer is at all times liable to total apostasy, and dying in that state, to final perdition. Hence the Romish Church, whose doctrine is purely Arminian, declares in her authoritative Standards: " If any one maintain that a man once justified cannot lose grace, and therefore that he who falls and sins never was truly justified, let him be accursed." Council of Trent, sess. vi., can. 23. The Protestant Arminians also hold that it is not only possible, but also a frequent fact, that, persons truly regenerate, by neglecting grace and grieving the Holy Spirit with sin, fall away totally, and at length finally, from grace into eternal reprobation. Conf. of the Remonstrants, xi. 7. The Calvinistic doctrine, as stated in this chapter of our Confession, is, that God has revealed his gracious purpose to cause every true believer to persevere in his faith and obedience till death; that he will never be allowed to fall away totally from grace, and therefore he never can fall away finally.

It is obvious, from this statement, that this doctrine is not open to the objections which are often brought against it.

(1.) It is absurd to say that, it is inconsistent with man’s free will. As God does not make a man come to Christ, so he does not constrain him to continue in Christ, irrespective of his will. God graciously causes a man to persevere in willing. That is the whole truth. It is a precious truth, clearly revealed, which the Arminian Christian can no more afford to give up than the Calvinist, that God can, and does, control the free wills of his people without limiting their liberty, making them "willing in the day of his power," and "working in them both to will and to do of his good pleasure." Psalms 110:3; Php 2:13. The Arminians themselves believe that the saints will be rendered secure from falling from grace when they go to heaven, and yet that they will be none the

less perfectly free as to their wills. If the two are consistent conditions in heaven, they can be none the less so on earth.

(2.) This doctrine is not liable to the charge of fostering a spirit of carnal security, on the ground that if we are once in grace we cannot lose grace or be lost, do what we please. Let it be observed -- (a.) That the true doctrine is not that salvation is certain if we have once believed, but that perseverance in holiness is certain if we have truly believed. (b.) The certainty -- nay, the probability -- of an individual's salvation is known to him only through the fact of his perseverance in holiness. A tendency to relax watchful effort to grow in grace because true Christians will not be allowed to fall away totally, is a direct evidence that we are not in a gracious state; and hence that the threatenings of the law and the invitations of the gospel, and not the perseverance of the saints, are the special truths applicable to our case. (c.) This doctrine teaches, not that persistent effort on our part is not necessary in order to secure perseverance in grace to the end, but that in this effort we are certain of success; for it is God that worketh in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure. Php 2:13.

1. The fact of this certain perseverance is distinctly asserted in Scripture. Believers are said to be "kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation." 1 Peter 1:5. Paul was confident that He who had begun a good work in them (the Philippians) will perform it (finish completely) until the day of Jesus Christ. Php 1:6. Jesus said, "I give unto them (my sheep) eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." John 10:28; Romans 11:29.

2. The ground of this certain perseverance is not at all in the free will of the saints, but altogether -- (1.) In the inherent immutability of the eternal decree of election. We saw, under chapter iii., that God's decree of election (a.) respects individuals; (b.) chooses them to salvation and all the means thereof; (c.) is not conditioned on the use he foresees they will make of grace, but is founded on " the counsel of his own will;" (d.) is immutable and certainly efficacious. Essence those elected to salvation through grace must persevere in grace unto salvation. The ground of the certainty of the perseverance of saints is also laid -- (2.) In the provisions of the eternal covenant of grace. We saw, under chapter vii., that the Scriptures teach that there was a covenant or personal counsel from eternity between the Father and the Son, as the Surety of the elect, determining explicitly (a.) who were to be saved; (b.) what Christ was to do and suffer in order to save them; (c.) as to how and when the redemption of Christ was to be personally applied to them; (d.) as to all the advantages embraced in their salvation, etc. Hence it follows necessarily that those embraced in this covenant cannot fail of the benefits provided for them. "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. This certainty is grounded -- (3.) In the merits and intercession of Christ. We saw, under chapter viii., that the Scriptures teach that Christ, by his vicarious obedience and suffering as their federal representative, wrought out a perfect righteousness in the stead of his people -- which people were all individually and certainly designated in the eternal covenant in pursuance of which he acted; and that he makes effectual intercession in heaven for all those, and for those only, for whom he hath purchased redemption. Since, therefore, neither Christ's redemption nor his intercession can fail of the ends for which they are designed, it is evidently impossible that those for whom he was substituted, and for whom he acquired a perfect righteousness, and for whom he offers an effectual intercession, can fail of salvation. The certainty of the perseverance of the saints in grace is se cured -- (4.) By the constant indwelling of the Holy Ghost. He acts upon the

soul in perfect accordance with the laws of its constitution as a rational and moral agent, and yet so as to secure the ultimate victory of the new spiritual principles and tendencies implanted in regeneration. John 14:16-17; 1 John 3:9.

3. The contents of the third proposition taught in this chapter should be examined carefully in connection with the proof-texts annexed to the several clauses. They need not be further illusitrated by us, since all therein contained is a matter of plain meaning and of universal experience. Observe the cases of David (2 Samuel 11:2-4; Psalms 51:1-19) and of Peter (Luke 22:54-62). The perseverance of believers in grace is wrought by the Holy Ghost, not irrespective of, but through, the free will of the man himself. Therefore it is a duty as well as a grace. The grace of it should be preached for the encouragement of the diligent. The duty, and absolute necessity of it to salvation, should be preached to quicken the slothful and to increase the sense of obligation felt by all .

01.18. Of Assurance of Grace and Salvation

Chapter Eighteen

Of Assurance of Grace and Salvation

SECTION 1: Although hypocrites and other unregenerate men may vainly deceive themselves with false hopes and carnal presumptions of being in the favor of God, and estate of salvation(1) (which hope of theirs shall perish):(2) yet such as truly believe in the Lord Jesus, and love him in sincerity, endeavoring to walk in all good conscience before him, may, in this life, be certainly assured that they are in the state of grace,(3) and may rejoice in the hope of the glory of God, which hope shall never make them ashamed.(4)

(1) Micah 3:11; Deuteronomy 29:19; John 8:41 (2) Amos 9:10; Matthew 7:22-23 (3) 1 John 2:3; 1 John 3:14, 1 John 3:18-19, 1 John 3:21, 1 John 3:24; 1 John 5:13 (4) Romans 5:2, Romans 5:5

SECTION 2: This certainty is not a bare conjectural and probable persuasion grounded upon a fallible hope;(5) but an infallible assurance of faith founded upon the divine truth of the promises of salvation,(6) the inward evidence of those graces unto which these promises are made,(7) the testimony of the Spirit of adoption witnessing with our spirits that we are the children of God,(8) which Spirit is the earnest of our inheritance, whereby we are sealed to the day of redemption.(9)

(5) Hebrews 6:11, Hebrews 6:19 (6) Hebrews 6:17-18 (7) 2 Peter 1:4-11; 1 John 2:3; 1 John 3:14; 2 Corinthians 1:12 (8) Romans 8:15-16 (9) Ephesians 1:13-14; Ephesians 4:30; 2 Corinthians 1:21-22

THESE sections teach the following propositions: --

1. There is a false assurance of salvation which unregenerate men sometimes indulge, in which they are deceived and which shall be finally disappointed.

2. There is, on the other hand, a true assurance, amounting to an infallible certainty, which sincere believers may entertain as to their own personal salvation, which shall not be confounded.

3. This infallible assurance of faith rests -- (1.) Upon the divine truth of the promises of salvation. (2.) Upon the inward evidence of those graces unto which those promises are made. (3.) The testimony of the Spirit of adoption, witnessing with our spirits that we are the children of God.

1. That unregenerate men, beguiled by the natural desire for happiness, flattered by self-love, and betrayed by a spirit of self-righteousness and self-confidence, should frequently indulge an unfounded assurance of their own gracious condition, is rendered antecedently probable from what we know of human nature, and rendered certain as a fact from common observation and from the declarations of Scripture. Micah 3:11; Job 8:13-14.

True assurance, however, may be distinguished from that which is false by the following tests: -- (1.) True assurance begets unfeigned humility; false assurance begets spiritual pride. 1

Corinthians 15:10; Galatians 6:14. (2.) The true leads to increased diligence in the practice of holiness; the false leads to sloth and self-indulgence. Psalms 51:12-13, Psalms 51:19. (3.) The true leads to candid self-examination and to a desire to be searched and corrected by God; the false leads to a disposition to be satisfied with appearance and to avoid accurate investigation. Psalms 139:23-24. (4.) The true leads to constant aspirations after more intimate fellowship with God. 1 John 3:2-3.

2. That true believers may in this life attain to a certainty with regard to their own personal relations to Christ, and that this certainty is not a bare conjectural and probable persuasion founded on a fallible hope, but an infallible assurance of faith, is proved from the fact -- (1.) That it is directly affirmed in Scripture: " The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Romans 8:16. " hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments." 1 John 2:3. "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." 1 John 3:14. (2.) The attainment of it is commanded as a duty in Scripture. We are exhorted "to shew the same diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end," (Hebrews 6:11); and to "give diligence to make our calling and election sure, for if we do these things we shall never fall." 2 Peter 1:10. (3.) There are examples of its attainment by ancient believers recorded in Scripture. Thus Paul: "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able," etc. " I have fought a good fight,..... I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness," etc. 2 Timothy 1:12; 2 Timothy 4:7-8; 2Ti 4:-- and John; 1 John 2:3; 1 John 4:16. (4.) There have been unquestionable instances in modern times in which sincere Christians have enjoyed a full assurance of their personal salvation, and in which their entire lives have vindicated the genuineness of their faith. The Protestant Reformers as a class were eminent examples of the possession of this assurance. God had qualified them for their great work with an extraordinary measure of this grace. Their controversy with the Romanists also led them to lay great stress upon the duty of this attainment, even going so far as to identify assurance with faith, making it essential to salvation. The Romanists held that faith is mere intellectual assent to the truth, not involving trust; and that hence faith has nothing to do with the judgment any one makes of his own personal salvation; and hence that no one could attain to any certainty upon that point in this life without an extraordinary revelation. Council of Trent, sess. vi., ch. ix. The Reformers, on the other hand, went so far as to teach that the special object of justifying faith is the favour of God toward us for Christ’s sake: therefore to believe is to be assured of our own personal salvation. Thus Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin taught. This is the doctrine taught in the Augsburg Confession and Heidelberg Catechism. It is not, however, taught in any other of the Reformed Confessions, and, as will be seen below, is not the Doctrine of our Standards.

3. This infallible assurance of faith rests (1.) upon the divine truth of the promises of salvation. Although it is one thing to be assured that the promise is true, and another thing to be assured of our own personal interest in it, yet assurance of the truth of the promise tends, in connection with a sense of our personal reliance upon it, directly to strengthen our assured hope that it will be fu1filled in our case also. Therefore God confirmed his promise by an oath, " That by two immutable things" (his promise and his oath), " 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 in the gospel " Hebrews 6:18. Thus faith includes trust. Trust rests upon the divine truth of the promises, and in turn supports hope; and the fullness of hope is assurance. This assurance rests (2.) upon

the inward evidence of those graces unto which the promises are made. Thus the Scriptures promise that whosoever believes shall have everlasting life. The believer whose faith is vigorous and intelligent has a distinct evidence in his own consciousness that he for one does believe. Hence the conclusion is obvious that he shall have everlasting life. The same promise is given to all who love God, to all who keep his commandments, to all who love the brethren, to the pure in heart, to those who hunger and thirst after righteousness, etc. Hence, when these graces are possessed in such a degree, strength, and purity, that we are conscious of their genuineness, then the conclusion is immediate and irresistible, that we are in union with Christ, and have a right to appropriate the promises to ourselves. This assurance rests (3.) upon the testimony of the Spirit of adoption, witnessing with our spirits that we are the children of God. This language is taken from Romans 8:16. The sense in which this witnessing of the Holy Spirit to our spirits is to be understood has been much debated among theologians.

Some have maintained that the passage teaches that the Holy Spirit in some mysterious way directly reveals to our spirits the fact that we are the children of God, as one man immediately conveys information to another man. The objections to this view are, that Christians are not, and cannot be, conscious of any such injection of information from without into the mind, and that, as far as such testimony alone is concerned, we would be unable to distinguish certainly the testimony of the Spirit from the conclusions of our own reasons or the suggestions of our own hearts. An expectation of such direct communications would be likely to generate enthusiasm and presumption. Some have maintained, on the opposite extreme, that the Spirit witnesses with our spirits only indirectly, through the evidence afforded by the graces he has formed within us. The true view appears to be, that the witness of the Spirit to our spirits that we are the children of God comprehends a number of particulars, all of which are confined by the Spirit to this end. (1.) The Spirit is the author of the promises of Scripture, and of the marks of character indicating the persons to which the promises belong. (2.) The Spirit is the author of the graces of the saints, corresponding to the marks of character which are associated with these promises in the Scripture. (3) The Spirit gives to the true believer, especially to the Christian eminent for diligence and faithfulness, the grace of spiritual illumination, that he may possess a keen insight into his own character, that he may judge truly of the genuineness of his own graces, that he may rightly interpret the promises and the characters to which they are limited in the Scriptures; so that, comparing the outward standard with the inward experience, he may draw correct and unquestionable conclusions. (4.) The Holy Spirit is the direct author of faith in all its degrees, as also of love and hope. Full assurance, therefore -- which is the fullness of hope resting on the fullness of faith -- is a state of mind which it is the office of the Holy Ghost to induce in our minds in connection with the evidence of our gracious character above stated. In whatever way he works in us to will and to do of his own good pleasure (Php 2:13), or sheds abroad the love of God in our hearts (Romans 5:5), or begets us again to a lively hope (1 Peter 1:3), in that way he gives origin to the grace of full assurance -- not as a blind and fortuitous feeling, but as a legitimate and undoubting conclusion from appropriate evidence. (5.) The presence of the Holy Spirit is the first installment of the benefits of Christ’s redemption, granted to those for whom they were purchased, and therefore the pledge and earnest of the completion of that redemption in due time. Thus Paul says of the Ephesians: " In whom also (Christ), after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession." Ephesians 1:13-14; Ephesians 4:30; 1 John 2:20, 1 John 2:27; 2

Corinthians 1:22; 2 Corinthians 5:5

SECTION 3: This infallible assurance doth not so belong to the essence of faith, but that a true believer may wait long, and conflict with many difficulties before he be partaker of it:(10) yet, being enabled by the Spirit to know the things which are freely given him of God, he may, without extraordinary revelation, in the right use of ordinary means, attain thereunto.(11) And therefore it is the duty of everyone to give all diligence to make his calling and election sure,(12) that thereby his heart may be enlarged in peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, in love and thankfulness to God, and in strength and cheerfulness in the duties of obedience, the proper fruits of this assurance;(13) so far is it from inclining men to looseness.(14)

(10) 1 John 5:13 (11) 1 Corinthians 2:12; 1 John 4:13; Hebrews 6:11-12; Ephesians 3:17-19 (12) 2 Peter 1:10 (13) Romans 5:1-2, Romans 5:5; Romans 14:17; Romans 15:13; Ephesians 1:3-4; Psalms 4:6-7; Psalms 119:32 (14) 1 John 1:6-7; 1 John 2:1-2; 1 John 3:2-3; Romans 6:1-2; Romans 8:1, Romans 8:12; Titus 2:11-12, Titus 2:14; 2 Corinthians 7:1; Psalms 130:4

SECTION 4: True believers may have the assurance of their salvation divers ways shaken, diminished, and intermitted; as, by negligence in preserving of it, by falling into some special sin which woundeth the conscience and grieveth the Spirit; by some sudden or vehement temptation, by God's withdrawing the light of his countenance, and suffering even such as fear him to walk in darkness and to have no light:(15) yet are they never utterly destitute of that seed of God, and life of faith, that love of Christ and the brethren, that sincerity of heart, and conscience of duty, out of which, by the operation of the Spirit, this assurance may, in due time, be revived;(16) and by the which, in the meantime, they are supported from utter despair.(17)

(15) Psalms 31:22; Psalms 51:8, Psalms 51:12, Psalms 51:14; Psalms 77:1-10; Ephesians 4:30-31; Matthew 26:69-72 and Luke 22:31-44 (16) 1 John 3:9; Luke 22:32; Psalms 51:8, Psalms 51:12; Psalms 73:15 (17) Micah 7:7-9; Jeremiah 32:40; Isaiah 54:7-14; 2 Corinthians 4:8-10

These sections teach: --

1. That this infallible assurance is not of the essence of faith; that, on the contrary, a man may be a true believer and yet destitute of this assurance.

2. That being, nevertheless, as taught in the preceding sections, attainable in this life in the use of ordinary means, without extraordinary revelation, it is consequently the duty of every one to give all diligence to make his calling and election sure; because this assurance, instead of inclining men to negligence, tends properly to increase (1.) spiritual peace and joy, (2.) love and thankfulness to God, and (3.) strength and cheerfulness in the works of obedience.

3. True believers, after having attained this assurance, may have it shaken, diminished, and intermitted: the causes or occasions of which are such as -- (1.) negligence in preserving this grace in full exercise; (2.) falling into some special sin; (3.) some sudden and vehement temptations; (4.) God's temporary withdrawing of the light of his countenance.

4. nevertheless, since, as was shown under chapter xvii., no true believer is ever permitted totally to fall away from grace, he is never left entirely without any token of God's favour; and, the root of faith remaining, this assurance may in due time be revived.

1. That this infallible assurance is not of the essence of saving faith is affirmed over and over again in our Standards, and is true. Assurance, in one degree or another of it, is of the essence of faith, because just in proportion to the strength of our faith is our assurance of the truth of that which we believe; but since true faith exists in very various degrees of strength, and since its exercises are sometimes intermitted, it follows that the assurance which accompanies true faith is not always a full assurance. Conf. Faith, ch. 14., section 8; L. Cat., q. 81.

Besides this, the phrase full or " infallible assurance," in this chapter, does not relate to the certainty of our faith or trust as to the truth of the object upon which the faith rests -- that is, the divine promise of salvation in Christ -- but to the certainty of our hope or belief as to our own personal relation to Christ and eternal salvation. Hence it follows that while assurance, in some degree of it, does belong to the essence of all real faith in the sufficiency of Christ and the truth of the promises, it is not in any degree essential to a genuine faith that the believer should be persuaded of the truth of his own experience and the safety of his estate. Theologians consequently have distinguished between the assurance of faith (Hebrews 10:22) -- that is, a strong faith as to the truth of Christ -- and the assurance of hope (Hebrews 6:11) -- that is, a certain persuasion that we are true believers, and therefore safe. This latter is also called the assurance of sense, because it rests upon the inward sense the soul has of the reality of its own spiritual experiences. The first is of the essence of faith, and terminates directly upon Christ and his promise; and hence is called the direct act of faith. The latter is not of the essence of faith, but is its fruit; and is called the reflex act of faith, because it is drawn as an inference from the experience of the graces of the Spirit which the soul discerns when it reflects upon its own consciousness. God says that whosoever believes is saved -- that is the object of direct faith: I believe -- that is the matter of conscious experience: therefore I am saved -- that is the matter of inference and the essence of full assurance. That this full assurance of our own gracious state is not of the essence of saving faith is proved -- (1.) From the form in which the offer of salvation in Christ -- which is the object of saving faith -- is set forth in the Scriptures: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved;" " whosoever will, let him take," etc.; "Him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out." Acts 16:31; Revelation 22:17; John 6:37. The matter revealed, and therefore the truth accepted by faith, is, not that God is reconciled to me in Christ, but that Christ is presented to me as the foundation of truth, and will save me if I do truly trust. It is evident that trust itself is something different from the certainty that we do trust, and that our trust is of the right kind. (2.) All the promises of the Bible are made to classes -- to believers, to saints, etc. -- and not to individuals. (3.) Paul appeared to doubt as to the genuineness of his faith long after he was a true believer. (4.) As we saw above, the Bible contains many exhortations addressed to believers to go on to the grace of full assurance, as something beyond their present attainments. Hebrews 10:22; Hebrews 6:11; 2 Peter 1:10. (5.) The experience of the great body of God’s people in modern times proves the same thing.

2. Since this infallible assurance is not of the essence of faith, but its fruit, and one of the highest attainments of the divine life; and since it may be attained in this life in the use of ordinary means, without extraordinary revelation -- it follows necessarily that its attainment is a duty as well as a grace, that all that leads to it should be diligently sought, and that all that prevents it should be carefully avoided. Genuine assurance cannot lead to looseness and indifference in the cultivation of grace and the performance of religious duties, since its very existence depends -- (1.) Upon the

evidence afforded by diligence in those duties, and by the strength of those graces, that we are true believers; and (2.) Upon the approving witness of the Holy Spirit. As we have seen above, under sections i. and ii., a false and presumptuous assurance is to be discriminated from a genuine assurance by certain clear, practical marks. On the contrary, genuine assurance naturally leads to a legitimate and abiding peace and joy, and to love and thankfulness to God; and these, from the very laws of our being, to greater buoyancy, strength, and cheerfulness in the practice of obedience in every department of duty. It hence follows that every principle of self-interest and every obligation resting upon us as Christians conspire to induce us to use all diligence in seeking the full attainment and the abiding enjoyment of this grace.

3. Since this assurance rests upon the consciousness of gracious experiences and the witness of the Holy Ghost; and as we have seen, under chapters xiii. and xvii., that true Christians may temporarily, though never totally, fall from the exercise of grace; and since these exercises in this life are never perfect and unmixed with carnal elements -- it necessarily follows that the assurance which rests upon them must be subject to be shaken, diminished, and intermitted in divers ways. (1.) Since it is a duty as well as a grace, it must be imperiled by any want of diligence in preserving it in full exercise. (2.) Since it rests upon the consciousness of gracious exercises, it must be marred, if not intermitted, by any notable fall into sin which grieves the Holy Spirit and wounds the conscience, thus clouding the sense of forgiveness and diminishing the evidence of grace. (3.) The same may evidently be effected by some vehement temptation. (4.) The same effect may be produced by God’s withdrawing the light of his countenance, in the way of fatherly discipline, for the purpose of trying our faith, of convincing us of our entire dependence, and of the all-sufficiency of his gracious help.

4. Since the true believer may fall into sin, but may never fall totally from grace, it is self-evident, as taught in these sections, that he may lose the exercise of full assurance, but that he cannot lose the principle from which it springs; and that hence, through the blessing of God upon the diligent use of the appropriate means, it may be strengthened when weakened and recovered when lost.

01.19. Of the Law of God

Chapter Nineteen

`

SECTION 1: God gave to Adam a law, as a covenant of works, by which he bound him and all his posterity to personal, entire, exact, and perpetual obedience, promised life upon the fulfilling, and threatened death upon the breach of it, and endued him with power and ability to keep it.(1)

(1) Genesis 1:26-27; Genesis 2:17; Ephesians 4:24; Romans 2:14-15; Romans 5:12, Romans 5:19; Romans 10:5; Galatians 3:10, Galatians 3:12; Ecclesiastes 7:29

SECTION 2: This law, after his fall, continued to be a perfect rule of righteousness; and, as such, was delivered by God upon Mount Sinai, in ten commandments, and written in two tables:(2) the first four commandments containing our duty towards God; and the other six, our duty to man.(3)

(2) James 1:25; James 2:8, James 2:10-12; Romans 3:19; Romans 13:8-9; Deuteronomy 5:32; Deuteronomy 10:4; Exodus 34:1 (3) Exodus 30:3-17; Matthew 22:37-40

These sections teach the following propositions: --

1. That God, as the supreme moral Governor of the universe, introduced the human race into existence as an order of moral creatures, under inalienable and perpetual subjection to an all-perfect moral law, which in all the elements thereof binds man's' conscience and requires perfect obedience.

2. That God, as the Guardian of the human race, entered into a special covenant with Adam, as the natural head of the race, constituting him also the federal head of all mankind, and requiring from him, during a period of probation, perfect obedience to the law above named, promising to him and to his descendants in him confirmation in holiness and eternal felicity as the reward of obedience, and threatening both his wrath and curse as the punishment of disobedience.

3. This law after the fall, and the introduction of the dispensation of salvation through the messiah, while it ceased to offer salvation on the ground of obedience, nevertheless continued to be the revealed expression of God's will, binding all human consciences as the rule of life.

4. That this moral law has for our instruction been summarily comprehended, as to its general principles, in their application to the main relations men sustain to God and to each other, in the Ten Commandments, " which were delivered by the voice of God upon Mount Sinai, and written by him in two tables of stone; and are recorded in Exodus 20:1-26. The first four commandments containing our duty to God, and the other six our duty to man." L. Cat., q. 98.

1. God introduced man at his creation as a moral agent, under. inalienable and perpetual subjection to an all-perfect moral law, which binds his conscience and requires perfect obedience. This follows self-evidently and necessarily from the very nature of God as a moral Governor, and

from the nature of man as a moral agent. Of this law we remark --

(1.) That it has its ground in the all-perfect and unchangeable moral nature of God. When we affirm that God is holy, we do not mean that he makes right to be right by simply willing it, but that he wills it because it is right. There must therefore be some absolute standard of righteousness. This absolute standard of righteousness is the divine nature. The infallible judge of righteousness is the divine intelligence. The a11-perfect executor and rule of righteousness among the creatures is the divine will. The form of our duties springs from our various relations to God and to man; but the invariable principle upon which all duty is grounded, and which gives it its binding moral obligation, is rooted in the changeless nature of God, of which his will is the outward expression. All the divine laws belong to one or other of four classes. They are either --

(a.) Such as are grounded directly in the perfections of the divine nature, and are hence absolutely immutable and irrepealable even by God himself. These are, such as the duty of love and obedience to God, and of love and truth in our relations to our fellow-creatures. Or,--

(b.) Such as have their immediate ground in the permanent Nature and relations of men; as, for instance, the laws which protect the rights of property and regulate the relation of the sexes. These continue unchanged as long as the present constitution of nature continues, and are of universal binding obligation, alike because of their natural propriety as because of the will of God by which they are enforced; although God, who is the author of nature, may in special instances waive the application of the law at his pleasure, as he did in the case of polygamy among the ancient Jews. Or,--

(c.) Such as have their immediate ground in the changing relations of individuals and communities. Of this class are the great mass of the civil and judicial laws of the ancient Jew, which express the will of God for them in their peculiar circumstances, and which of course are intended to be binding only so long as the special conditions to which they are appropriate exist. Or,--

(d.) Such as depend altogether for their binding obligation upon the positive command of God, which are neither universal nor perpetual, but bind those persons only to whom God has addressed them, and only so long as the positive enactment endures. This class includes all rites and ceremonies, etc.

(2.) We remark in the second place that this moral law, at least in its essential principles, and as far as was necessary for the guidance of men in a state of innocency, was revealed in the very constitution of man's nature; and although it has been greatly obscured by sin, it remains sufficiently clear to render even the heathen without excuse. This is certain -- (a.) Because it is asserted and argued by Paul (Romans 1:19-20; Romans 2:14-15); (b.) From the fact that all heathen do possess and act upon such an innate sense of right and of moral accountability, although they may in various degrees be ignorant of specific moral duties. This moral law written upon the heart was part of Adam's original endowment when he was created, as we saw under chapter iv., section 2.

(3.) We remark that the revelation of this moral law of God made in the human constitution, however sufficient it may have been for the guidance of man before he fell, in the natural relations he sustained to his Creator, is under his present circumstances altogether insufficient, as we saw under chapter 1., section 1. Hence God has been pleased to make a more full and explicit

revelation of his law to man in the inspired Scriptures taken as a whole, which is the only and the all-sufficient rule of faith and practice, as we saw under chapter i.

(4.) We remark in the fourth place that the Scriptures being the only and a complete rule of faith and practice, whatever is revealed therein as the will of God is part of the moral law for Christian men; and whatever is not revealed therein as his will, either directly or by necessary implication, is no part of our moral obligation at all. See chapter 16., sections 1 and 2.

2. That God introduced Adam, as the head and representative of the whole human family, at his creation, into a covenant relation to the law, making perfect obedience to it for a probationary period the condition of his character and destiny for ever, we have already discussed, chapter vii., sections1 and 2. After the fall of Adam, both he and all his race became incapable of satisfying that covenant themselves, and it pleased God to send forth his Son, made under the law, being born of a woman, to fulfil as the second Adam all the requirements of the legal covenant in behalf of his elect, and to secure for them all its benefits, as we saw under chapter viii.

3. While the law in its relation of a covenant of works has been fulfilled by our Surety, so that they who are under grace are no more under the law in that capacity (Romans 6:14), nevertheless the law as a rule of action and standard of character is immutable, unrelaxable, and inalienable, in its personal relations. Christ fulfilled the law for us vicariously as the condition of salvation, and on that basis we are justified. But no one can be vicariously conformed to the law for us as a rule of conduct or of moral character. Therefore, while Christ fulfilled the law for us, the Holy Spirit fulfils the law in us, by sanctifying us into complete conformity to it. And in obedience to this law the believer brings forth those good works which are the fruits though not the ground of our salvation.

4. That this moral law has been summarily comprehended in the two tables of the law, called the Ten Commandments, is a fact not disputed. By this it is not meant that every duty which God now requires of Christian men may be directly derived from the Decalogue, but that the general principles of the infinite law of moral perfection, as adjusted to the general relations sustained by men to God and to one another, may be found there. This is certain, because --

(1.) The two tables of the law were placed under the mercy-seat, which was God’s throne, and were called the testimonies of God against the sins of the people; and over them, upon the " covering" or mercy-seat, the high priest sprinkled the blood of the sin-offering. Deuteronomy 10:1-5; Exodus 30:6; Exodus 31:18; Leviticus 16:14-15. They therefore represented that all-perfect law of righteousness which is the foundation of God’s throne, and which is the testimony of God against human sin, and which is propitiated by the atoning sacrifice of Christ.

(2.) The Ten Commandments teach love to God and to man; and on these, the Saviour said, hang all the Law and the Prophets. Matthew 22:37-40.

(3.) Christ said, that if a man keep this law he shall live. Luke 10:25-28.

(4.) Every specific duty taught in any portion of the Scriptures may more or less directly be referred to one or other of the general precepts taught in the Decalogue.

These commandments were originally written by the finger of God himself on two tables of stone. The first four relate to the duties man owes to God, and the remaining six relate to the duties we owe to our fellow-men. The Romish Church assigns only three commandments to the first table,

and seven to the second. She unites the first and second commandments together, in order to make it appear that only the worship of false gods and images of them is forbidden, while the images of the true God and of saints are not excluded from the instruments of worship; and, in order to keep up the number, she divides the tenth into two -- making the first clause the ninth commandment, and the remaining clauses the tenth. The great rule for interpreting the Decalogue is to keep constantly in mind that it is the law of God, and not the law of man -- that it respects and requires the conformity of the governing affections and dispositions of the heart as well as of the outward actions. Every commandment involves a general moral principle, applicable to a wide variety of particular conditions, respecting the motives and ends of action, as well as action itself The rules of interpretation laid down in the L. Cat., q. 99, are in substance as follows: -- (1.) The law is perfect, requiring perfect obedience, and condemning the least shortcoming as sin.

(2.) It is spiritual, respecting thoughts, feelings, motives, and inward states of hearts, as well as actions.

(3.) That every command implies a corresponding prohibition, and every prohibition a corresponding command; and every promise a corresponding threatening, and every threatening a corresponding promise.

(4.) That under one sin or duty all of the same kind are forbidden or commanded, together with all that, directly or indirectly, are the causes or occasions of them.

(5.) That we are not only bound to fulfil the law ourselves, but also to help others to do so as far as we can.

SECTION 3: Beside this law, commonly called moral, God was pleased to give to the people of Israel, as a church under age, ceremonial laws, containing several typical ordinances, partly of worship, prefiguring Christ, his graces, actions, sufferings, and benefits;(4) and partly, holding forth divers instructions of moral duties.(5) All which ceremonial laws are now abrogated, under the new testament.(6)

(4) Hebrews 10:1; Galatians 4:1-3; Colossians 2:17; Hebrews 9:1-28 (5) Leviticus 19:9-10, Leviticus 19:19, Leviticus 19:23, Leviticus 19:27; Deuteronomy 24:19-21; see 1 Corinthians 5:7; 2 Corinthians 6:17; Jude 1:23 (6) Colossians 2:14, Colossians 2:16-17; Daniel 9:27; Ephesians 2:15-16; Hebrews 9:10; Acts 10:9-16; Acts 11:2-10

SECTION 4: To them also, as a body politic, he gave sundry judicial laws, which expired together with the State of that people; not obliging any other now, further than the general equity thereof may require.(7) (7) Exodus 21:1-Exodus 23:19; Genesis 49:10 with 1 Peter 2:13-14; 1 Corinthians 9:8-10

SECTION 5: The moral law doth forever bind all, as well justified persons as others, to the obedience thereof;(8) and that, not only in regard of the matter contained in it, but also in respect of the authority of God the Creator, who gave it.(9) Neither doth Christ, in the gospel, any way dissolve, but much strengthen this obligation.(10)

(8) Romans 3:31; Romans 7:25; Romans 13:8-10; 1 Corinthians 9:21; Galatians 5:14; Ephesians 6:2-3; 1 John 2:3-4, 1 John 2:7; Romans 3:20; Romans 7:7-8 and 1 John 3:4 with Romans 6:15 (9) Deuteronomy 6:4-5; Exodus 20:11; Romans 3:19; James 2:8, James 2:10-11; Matthew 19:4-6;

Genesis 17:1 (10) Matthew 5:17-19; Romans 3:31; 1 Corinthians 9:21; Luke 16:17-18

These sections teach: --

1. That besides the moral law summarily expressed in the Decalogue, God gave the Jews a ceremonial law, wherein, by means of types and symbols, (1,) Christ and his work were set forth, and (2.) certain moral truths inculcated. That he also gave to them, as a body politic, a system of judicial laws.

3. That both the ceremonial and judicial laws of the Jews have ceased to have any binding force under the Christian economy.

4. That on the other hand the moral law continues of unabated authority, not only because its elements are intrinsically binding, but because, also, of the authority of God, who still continues to enforce it. And Christ, instead of lessening, has greatly increased the obligation to fulfil it.

We have already stated, under the preceding sections of this chapter, the principles which distinguish the different classes of divine commands.

Those commands which have their ground or reason either in the essential principles of the divine nature or in the permanent constitution of things, of course have not been abrogated by the introduction of the Christian dispensation. On the contrary, it was precisely the law of perfect moral rectitude that Christ vicariously fulfilled as our representative, and thus became "the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Romans 10:4. Christ also redeemed his people "from all iniquity," that they might be "zealous of good works" (Titus 2:14); and we have seen under chapter xvi. that those only are good works which are done in obedience to the law. By redemption, also, Christ has brought his people under new and higher obligations to obedience; he furnishes new motives, and in the graces of regeneration and sanctification he communicates to the soul new powers and encouragements for the same. Some of these original laws, founded on the constitution of things, God was pleased under the Mosaic dispensation to relax to a degree, as in the case of marriage and divorce; but in every case the original law, instead of being abrogated, has been restored to its pristine breadth and authority by Christ and his apostles. The Sermon on the Mount, recorded in the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters of Matthew, is an example of the manner in which the spirit of Christianity exalts and expands the letter of the law beyond any revelation of it which had previously been made. The principles by which we are to determine what element of the law enacted under the old dispensation is abrogated, and what element remains in full force under the new dispensation, are the following: --

(1.) When the continued obligation of any commandment is asserted or practically recognized in the New Testament, it is plain that the change of dispensations has made no change in the law. Thus the provisions of the moral law are constantly recognized in the New Testament. On the other hand, when the enactment is explicitly repealed, or its abrogation implied by what is taught in the New Testament, the case is also made plain.

(2.) Where there is no direct information upon the question to be gathered from the New Testament, a careful examination of the reason of the law will afford us good ground of judgment as to its perpetuity. If the original reason for its enactment is universal and permanent, and the law has never been explicitly repealed, then the law abides in force. If the reason of the law is

transient, its binding force is transient also. The Mosaic institute may be viewed in three different aspects: --

(1.) As a national and political covenant, whereby, under his theocratic government, the Israelites became the people of Jehovah and he became their King, and in which the Church and the State are identical.

(2.) In another aspect it was a legal covenant, because the moral law, obedience to which was the condition of life in the Adamic covenant, was now prominently set forth in the Ten Commandments and made the basis of the new covenant of God with his people. Even the ceremonial system, in its merely literal and apart from its ceremonial aspect, was a rule of works; for cursed was he that confirmed not all the words of the law to do them. Deuteronomy 27:26.

(3.) It contained also an elaborate system of symbols, wherein spiritual truths were significantly set forth by outward visible signs, the vast majority of which were types, or prophetic symbols, setting forth the person and work of Christ and the benefits of his redemption. That the ceremonial law introduced by Moses was typical of Christ and his work is taught throughout the New Testament, and especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews. It was declared to be a "shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ." The tabernacle and its services were "patterns of things in the heavens," and figures, antitypes, of the true tabernacle, into which Christ has now entered for us. Colossians 2:17; Hebrews 9:23-24. Christ is said to have effected our salvation by offering himself as a sacrifice and by acting as our high priest. Ephesians 5:2; Hebrews 9:11-12, Hebrews 9:26, Hebrews 9:28; Hebrews 13:11-12. That the coming of Christ has superseded and for ever done away with the ceremonial law is also evident from the very fact just stated -- that its ceremonies were types of him, that they were the shadows of which he was the substance. Their whole purpose and design were evidently discharged as soon as his real work of satisfaction was accomplished; and therefore it is not only a truth taught in Scripture (Hebrews 10:1-14; Colossians 2:14-17; Ephesians 2:15-16), but an undeniable historical fact, that the priestly work of Christ immediately and definitely superseded the work of the Levitical priest. The instant of Christ's death, the veil separating the throne of God from the approach of men "was rent in twain from the top to the bottom" (Matthew 27:50-51), thus throwing the way open to all, and dispensing with priests and their ceremonial for ever. That the judicial laws of the Jews have ceased to have binding obligation upon us follows plainly, from the fact that the peculiar relations of the people to God as theocratical King, and to one another as fellow-members of an Old Testament Church State, to which these laws were adjusted, now no longer exist.

SECTION 6: Although true believers be not under the law, as a covenant of works, to be thereby justified, or condemned;(11) yet is it of great use to them, as well as to others; in that, as a rule of life informing them of the will of God, and their duty, it directs and binds them to walk accordingly;(12) discovering also the sinful pollutions of their nature, hearts, and lives;(13) so as, examining themselves thereby, they may come to further conviction of, humiliation for, and hatred against sin,(14) together with a clearer sight of the need they have of Christ, and the perfection of his obedience.(15) It is likewise of use to the regenerate, to restrain their corruptions, in that it forbids sin:(16) and the threatenings of it serve to show what even their sins deserve; and what afflictions, in this life, they may expect for them, although freed from the curse thereof threatened in the law.(17) The promises of it, in like manner, show them God's approbation of obedience, and

what blessings they may expect upon the performance thereof:(18) although not as due to them by the law as a covenant of works.(19) So as, a man's doing good, and refraining from evil, because the law encourageth to the one, and deterreth from the other, is no evidence of his being under the law; and, not under grace.(20)

(11) Romans 6:14; Romans 7:4; Romans 8:1, Romans 8:33; Galatians 2:16; Galatians 3:13; Galatians 4:4-5; Acts 13:38-39 (12) Romans 7:12, Romans 7:22, Romans 7:25; Psalms 119:1-6; 1 Corinthians 7:19; Galatians 5:14-23 (13) Romans 3:20; Romans 7:7, Romans 7:13 (14) James 1:23-25; Romans 7:9, Romans 7:14, Romans 7:24 (15) Galatians 3:24; Romans 7:24-25; Romans 8:3-4 (16) James 2:11-12; Psalms 119:101, Psalms 119:104, Psalms 119:128 (17) Ezra 9:13-14; Psalms 89:30-34; Galatians 3:13 (18) Exodus 19:5-6; Deuteronomy 5:33; Leviticus 18:5; Leviticus 26:1-13; Matthew 5:5; Matthew 19:17; 2 Corinthians 6:16; Ephesians 6:2-3; Psalms 19:11; Psalms 37:11 (19) Galatians 2:16; Luke 17:10 (20) Romans 6:12-15; cf. 1 Peter 3:8-12 with Psalms 34:12-16; Hebrews 12:28-29

SECTION 7: Neither are the forementioned uses of the law contrary to the grace of the gospel, but do sweetly comply with it;(21) the Spirit of Christ subduing and enabling the will of man to do that freely, and cheerfully, which the will of God, revealed in the law, requireth to be done.(22)

(21) Romans 3:31; Galatians 3:21; Titus 2:11-14 (22) Ezekiel 36:27; Hebrews 8:10 with Jeremiah 31:33; Psalms 119:35, Psalms 119:47; Romans 7:22 In these sections it is affirmed: --

1. That since the fall no man is able to attain to righteousness and eternal life through obedience to the law. This is beyond question, because all men have sinned; because men's natures are depraved; because the law demands perfect and perpetual obedience; and because ." if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain." Galatians 2:21.

2. That those who have embraced the gospel of Christ are no longer under the law as a covenant of life, but under grace.

3. That nevertheless, under the gospel dispensation, and in perfect harmony with its principles, the law is of manifold uses for all classes of men, and especially in the following respects: --

(1.) To all men generally the law is a revelation of the character and will of God, a standard of moral excellence, and a rule for the regulation of action.

(2.) To unregenerate men, considered in relation to the gospel, the law is of use to convince them of the holiness and justice of God, of their own guilt and pollution, of their utter inability to fulfil its requirements, and so to act as a schoolmaster to bring them to Christ. Romans 7:7-13; Galatians 3:24.

(3) With respect to incorrigible sinners, the law is of use to restrain the outbursts of their evil passions, to render their disobedience without excuse, to vindicate the justice of God in their condemnation, and to render their cases a warning to others. 1 Timothy 1:9; Romans 1:20; Romans 2:15; John 3:18.

(4.) In respect to regenerate men, the law continues to be indispensable as the instrument of the Holy Ghost in the work of their sanctification. It remains to them an inflexible standard of righteousness, to which their nature and their actions ought to correspond. It shows them the

extent of their obligations to Christ, and how far short, as yet, they are from having apprehended that whereunto they were apprehended in Christ Jesus. It thus tends to set up in the regenerate the habit of conviction of sin and of repentance and faith. Its threatenings and its promises present motives deterring from sin and assuring of grace, and thus leading the soul onward to that blissful attainment when the sovereignly imposed law of God will become the spontaneous law of our spirits, and hence that royal law of liberty of which James speaks. James 1:25; James 2:8, James 2:12. See L. Cat., qs. 94 -- 97.

01.20. Of Christian Liberty and Liberty of Conscience

Chapter Twenty

Of Christian Liberty and Liberty of Conscience

SECTION 1: The liberty which Christ hath purchased for believers under the gospel consists in their freedom from the guilt of sin, the condemning wrath of God, the curse of the moral law;(1) and, in their being delivered from this present evil world, bondage to Satan, and dominion of sin;(2) from the evil of afflictions, the sting of death, the victory of the grave, and everlasting damnation;(3) as also, in their free access to God,(4) and their yielding obedience unto him, not out of slavish fear, but a childlike love and willing mind.(5) All which were common also to believers under the law.(6) But, under the new testament, the liberty of Christians is further enlarged, in their freedom from the yoke of the ceremonial law, to which the Jewish church was subjected;(7) and in greater boldness of access to the throne of grace,(8) and in fuller communications of the free Spirit of God, than believers under the law did ordinarily partake of.(9)

(1) Titus 2:14; 1 Thessalonians 1:10; Galatians 3:13 (2) Galatians 1:4; Colossians 1:13; Acts 26:18; Romans 6:14

(3) Romans 8:28; Psalms 119:71; 2 Corinthians 4:15-18; 1 Corinthians 15:54-57; Romans 5:9; Romans 8:1; 1 Thessalonians 1:10 (4) Romans 5:1-2 (5) Romans 8:14-15; Galatians 4:6; 1 John 4:18 (6) Galatians 3:8-9, Galatians 3:14; Romans 4:6-8; 1 Corinthians 10:3-4; Hebrews 11:1-40 (7) Galatians 4:1-7; Galatians 5:1; Acts 15:10-11 (8) Hebrews 4:14-16; Hebrews 10:19-22 (9) John 7:38-39; Acts 2:17-18; 2 Corinthians 3:8, 2 Corinthians 3:13, 2 Corinthians 3:17-18; Jeremiah 31:31-34 THE subject of this chapter is that liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free, which is very different from that freedom of the will which we discussed under chapter ix. We there saw that freedom of the will is an inalienable, constitutional faculty of the human soul, whereby it always exercises its volitions as upon the whole it pleases in any given case. This liberty of will is essential to free agency, and is possessed by all free agents, good or bad, or they could not be held accountable. Christian liberty, on the other hand, implies two things: -- (1.) Such an inward spiritual condition of soul that a man has full power through grace to desire and will as he ought to do in conformity to the law of God; and (2.) Such relations to God that the person is delivered from the constraining motives of fear, and brought under the ennobling impulses of love and hope; and such relations to Satan and evil men that he is delivered. from their coercive influences; and such providential circumstances that he has knowledge of his privileges and gracious aid in availing himself of them. This liberty involves the change of nature effectd in regeneration and perfected in sanctification, and the change of relation involved in justification. It is a main element in the grace of adoption, and a privilege of all the children of God. Romans 8:14-15. It was purchased for us by Christ, and is therefore attributed to him (Galatians 5:1); it is applied and effectually wrought in us by the Holy Ghost, and therefore attributed to him. 2 Corinthians 3:17. This section sets forth this precious and most comprehensive Christian grace in two orders; -- first, as it is common to all believers at all times; and, second, as it is enjoyed pre-eminently in certain respects by believers

under the new dispensation in contrast to believers under the old.

1. As this Christian liberty is common to all believers in all ages, it consists mainly in the following particulars: --

(1.) They are delivered from the guilt of sin and the curse of the moral law. This is done, as we saw under chapter xi., when the believer is justified, his guilt in strict rigour of justice cancelled, and all the demands of the law satisfied by crediting to his account the perfect righteousness of Jesus Christ. The guilt of his sin having thus been actually extinguished, and the demands of the law having been perfectly satisfied, they can no longer hold him in bondage. "It is God that JUSTIFIETH: Who is he that condemneth?" Romans 8:33-34.

(2.) They are delivered also from the bondage of sin as an inherent principle of their nature. This deliverance is commenced in regeneration, and is carried on and perfected in sanctification, as we saw under chapters x. and xiii. A law still remains in their members warring against the law of their mind, and bringing them into captivity to the law of sin which is in their members (Romans 7:23); nevertheless the indwelling Holy Spirit works with them to will and to do of his good pleasure, and thus secures them, upon the whole, the victory. See chapter xvii.

(3.) They thus have peace with God. This includes the two precious benefits of God's reconciliation to us through the propitiation of our High Priest, and our reconciliation to him through the work of the Holy Ghost. Thus we are delivered from that fear which hath torment and gendereth to bondage, and have that filial, submissive, confiding love shed abroad in our hearts which casteth out all fear. 1 John 4:18. The Holy Ghost himself is the earnest of our inheritance, and witnesseth with our spirits that we are the children of God. Romans 8:16. Thus having a High Priest over the house of God, we have great confidence in entering into the very holiest through the new and living way opened by Christ, where God makes the clearest revelations and fullest communications of his grace to his beloved.

(4.) They are delivered from the bondage of Satan and the dominating influence of this present evil world. The power of the "world." and the "devil" depends upon the "flesh," or the corrupt state of the man's own heart. Christ "was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." Hebrews 4:15. The act of justification has consecrated the believer to God. The work of sanctification breaks the power of temptation, God in every case either graciously enabling us to resist and come off conquerors, or providentially opening a way of escape for us. 1 Corinthians 10:13. Thus Satan, too, is subject to his power; he helps us to resist Satan and put him to flight, and the excess of his malignant power he prevents and restrains.

(5.) They are delivered from the evil of afflictions and the sting of death. The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law, but Christ has delivered them from the curse of the law, being made a curse for them. In justification the believer's relation to the law is permanently changed. It is no more the basis of his salvation. And death, and all the sorrows incident to this life, which are the consequences of sin, which to the reprobate are parts of the penalty of sin inflicted in pursuance of law, to the true believers are elements of God's chastening grace, designed for their improvement. Hebrews 12:6-11. By the death of Christ believers are delivered from the fear of death. Hebrews 2:14-15.

(6.) They are also delivered from the victory of the grave and everlasting damnation. The first effect of his redemption which the true believer sensibly experiences is the forgivenes of his sins. If his sins are forgiven, the penal consequences of them must be removed. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." Rom. viii. 1. There can therefore be nothing to fear beyond death. Even our mortal bodies are members of Christ and temples of that Holy Ghost who will quicken them and transform them into the likeness of our glorious Redeemer. 1 Corinthians 6:15, 1 Corinthians 6:19; Romans 8:11; Php 3:21.

2. In certain respects believers under the Gospel enjoy this Christian liberty in a higher degree than it was enjoyed by believers under the Old Testament: --

(1.) The New Testament believer is delivered from the obligation of the ceremonial law. This law was to the Old Testament believer the revelation of the gospel of the Son of God, and therefore an inestimable blessing; but it was comparatively so obscured with material symbols and ceremonies, and enforced obedience so largely by coercive measures, that the apostle called the whole system " the elements of the world," under which the Jews were " in bondage" (Galatians 4:3); a " yoke of bondage " (Galatians 5:1), and " carnal ordinances imposeed on them until the time of reformation." Hebrews 9:10. And in contrast therewith he exhorts the Christian Galatians to "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free." Galatians 5:1. We enjoy the clear light shed from the person and work of our adorable Redeemer in person. We have the direct instead of the reflected ray -- immediate access to the Father instead of a constrained approach through the medium of priests and an outward sanctuary.

(2.) In connection with this, believers under the present dispensation have greater boldness in approaching God, and fuller communications of his Spirit. The greater boldness now enjoyed evidently results from the clearer and fuller revelation now enjoyed of the method and completeness of redemption and the greater fulness in the communications of the Holy Ghost. This divine person, as we know, inspired the Old Testament prophets and sanctified the Old Testament saints; nevertheless the new dispensation is pre-eminently characterized by the clearness with which the truth with respect to the office of the Holy Ghost is revealed and the fulness with which his influence is dispensed. Christ promised the gift of the Holy Ghost in this pre-eminent measure of it after his ascension. John 15:26. Previously it was said, " The Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified." John 7:39. After his ascension, on the great day of Pentecost, Peter said that in fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecy (Isaiah 44:3; Ezekiel 36:27; Joel 2:28-29,) and the promise of Christ, " he being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." Acts 2:16-17, Acts 2:33.

SECTION 2: God alone is Lord of the conscience,(10) and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are, in anything, contrary to his Word; or beside it, if matters of faith, or worship.(11) So that, to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commands, out of conscience, is to betray true liberty of conscience:(12) and the requiring of an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also.(13)

(10) James 4:12; Romans 14:4, Romans 14:10; 1 Corinthians 10:29 (11) Acts 4:19, Acts 5:29; 1 Corinthians 7:22-23; Matthew 15:1-6, Matthew 15:9; Matthew 23:8-10; 2 Corinthians 1:24 (12) Colossians 2:20-23; Galatians 1:10; Galatians 2:4-5; Galatians 4:9-10; Galatians 5:1 (13) Romans

10:17; Isaiah 8:20; Acts 17:11; John 4:22; Revelation 13:12, Revelation 13:16-17; Jeremiah 8:9; 1 Peter 3:15

SECTION 3: They who, upon pretense of Christian liberty, do practice any sin, or cherish any lust, do thereby destroy the end of Christian liberty, which is, that being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, we might serve the Lord without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life.(14) (14) Galatians 5:13; 1 Peter 2:16; 2 Peter 2:19; Romans 6:15; John 8:34; Luke 1:74-75

SECTION 4: And because the powers which God hath ordained, and the liberty which Christ hath purchased, are not intended by God to destroy, but mutually to uphold and preserve one another, they who, upon pretense of Christian liberty, shall oppose any lawful power, or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical, resist the ordinance of God.(15) And, for their publishing of such opinions, or maintaining of such practices, as are contrary to the light of nature, or to the known principles of Christianity (whether concerning faith, worship, or conversation), or to the power of godliness; or, such erroneous opinions or practices, as either in their own nature, or in the manner of publishing or maintaining them, are destructive to the external peace and order which Christ hath established in the church, they may lawfully be called to account, and proceeded against, by the censures of the church.(16)

(15) 1 Peter 2:13-14, 1 Peter 2:16; Romans 13:1-8; Hebrews 13:17; 1 Thessalonians 5:12-13 (16) Romans 1:32; Romans 16:17; 1 Corinthians 5:1, 1 Corinthians 5:5, 1 Corinthians 5:11-13; 2 John 1:10-11; 2 Thessalonians 3:6, 2 Thessalonians 3:14; 1 Timothy 1:19-20; 1 Timothy 6:3-4; Titus 1:10-11, Titus 1:13-14; Titus 3:10; Matthew 18:15-17; Revelation 2:2, Revelation 2:14-15, Revelation 2:20

These sections teach the following propositions: --

1. God alone is Lord of the human, conscience, which is responsible only to his authority.

2. God has authoritatively addessed the human conscience only in his law, the only perfect revelation of which in this world is the inspired Scriptures. Hence God himself has set the human conscience free from all obligation to believe or obey any such doctrines or commandments of men as are either contrary to or aside from the teachings of that Word.

3. Hence to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commandments as a matter of conscience, is to be guilty of the sin of betraying the liberty of conscience and its loyalty to its only Lord; and to require such an obedience of others is to be guilty of the sin of usurping the prerogative of God and attempting to destroy the most precious liberties of men.

4. This Christian liberty is not, however, absolute. It has its distinct end and limits. Its end, is that every person, without hindrance of his fellow-men, should have opportunity to serve God according to his will. The limits of this liberty are of two kinds: (a.) The authority of God, the Lord of conscience.

(b.) The equal liberties and rights of our fellow-men, with whom we dwell in organized societies.

5. Since God has established both the Church and the State, obedience to the legitimate authorities of either, acting within their rightful sphere, is an essential part of obedience to God.

6. The Church has the right from God of exercising its discipline upon any who maintain or practise opinions or actions plainly contrary to the light of nature, the doctrines of the Scripture, or the peace and welfare of the Christian community.

1. That, in the highest and only absolute sense, God alone is Lord of the human conscience, has never been denied. The real question raised by Romanists, and those in general who have claimed the authority of binding and loosing the consciences of their fellow-men, relates to the standard which God has given us of his will, and the means he has chosen to enforce it. The Romanists maintain that the true standard and organ of the will of God in the world is the infallible inspired Church, or body of bishops ordained regularly in a direct line from the apostles, and in communion with the See of Rome. They hold that this Church has power to define doctrines and enact laws in God's name, binding the consciences of men; and that it possesses, in the power of the keys, the right, in execution of these laws, to absolve or condemn in God's name, to bind or loose the subject, and open or shut the kingdom of heaven, and to impose ecclesiastical penalties. By far the larger part of what the Church of Rome actually enforces, in the way of faith and practice, is derived from ecclesiastical tradition and, evidently perverted interpretations of Scripture. The Erastian State Churches of Germany and England have often attempted to enforce outward uniformity in profession and worship, in spite of the conscientious scruples of multitudes of their best citizens, on the plea that the right and responsibility of regulating the ecclesiastical as well as the civil interests of the nation devolve upon the civil magistrate. In opposition to all this, Protestants insist --

2. That God has given only one, and that a perfect, rule of faith and practice in spiritual matters in the inspired Scriptures, and that he has hence set free the human conscience from all obligation to believe or obey any such doctrines or commandments of men as are contrary to or aside from the teachings of that Word.

We have already proved, under chapter 1. sections 6, 7, 9, 10, that Scripture is at once a complete and perspicuous rule of faith and practice, and the supreme judge of all controversies. It hence follows self-evidently -- (1.) That nothing contrary to Scripture can be true; (2.) That nothing in addition to what is revealed or commanded in Scripture can be binding upon the conscience; and (3.) That, since the Scriptures are perspicuous, every believer is personally responsible for interpreting Scripture and judging of all human doctrines and commandments by Scripture for himself. This is further proved --

(a.) Because the Scriptures are addressed immediately either to all men promiscuously, or else to the whole body of believers as such. Deuteronomy 6:4-9; Luke 1:3; Romans 1:7; 1 Corinthians 1:2; Galatians 1:2, etc.

(b.) All Christians promiscuously are commanded to search the Scriptures (John 5:39; Acts 17:11; 2 Timothy 3:15-17), and to give a reason for their faith (1 Peter 3:15), and to resist the authority even of legitimate church rulers when it is opposed to that of the Lord of conscience. Acts 4:19-20.

(c.) The "Church" which Christ promises to guide into all truth and to preserve from fatal error is not a hierarchy or a body of officers, but the body of the " called " or " elect "-- the body of believers as such. 1 John 2:20, 1 John 2:27; 1 Timothy 3:15; Matthew 16:18; Ephesians 5:27; 1 Peter 2:5; Colossians 1:18, Colossians 1:24.

(d.) Those who claim, as the successors of the apostles, to exercise this Authority, are utterly destitute of all the " signs of an apostle." 2 Corinthians 12:12; 1 Corinthians 9:1; Galatians 1:1, Galatians 1:12; Acts 1:21-22. While provision was made for the regular perpetuation of the offices of deacon and presbyter (1 Timothy 3:1-13), there was no direction given for the perpetuation of the apostolate. They are utterly without credentials. The question as to the right of the civil magistrate to impose religious articles of faith or rules of worship will recur again under chapter xxiii., section 3. It hence follows --

3. That it is a great sin, involving at the same time sacrilege, and treason to the human race, for any man or set of men to arrogate the prerogative of God and to attempt to bind the consciences of their fellow-men by any obligation not certainly imposed by God and revealed in his Word. At the same time it is a sin of disloyalty to God, and a violation of our own nature as moral and rational beings, to yield to any such imposition, and to accept as a matter truly binding the conscience anything not authoritatively taught and imposed in the Scriptures.

4. It is of the highest importance, on the other hand, clearly to understand that Christian liberty is not an absolute liberty to do as we choose, but a regulated liberty to obey God without hindrance from man. It is a freedom from usurped authority, in order that we may be the more perfectly subject to the only legitimate authority. It is hence absurd, as well as wicked, for a man to make his Christian liberty to obey only God a plea to disobey God, as he does whenever he violates any of the principles of natural right or of revealed truth which express at once the unchangeable nature and the all-perfect will of God. There can be no liberty which sets a man independent of that will; and this is always the will of God concerning us, even our sanctification. 1 Thessalonians 4:3.

Christian liberty is also further limited by the mutual duties we owe one another. The eating of meat offered to idols is in itself a thing indifferent, because not either commanded or forbidden. The Christian, therefore, is at liberty either to eat or not to eat. But Paul commands the Corinthians to "take heed lest by any means this liberty of theirs become a stumblingblock to them that are weak." 1 Corinthians 8:9. To allow this would be a sin. The Christian, therefore, may be at liberty to eat or not to eat, but he is not at all at liberty so to use his liberty that his fellow-man is injured thereby. The liberty ceases to be liberty, and becomes licentiousness, when it transcends the law of God or infringes upon the rights of our fellows.

5. and 6. Since both the Church and the State are divine institutions, it follows necessarily that the authority of the officers of each, when acting legitimately within their respective spheres, represents the authority of God and binds the Christian to obedience for conscience’ sake. It follows also that both the civil magistrate and the ecclesiastical courts must have the right of enforcing obedience by a mode of discipline appropriate to both spheres of authority. These matters, however, come up appropriately under chapters 23., 25., and 30.

01.21. Of Religious Worship and the Sabbath Day

Chapter Twenty-one

Of Religious Worship and the Sabbath Day

SECTION 1: The light of nature showeth that there is a God, who hath lordship and sovereignty over all, is good, and doth good unto all, and is therefore to be feared, loved, praised, called upon, trusted in, and served, with all the heart, and with all the soul, and with all the might.(1) But the acceptable way of worshiping the true God is instituted by himself, and so limited by his own revealed will, that he may not be worshiped according to the imaginations and devices of men, or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation, or any other way not prescribed in the Holy Scripture.(2)

(1) Romans 1:20; Psalms 19:1-4; Psalms 50:6; Psalms 86:8-10; Psalms 89:5-7; Psalms 95:1-6; Psalms 97:6; Psalms 104:1-35; Psalms 145:9-12; Acts 14:17; Deuteronomy 6:4-5 (2) Deuteronomy 4:15-20; Deuteronomy 12:32; Matthew 4:9-10; Matthew 15:9; Acts 17:23-25; Exodus 20:4-6, John 4:23-24; Colossians 2:18-23

SECTION 2: Religious worship is to be given to God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and to him alone; (3) not to angels, saints, or any other creature:(4) and, since the fall, not without a Mediator; nor in the mediation of any other but of Christ alone.(5)

(3) John 5:23; Matthew 28:19; 2 Corinthians 13:14; Ephesians 3:14; Revelation 5:11-14; Acts 10:25-26 (4) Colossians 2:18; Revelation 19:10; Romans 1:255. John 14:6; 1 Timothy 2:5; Ephesians 2:18; Colossians 3:17

THESE sections teach: --

1. That the obligation to render supreme worship and devoted service to God is a dictate of nature as well as a doctrine of revelation.

2. That God in his Word has prescribed for us how we may worship him acceptably; and that it is an offence to him and a sin in us either to neglect to worship and serve him in the way prescribed, or to attempt to serve him in any way not prescribed.

3. That the only proper objects of worship are the Father, Son, and holy Ghost; and that, since the fall, these are to be approached only through a Mediator, and through the mediation of none other than Christ alone.

4. That religious worship is upon no pretence to be rendered to angels, or to saints, nor to any other creature.

1. That it is a dictate of natural reason and conscience that a Being of infinite and absolute perfection, the Creator, Possessor and sovereign Lord, the Preserver and bountiful Benefactor of all creatures, and the absolute moral Governor of all moral agents, should be adored, praised,

thanked, supplicated, obeyed, and served, is self-evident, and is witnessed to by the common consent of all nations of all ages. The reasons for this are -- (1.) His absolute perfection in himself. (2.) His infinite superiority to us. (3.) His relation to us as Creator, Preserver, and moral Governor. (4.) Our absolute dependence upon him for every good, and our obligations for his infinite goodness to us. (5.) His commands requiring this at our hands. (6.) The impulse of our nature as religious beings and morally responsible agents. (7.) The fact that our faculties find their highest exercise, and our whole being its highest development and blessedness, in this worship and service.

2. We have already seen, under chapter i., that God has given us in the Holy Scriptures an infallible, authoritative, complete, and perspicuous rule of faith and practice. That "the whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory and man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture." It hence necessarily follows that since God has prescribed the mode in which we are acceptably to worship and serve him, it must be an offence to him and a sin in us for us either to neglect his way, or in preference to practise our own. It may well have been that in the natural state of man, and in the moral relations to God in which he stood before the fall, his natural reason, conscience, and religious instincts might have sufficed to direct him in his worship and. service. But since man's moral nature is depraved, and his religious instincts perverted, and his relations to God reversed by sin, it is self-evident that an explicit, positive revelation is necessary, not only to tell man that God will admit his worship at all, but also to prescribe 'the principles upon which, and the methods in which, that worship and service may be rendered. As before shown from Scripture, not only all teaching for doctrine the commandments of men, but all manner of will-worship, of self-chosen acts and forms of worship, are an abomination to God. At the same time, of course, there are, as, the Confession admits, chapter i., section 6, "some circumstances concerning the worship of God, and the government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word." These relate obviously to the application of the principles and "general rules" laid down in Scripture, for our guidance in worship and ecclesiastical government, to the varying times and circumstances of the case in hand. But we have in no case any right, upon the ground of taste, fashion, or expediency, to go beyond the clear warrant of Scripture.

3. That the divine worship is to be addressed equally to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, follows necessarily from what we have proved under chapter 2., section 8 -- that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, being distinct persons, are yet each equally, in the same absolute sense, the one supreme God. That God can now be acceptably approached only through a Mediator is proved by what we have already proved,-- (1,) As to the guilt of man by nature and in consequence of habitual transgression; (2.) As to the justice of God; and (3.) As to the fact that God has from eternity determined to deal with men, as the subjects of redemption, only through a mediator. If Christ as our High Priest truly represents the elect before the Father, in obeying and suffering vicariously in their stead and in making intercession in their behalf; and if he is the medium through which all gracious benefits come to us from God,-- it follows that all our approaches to God should be made through him. That God is the only proper object of worship, and that Christ is the only Mediator through whom we may approach God, will be shown under the next head.

4. Religious worship is upon no pretence to be offered to angels, nor to saints, nor to any other creature, nor to God through any other mediator save Christ alone. The most authoritative Standards of the Church of Rome teach -- (1.) That the Virgin Mary and saints and angels are to receive true religious worship, in proportion to their respective ranks. (2.) That they are to be invoked to help us in our times of need. (3) That they are to be invoked to intercede with God or with Christ for us. (4.) Some of their most authoritative books of worship teach that God is to be asked to save and help us on the ground of the merits of the saints; (5.) That the pictures, images, and relics of saints and martyrs, are to be retained in churches and worshipped. To avoid the charge of idolatry made upon them for these practices, they distinguish between (a.) Latria, or the highest religious worship, which is due to God alone, and (b.) Doulia, or that inferior religious worship which is due in various degrees to saints and angels, according to their rank. Sonic also mark a middle degree of worship, which is due to the Virgin Mary alone, by the term Hyperdoulia. They also distinguish between (a.) that direct worship which is due severally to God, to the Virgin, or to the saints and angels, and (b.) that indirect worship which terminates upon the picture or image which represents to the worshipper the direct object of his worship. The objections to this entire system are -- (1.) That it has neither as a whole nor in any element of it a shadow of support in Scripture. (2.) That the reasons for worshipping God apply to the worship of no other being. That reason and revelation unite in teaching us that a Being of infinite and absolute perfection, our Creator, Preserver, and moral Governor, stands apart from all other objects, and therefore is not to be classed as an object of worship with any other.

(3.) The sin of worshipping other gods and angels is explicitly forbidden. Exodus 20:3, Exodus 20:5; Colossians 2:18. When the people of Lystra proposed to worship Saint Paul and Saint Barnabas, "they rent their clothes, and ran in among the people," saying, "We also are men,.....and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God." Acts 14:14-15.

(4.) The worship of images, or of God, Christ, or saints by images, is forbidden in the Second Commandment. Exodus 20:4-5.

(5.) The distinctions they make between the different degrees of worship due to God and to holy creatures, and between the indirect worship which terminates upon the image or picture and the direct worship which terminates upon the person represented by it, are not their peculiar property, but, as every missionary to the heathen knows, are common to them with the educated class among all idolaters. If the Romanists be not idolaters, the sins forbidden in the First and Second Commandments have never been committed.

(6.) The invocation of the saints is a pure absurdity, for unless they are omnipresent and omniscient, they cannot hear us; and in many cases, unless they are omnipotent, they cannot help us. The Romish explanation, that God may perhaps tell the saints what we pray, in order that the saints may in turn tell God, is worthy of the doctrine it explains.

(7.) The saints and angels are not mediators between us and God or us and Christ -- (a.) Because it is explicitly asserted that Christ is the only Mediator between God and man. 1 Timothy 2:5. (b} Christ has exhaustively discharged every requisite mediatorial function, both on earth and in heaven. Hebrews 9:12, Hebrews 9:24; Hebrews 7:25; Hebrews 10:14. (c.) Because we are "complete" in Christ; and we are exhorted to come immediately to God through Christ, and to

come with the utmost boldness and sense of liberty. Colossians 2:10; Ephesians 2:18; Ephesians 3:12; Hebrews 4:15-16; Hebrews 10:19-22. The very suggestion of supplementing the work of Jesus Christ with that of other mediators is infinitely derogatory to him. (d.) There can be no room for intercessors between us and Christ, because Christ is our tender Brother Matthew 11:28), and because it is the once of the Holy Ghost to draw men to Christ. John 6:44; John 16:18. (e.) Even if there were need for other mediators, the saints would not be fit for the place. They are absent; they cannot bear when we cry. They are dependent; they cannot help others. As we have seen, they have no supererogatory merits, and therefore cannot lay in our behalf a foundation for our acceptance with God. They are busy worshipping and enjoying Christ in person, and have neither the time, the opportunity, nor the ability to manage the affairs of the world.

SECTION 3: Prayer, with thanksgiving, being one special part of religious worship,(6) is by God required of all men:(7) and, that it may be accepted, it is to be made in the name of the Son,(8) by the help of his Spirit,(9) according to his will,(10) with understanding, reverence, humility, fervency, faith, love, and perseverance;(11) and, if vocal, in a known tongue.(12)

(6) Php 4:6; 1 Timothy 2:1; Colossians 4:2 (7) Psalms 65:2; Psalms 67:3; Psalms 96:7-8; Psalms 148:11-13; Isaiah 55:6-7 (8) John 14:13-14; 1 Peter 2:5 (9) Romans 8:26; Ephesians 6:18 (10) 1 John 5:14 (11) Psalms 47:7; Ecclesiastes 5:1-2; Hebrews 12:28; Genesis 18:27; James 1:6-7; James 5:16; Mark 11:24; Matthew 6:12, Matthew 6:14-15; Colossians 4:2; Ephesians 6:18 (12) 1 Corinthians 14:14

Section IV. Prayer is to be made for things lawful;(13) and for all sorts of men living, or that shall live hereafter:(14) but not for the dead,(15) nor for those of whom it may be known that they have sinned the sin unto death.(16)

(13) 1 John 5:14, 1 John 5:16; John 15:7 (14) 1 Timothy 2:1-2; John 17:20; 2 Samuel 7:29; 2 Chronicles 6:14-42 (15) Luke 16:25-26; Isaiah 57:1-2; Psalms 73:24; 2 Corinthians 5:8, 2 Corinthians 5:10; Php 1:21-24; Revelation 14:13 (16) 1 John 5:16 Our Confession having established the general truth as to the object to whom religious worship is to be rendered, and as to the source of our knowledge of its nature and proper methods, now proceeds to state more particularly what the Scriptures teach on this subject.

These sections teach --

1. That prayer is a principal part of religious worship. The word "prayer" is used constantly in a more general and a more specific sense. In its more specific sense it is equivalent to supplication, the act of the soul engaged in presenting its desires to God, and asking God to gratify them and to supply all the necessities of the supplicant. In its general sense, prayer is used to express every act of the soul engaged in spiritual intercourse with God. In this sense the main elements it embraces are -- (1.) Adoration, (2.) Confession, (3.) Supplication, (4.) Intercession, (5,) Thanksgiving. Thus prayer in its wide sense includes all direct acts of worship. And hymns and psalms of praise are in their essence only metrical and musically-uttered prayers.

2. The Confession here asserts that prayer is required of all men. This is absolutely true, even of the heathen who know not God, and of the unregenerate who are morally unable to pray in a manner pleasing to God; because neither our knowledge of moral truths nor our moral ability to do what is right is the measure of our responsibility. The duty of prayer is a natural duty growing out of

our natural relations to God, manifested by the natural conscience, and enjoined in the Scriptures upon all men indiscriminately. 1 Thessalonians 5:17; Acts 8:22-23; Luke 11:9-13. We are told not only to pray after we receive the Holy Spirit, but to pray also that we may receive him.

3. In order that prayer may be acceptable to God and effectual, it is here taught that it is necessary -- (1.) That it should be offered through the mediation. of Christ. It has been shown above, under sections 1 and 2, that all religious worship must be presented through Christ; that is, relying upon his merits, and approaching God through his present personal intercession. Prayer is a kind of religious worship. What, therefore, is true of the class is true of all its elements. Besides, this truth follows from all that is revealed of our redemption through the merits of Christ, and is directly taught in Scripture. John 14:13-14; John 16:23-24. (2.) It must be made by the help of the Holy Ghost. The same word paraclete is applied to Christ and to the Holy Ghost: it is translated when applied to Christ advocate (1 John 2:1), and comforter when applied to the Holy Ghost. John 14:16. Thus Christ as our Advocate makes intercession for us in heaven (Romans 8:34); the Holy Ghost as our Advocate makes intercession within us, inditing our prayers, kindling our desires for that which is according to the will of God, and thus maintaining harmony in the constant current of petition ascending from Christ the Head in heaven and his members on earth. Romans 8:26-27. (3.) It is essential to acceptable prayer that the heart of the worshipper should. be in the proper state, and that his prayer be offered in reverence for the majesty and moral perfections of God; humility, because of our guilt and pollution; submission to his will; confidence in his ability and willingness to help us, and upon his covenanted grace; intelligent apprehension of the relations we sustain, the nature of the service we are engaged in, and the subject-matter of our prayer and objects of petition; and real earnestness and fervency of heart, corresponding fully to all the words whereby our prayer is expressed; and with importunity and perseverance. Luke 18:1-8. And when the prayer is common between two or more persons, it is self-evident that it must be expressed in a language common to all; otherwise, it must cease to be in any sense the prayer of those who fail to understand it. This point is aimed at the Romish custom of uttering many of her public prayers in Latin, which to the vast majority of her worshippers is an unknown tongue. This is explicitly forbidden. 1 Corinthians 14:1-33.

4. As to the objects of petition, we are here taught that they cover the whole ground of things that are at once desirable and lawful. This is self-evident, because we depend upon God for all things, and therefore should ask him for everything we need; yet, of course, giving a precedence in our desires for the " best things,' " seeking first the kingdom of heaven and God's righteousness." 1 Corinthians 12:31; Matthew 6:33. Desires for unlawful things are of course unlawful desires, and should be laid aside and repented of. Even concerning those things which it is in general lawful for us to desire, there may be in many instances uncertainty whether it is the will of God that we should have them at the time and in the way we desire. In every such case we should, of course, make our petitions conditional upon God's will, as our blessed Lord did in Gethsemane. Luke 22:42; 1 John 5:14. As to the subjects of intercession, we are taught to pray for all men living or to live. 1 Timothy 2:1-2; John 17:20. But not for those already dead, nor for those known to have committed the unpardonable sin. The doctrine of the Romish Church concerning prayers for the dead is a dependent part of their doctrine concerning the state of the souls of men after death. They hold that those who are perfect at the time of death go immediately to heaven; those who are infidels or die in mortal sin go immediately to hell; but the great mass of imperfect Christians go to

purgatory, where they must stay until they get fit for heaven. Concerning purgatory, the Council of Trent teaches -- (1.) That there is a purifying fire through which imperfect Christian souls must pass. (2.) That the souls temporarily suffering therein may be materially benefited by the prayers of their fellow-Christians and the masses offered up in their behalf on earth. (Council of Trent, sess. 25.) But if there is no purgatory, as will be shown under chapter xxxii., there can be no prayers for the dead, since those in heaven need no intercession, and for those in hell none can avail. It is as presumptuous as it is futile to assail the throne of God with supplications "when once the Master of the house has shut to the door." Luke 13:25. The Scriptures teach of only two states of existence beyond death, and of a great, impassable gulf fixed between. Luke 16:25-26. Besides, the practice of praying for the dead has no warrant, direct or by remote implication, in Scripture.

SECTION 5: The reading of the Scriptures with godly fear,(17) the sound preaching (18) and conscionable hearing of the Word, in obedience unto God, with understanding, faith, and reverence,(19) singing of psalms with grace in the heart;(20) as also, the due administration and worthy receiving of the sacraments instituted by Christ, are all parts of the ordinary religious worship of God:(21) beside religious oaths,(22) vows,(23) solemn fastings,(24) and thanksgivings upon special occasions,(25) which are, in their several times and seasons, to be used in an holy and religious manner.(26)

(17) Luke 4:16-17; Acts 15:21; Colossians 4:16; 1 Thessalonians 5:27; Revelation 1:3 (18) 2 Timothy 4:2; Acts 5:42 (19) James 1:22; Acts 10:33; Matthew 13:19; Hebrews 4:2; Isaiah 66:2 (20) Colossians 3:16; Ephesians 5:19; James 5:13; 1 Corinthians 14:15 (21) Matthew 28:19; 1 Corinthians 11:23-29; Acts 2:42 (22) Deuteronomy 6:13; Nehemiah 10:29; 2 Corinthians 1:23 (23) Psalms 116:14; Isaiah 19:21; Ecclesiastes 5:4-5 (24) Joel 2:12; Esther 4:16; Matthew 9:15; Acts 14:23 (25) Exodus 15:1-21; Psalms 107:1-43; Nehemiah 12:27-43; Esther 9:20-22 (26) Hebrews 12:28.

SECTION 6: Neither prayer, nor any other part of religious worship, is now, under the gospel, either tied unto, or made more acceptable by any place in which it is performed, or towards which it is directed:(27) but God is to be worshiped everywhere,(28) in spirit and truth;(29) as, in private families (30) daily,(31) and in secret, each one by himself;(32) so, more solemnly in the public assemblies, which are not carelessly or willfully to be neglected, or forsaken, when God, by his Word or providence, calleth thereunto.(33)

(27) John 4:21 (28) Malachi 1:11; 1 Timothy 2:8 (29) John 4:23-24 (30) Jeremiah 10:25; Deuteronomy 6:6-7; Job 1:5; 2 Samuel 6:18, 2 Samuel 6:20 (31) Matthew 6:11; see Job 1:5 (32) Matthew 6:6; Matthew 6:16-18; Nehemiah 1:4-11; Daniel 9:3-4 (33) Isaiah 56:6-7; Hebrews 10:25; Psalms 84:1-12; Psalms 100:4; Psalms 122:1, Luke 4:16; Acts 2:42; Acts 13:42, Acts 13:44

These sections proceed to particularize the different ways in which God requires us under the present dispensation to worship him. These are the regular and the occasional acts of worship. The regular worship of God is to be conducted in the public assembly, in the private family, and personally in secret. The worship of God in the public assembly is to consist in the reading, preaching, and hearing of the Word; prayer, singing of psalms; and the administration and receiving of the sacraments instituted by him. In the Word, read or properly preached, God speaks to us, and we worship him by hearing with reverence, diligent attention, and self-application and obedience. In prayer and the singing of praise we address to God the holy affections, desires, and

thanksgivings inspired in our hearts by his Holy Spirit. In the sacraments God communes with and enters into covenant with our souls, and we commune with and enter into covenant with him. And the acceptability of this worship depends not at all, as Ritualists fondly imagine, upon the sanctity of the place in which it is rendered or the direction in which it is addressed. The dispensation in which worship was limited to holy places, persons, and seasons, has been done away with by our Lord, as we have seen under chapters vii. and xix., and as Christ plainly teaches the woman of Samaria. John 4:20-24. But its acceptance depends upon -- (1.) Its being accompanied with .and founded upon the pure, unadulterated truth of God's Word; (2.) Its being the fruit of the Holy Ghost, the result of en- lightened, reverent, and fervent love; (3.) Its being offered entirely through the mediation of the Lord Jesus.

"Besides the public worship in congregations, it is the indispensable duty of each person, alone in secret, and of every family by itself in private, to pray to and worship God.

"Secret worship is most plainly enjoined by our Lord. Matthew 6:6; Ephesians 6:18. In this duty every one, apart by himself, is to spend some time in prayer, reading the Scriptures, holy meditation, and serious self-examination. The many advantages arising from a conscientious discharge of these duties are best known to those who are found in the faithful discharge of them.

"Family worship, which ought to be performed by every family, ordinarily morning and evening, consists in prayer, reading the Scriptures, and singing praises.

" The head of the family, who is to lead in this service, ought to be careful that all the members of his household duly attend; and that none withdraw themselves unnecessarily from any part of family worship; and that all refrain from their common business while the Scriptures are read, and gravely attend to the same, no less than when prayer and praise are offered up.

"Let the heads of families be careful to instruct their children and servants in the principles of religion. Every proper opportunity ought to be embraced for such instruction. But we are of opinion that the Sabbath evenings, after public worship, shouldst be sacredly preserved for this purpose. Therefore we highly disapprove of paying unnecessary private visits on the Lord's day; admitting strangers into the families, except when necessity or charity requires it; or any other practices, whatever plausible pretences may be offered in their favour, if they interfere with the above important and necessary duty." (American) Directory for Worship, chap. 15. The occasional modes by which God may be in proper seasons worshipped are such as religious oaths, and vows, and fasting, and special thanksgiving. Of oaths and vows we will treat under chapter 22. Of the propriety and usefulness of special seasons of fasting and of thanksgiving, the examples of God's Word (Psalms 107:1-43; Matthew 9:15) and the experience of the Christian Church in modern times leave no room for doubt.

SECTION 7: As it is the law of nature, that, in general, a due proportion of time be set apart for the worship of God; so, in his Word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment binding all men in all ages, he hath particularly appointed one day in seven, for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto him:(34) which, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week,(35) and, from the resurrection of Christ, was changed into the first day of the week, which, in Scripture, is called the Lord's day,(36) and is to be continued to the end of the world, as the Christian Sabbath.(37)

(34) Exodus 20:8-11; Isaiah 56:2-7 (35) Genesis 2:2-3; 1 Corinthians 16:1-2; Acts 20:7 (36) Revelation 1:10 (37) Matthew 5:17-18; Mark 2:27-28; Romans 13:8-10; James 2:8-12

SECTION 8: This Sabbath is then kept holy unto the Lord, when men, after a due preparing of their hearts, and ordering of their common affairs beforehand, do not only observe an holy rest, all the day, from their own works, words, and thoughts about their worldly employments and recreations,(38) but also are taken up, the whole time, in the public and private exercises of his worship, and in the duties of necessity and mercy.(39)

(38) Exodus 16:23, Exodus 16:25-26, Exodus 16:29-30; Exodus 20:8; Exodus 31:15-17; Isaiah 58:13-14; Nehemiah 13:15-22 (39) Isaiah 58:13-14; Luke 4:16; Matthew 12:1-13; Mark 3:1-5

Under chapter xix. we saw that the different laws of God, when classified according to their respective grounds or reasons, might be grouped as follows: (1.) Those having their ground in the divine nature, and therefore universal and immutable. (2.) Those having their ground, as far as known to us, simply and purely in the divine will, hence called positive commandments, and binding only so far and so long as commanded. (3.) Those having their ground and reason in the temporary circumstances to which they were adapted, and to which alone they were intended to apply, so that they cease to be binding as soon as those circumstances cease to exist. (4.) Those which have their ground in the universal and permanent state and relations of men in this world, and hence are intended to be as universal and as permanent as those relations.

It is evident that the Scriptural law as to the Sabbath comes partly under the fourth and partly also under the second of these classes.

1. The law of the Sabbath in part has its ground in the universal and permanent needs of human nature, and especially of men embraced under an economy of redemption. It is designed -- (1.) To keep in remembrance the fact that God created the world and all its inhabitants (Genesis 2:2-3; Exodus 10:11), which is the great fundamental fact in all religion, whether natural or revealed. (2.) As changed to the first day of the week it is designed to keep in remembrance the fact of the ascension of the crucified Redeemer and his session at the right hand of power, the great central fact in the religion of Christ. (3.) To be a perpetual type of the eternal Sabbath of the saints which remains. Hebrews 4:3-11. (4.) To afford a suitable time for the public and private worship of God and the religious instruction of the people. (5.) To afford a suitable period of rest from the wear and tear of labour, which is rendered alike physically and morally necessary from the present constitution of human nature and from the condition of man in this world.

All of these reasons for the institution of the Sabbath have their ground in human nature, and remain in full force among all men of all nations, in all stages of intellectual and moral development. Hence the Sabbath was introduced as a divine institution at the creation of the race, and was then enjoined upon man as man, and hence upon the race generally and in perpetuity. Genesis 2:2-3. Hence we find that the Jews (Genesis 7:10; Genesis 8:10; Genesis 29:27-28; Job 2:13), and all Gentile nations also, as the Egyptians, Arabians, Indians, etc., divided their time by weeks, or periods of seven days, from the earliest ages. Hence before the giving of the law the Jews were required to observe the Sabbath. Exodus 16:23. Hence also the law with respect to the Sabbath has been incorporated into the Decalogue, as one of the ten requirements in which the entire moral law, touching all our relations to God and to our fellow-men, is generalized and

condensed. It was written by the finger of God on stone. It is put side by side with the commandments which require us to love God, to honour his name, and which forbid unchastity and murder. It was put, as a part of the "testimonies of God," under the "mercy-seat," at the foundation of his throne. And hence, when the great commandment is uttered, God does not say, "I appoint to you a Sabbath-day," but, "remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy," -- evidently implying that he was referring to a well-known and pre-existent institution common to the Jews with the Gentiles. And the reason annexed for the enactment of the law is not a fact peculiar to Jewish history, but a fact underlying all the relations God sustains to the entire race, and, as before shown, the fact out of which the Sabbatic institution had originated thousands of years before --" For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea," etc. Exodus 20:8-11. So Christ says, "The Sabbath was made for man;" that is, for mankind. Mark 2:27.

2. The law of the Sabbath, in fact, is also a positive commandment, having its ground in the will of God as supreme Lord. That a certain portion of time should be set apart for the worship of God and the religious instruction of men is a plain dictate of reason. That a certain portion of time should be set apart for rest from labour is by experience found to be, on physiological and moral grounds, highly desirable. That some monument of the creation of the world and of the resurrection of Christ, and that some permanent and frequently-recurring type of the rest of heaven, should be instituted, is eminently desirable for man, considered as a religious being. But that all these ends should be combined and secured by one institution, and that precisely one whole day in seven should be allotted to that purpose, and that this one day in seven should be at one time the seventh and afterward the first day of the week, is evidently a matter of positive enactment, and binds us as long as the indications of the divine will in the matter remain unchanged. The time of observance was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week in the age of the apostles, and consequently with their sanction; and that day, as "the Lord’s day" (Revelation 1:10), has ever since been observed in the stead of the ancient Sabbath, in all portions and ages of the Christian Church. We accept this change as it comes to us, and believe it to be according to the will of God -- (1.) Because of its apostolic origin; (2.) Because of the transcendent importance of the resurrection of Christ, which is thus associated with the creation of the world by God, as the foundation of the Christian religion; and (3.) Because of the universal consent of Christians of all generations and denominations, and the approbation of the Holy Ghost that dwelleth in them that is implied thereby. As to the observance of the Christian Sabbath, the obvious general rule is, that it is to be observed, (1.) Not in the spirit of the law, which Christ condemns Matthew 12:1; Luke 13:15), but in the holy and free spirit of the gospel, (2.) In accordance with the ends for which it is instituted, and which have been above enumerated.

Since God has appointed the Sabbath to be one day in seven, we should consecrate the whole day, without curtailment or alienation, to the purposes designed; that is, to rest from worldly labour, the worship of God, and the religious instruction of our fellow-men. We should be diligent in using the whole day for these purposes, and to avoid, and, as far as lieth in us, lead our fellow-men to avoid, all that hinders the most profitable application of the day to its proper ends. And nothing is to be allowed to interfere with this consecration of the day except the evident and reasonable demands of necessity as far as our own interests are concerned, and of mercy as far as the necessities of our fellow-men and of dependent animals are concerned.

01.22. Of Lawful Oaths and Vows

Chapter Twenty-two

Of Lawful Oaths and Vows

SECTION 1: A lawful oath is a part of religious worship,(1) wherein, upon just occasion, the person swearing solemnly calleth God to witness what he asserteth, or promiseth, and to judge him according to the truth or falsehood of what he sweareth.(2)

(1) Deuteronomy 10:20; Isaiah 45:23; Romans 14:11; Php 2:10-11 (2) Exodus 20:7; Leviticus 19:12; Romans 1:9; 2 Corinthians 1:23; 1 Corinthians 11:31; Galatians 1:20; 2 Chronicles 6:22-23

SECTION 2: The name of God only is that by which men ought to swear, and therein it is to be used with all holy fear and reverence.(3) Therefore, to swear vainly, or rashly, by that glorious and dreadful Name; or, to swear at all by any other thing, is sinful, and to be abhorred.(4) Yet, as in matters of weight and moment, an oath is warranted by the Word of God, under the new testament as well as under the old;(5) so a lawful oath, being imposed by lawful authority, in such matters, ought to be taken.(6)

(3) Deuteronomy 6:12; Joshua 23:7 (4) Exodus 20:7; Jeremiah 5:7; Matthew 5:33-37; James 5:12

(5) Hebrews 6:16; 2 Corinthians 1:23; Isaiah 65:16 (6) 1 Kings 8:31; Nehemiah 13:25; Ezra 10:5

SECTION 3: Whosoever taketh an oath ought duly to consider the weightiness of so solemn an act, and therein to avouch nothing but what he is fully persuaded is the truth:(7) neither may any man bind himself by oath to anything but what is good and just, and what he believeth so to be, and what he is able and resolved to perform.(8) Yet it is a sin to refuse an oath touching any thing that is good and just, being imposed by lawful authority.

(7) Exodus 20:7; Leviticus 19:12; Jeremiah 4:2; Hosea 10:4 (8) Genesis 24:2-9; Nehemiah 5:12-13; Ecclesiastes 5:2, Ecclesiastes 5:5

SECTION 4: An oath is to be taken in the plain and common sense of the words, without equivocation, or mental reservation.(9) It cannot oblige to sin; but in anything not sinful, being taken, it binds to performance, although to a man's own hurt.(10) Nor is it to be violated, although made to heretics, or infidels.(11)

(9) Jeremiah 4:2; Psalms 24:4 (10) 1 Samuel 25:22, 1 Samuel 25:32-34; Psalms 15:4 (11) Ezekiel 17:16-19; Joshua 9:18-19; 2 Samuel 21:1 The subjects treated of in these sections are -- 1. The nature of a lawful oath. 2. The only name in which it is lawful to swear. 3. The propriety and duty of taking oaths upon proper occasions. 4. The sense in which an oath is to be interpreted. And, 5. The extent and grounds of its binding obligation.

1. A lawful oath consists in calling upon God, the occasion being of sufficient seriousness and importance, to witness the truth of what we affirm as true, or our voluntary assumption of an

obligation to do something in the future -- with an implied imprecation of God's disfavour if we lie or prove unfaithful to our engagements. This last is generally expressed by the phrase forming the concluding part of the formula of most oaths, "So help me God; "-- i.e., Let God so help me as I have told the truth, or as I will keep my promise.

Hence an oath is an act of supreme religious worship, since it recognizes the omnipresence, omniscience, absolute justice and sovereignty of the Person whose august witness is invoked, and whose judgment is appealed to as final.

2. It hence follows that it is a sin equivalent to that of worshipping a false god if we swear by any other than the only true and living God; and a sin of idolatry if we swear by any thing or place, although it be associated with the true God. Those who swear with uplifted hand swear by the God who created, preserves, and governs all things. Those who swear with hand upon or kissing the Bible, swear by the God who reveals himself in the Bible -- that is, by the true Christian God. It is evident that none who believe in the true God can, consistently with their integrity, swear by a false god. And it is no less evident that it is dishonest for an atheist to go through the form of swearing at all; or for an infidel to swear with his hand upon the Christian Scriptures, thereby professing to invoke a God in whose existence he does not believe. This principle is fully recognized in Scripture. We are told to swear by the true God: "Unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear," Isaiah 45:23; "He that sweareth in the earth shall swear by the God of truth," Isaiah 65:16; "Thou shalt fear JEHOVAH thy God and serve him, and shalt swear by his name," Deuteronomy 6:13. We are forbidden to swear by the name of false gods: " How shall I pardon thee for this? thy children have forsaken me, and sworn by them that are no gods." Jeremiah 5:7; Joshua 23:7.

3. The literal meaning of the Third Commandment is, "Thou shalt not take the name of thy God in that which is false" -- that is, to confirm an untruth. The command not to take a false oath, or any oath upon a trifling occasion, by implication carries with it the permission to call upon the God of truth to confirm the truth upon all worthy occasions. Hence the oath is enjoined in the Old Testament as a recognized religious institution. Deuteronomy 6:13; Deuteronomy 10:20, etc. Christ himself, when put upon oath in the form common among the Jews, did not hesitate to answer. Matthew 26:63-64. Paul often appeals to God for the truth of his statements -- thus: " God is my witness;" "I call God for a record upon my soul." Romans 1:9; 2 Corinthians 1:23. In Hebrews 6:13-18, Paul declares that God, in order "to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath;" and that, "because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself."

It is evident, therefore, that the words of our Saviour (Matthew 5:33-37), " Swear not at all," cannot be intended to forbid swearing upon proper occasions in the name of the true God, but must be designed to forbid the calling upon his name in ordinary conversation and on trifling occasions, and the swearing by that which is not God. The proper occasions upon which an oath may be taken are all those in which serious and perfectly lawful interests are involved, and in which an appeal to the witness of God is necessary to secure confidence and end strife (Hebrews 6:16); and also whenever the oath is imposed by competent authority upon those subject to it. In the latter case, our Confession says that the taking the oath is a duty, and its refusal a sin. The oath, of course, both because of its nature as an act of divine worship and because of the effect

designed to be attained by it -- namely, the establishment of confidence among men -- ought always to be administered and taken in a reverent manner, and with whatever outward action -- such as raising the hand, placing it upon the Scriptures or kissing them -- as by common consent is generally understood, by all parties and witnesses, to signify that the God appealed to is the true God of creation, of providence, and of the Christian revelation.

4. The oath is always to be interpreted and kept sacred by the person taking it, in the sense in which he honestly believes that it is understood by the person who imposes it. It is evident that if the government, the judge, the magistrate, or a private fellow-citizen, require an oath from us for their satisfaction, and if we put a private sense upon the matter upon which we invoke the witness of God different from that which we know they understand by it, that we deceive them intentionally; and, by calling God to witness our truth while we are engaged in the very act of a lie, we commit the sin of perjury.

5. The obligation of the oath arises (1.) out of the original and universal obligation to speak the truth and to keep faith in all engagements; (2.) and, in addition to this, our obligation to honour God, and to avoid dishonouring him by invoking his witness to a falsehood; (3.) the profanity involved in suspending our hopes of God's favour upon the truth of that which we know and intend to be false. An oath cannot bind to that which is in itself unlawful, because the obligation of the law is imposed upon us by the will of God, and therefore takes precedence of all obligations imposed upon us by the will of men or by ourselves; and the lesser obligation cannot relieve from the greater. The sin is in taking the oath to do the unlawful thing, not in breaking it. Therefore Luther was right in breaking his monastic vows. Neither can an oath to do that which is impossible bind, for its impossibility is an expression of the will of God. But an oath to do what is in itself right and binding imposes an additional obligation to perform it -- the obligation imposed by the law, and the obligation voluntarily assumed by ourselves. And an oath to do anything which is lawful binds both for truth's sake and for God's sake. And --

(1.) This obligation evidently does not depend upon the goodness or badness of the persons imposing the oath. An oath to an infidel or a heretic binds as much as an oath to a saint. The Romanists excuse the practice of their Church of releasing persona from the obligation of oaths to infidels or heretics, and of breaking faith generally with all with whom she has controversy, on the plea that an oath cannot bind to that which is unlawful or release from a prior obligation, and that the highest of all obligations is to subserve at all cost the interest of the Church. But they deliberately make the oath in order to break it, and there- fore both lie and profane God's holy name in the making and the breaking. Besides, the interest of the Church is not the superior law which takes precedence of all oaths, but the clearly revealed will of God only.

(2.) The obligation of the oath binds even when a man swears to his own disadvantage. Psalms 15:4.

(3.) Nor is the obligation impaired when the oath is extorted either by violence or fraud. Thus the oaths imposed by conquerors upon the vanquished bind, because they are voluntarily assumed in preference to the alternatives presented. And thus Joshua kept the oath which the Gibeonites had induced him through deceit to swear in their behalf. Joshua 9:8-27.

SECTION 5: A vow is of the like nature with a promissory oath, and ought to be made with the like religious care, and to be performed with the like faithfulness.(12) (12) Numbers 30:2; Isaiah 19:21; Ecclesiastes 5:4-6; Psalms 61:8; Psalms 66:13-14

SECTION 6: It is not to be made to any creature, but to God alone:(13) and, that it may be accepted, it is to be made voluntarily, out of faith, and conscience of duty, in way of thankfulness for mercy received, or for the obtaining of what we want, whereby we more strictly bind ourselves to necessary duties; or, to other things, so far and so long as they may fitly conduce thereunto.(14)

(13) Psalms 50:14; Psalms 76:11; Psalms 116:14 (14) Deuteronomy 23:21-23; Genesis 28:20-22; 1 Samuel 1:11; Psalms 66:13-14; Psalms 132:2-5

SECTION 7: No man may vow to do anything forbidden in the Word of God, or what would hinder any duty therein commanded, or which is not in his own power, and for the performance whereof he hath no promise of ability from God.(15) In which respects, popish monastical vows of perpetual single life, professed poverty, and regular obedience, are so far from being degrees of higher perfection, that they are superstitious and sinful snares, in which no Christian may entangle himself.(16)

(15) Acts 23:12-14; Mark 6:26; Numbers 30:5, Numbers 30:8, Numbers 30:12-13 (16) Matthew 10:11-12; 1 Corinthians 7:2, 1 Corinthians 7:9; Hebrews 13:4; Ephesians 4:28; 1 Thessalonians 4:11-12; 1 Corinthians 7:23 The vow is a promise made to God. In the oath, the parties are both men, and God is invoked as a witness. In the vow, God is the party to whom the promise is made. It is of like nature with an oath, because we are bound to observe them on the same grounds -- because of our obligation to truth, and because of our obligation to reverence God. Lightly to vow on a trifling occasion, or having vowed to fail to keep it, is an act of profanity to God. As in the case of the oath, we have abundant Scriptural sanction for the vow. Ecclesiastes 5:4; Psalms 76:11; 1 Samuel 1:11; and the case of Paul, Acts 18:18. Reception of either of the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper involves very sacred and binding vows to God; and the same is repeated whenever in prayer, orally or in writing, we formally or informally renew our covenant promises to God. Thus a vow, as any other promise, may bind generally to loyal obedience or specially to some particular action. A vow cannot bind to do that which is unlawful or impossible, for reasons before explained in relation to an oath; nor when made by a child or other person under authority and destitute of the right to bind themselves of their own will. Numbers 30:1-8. Nor can it continue to bind in cases in which its continued observance is found clearly to be inconsistent with our spiritual interests; for then it is certain that God does not wish it, and a promise can never bind when the party to whom it is made does not desire it kept. When the matter of the vow is not unlawful, but morally indifferent, the vow is binding; but experience abundantly proves that to accumulate such obligations is very injurious. The Word of God in the Scriptures imposes upon us by his authority all that it is his will or for our interest for us to observe. The multiplication of self-imposed duties dishonours him, and greatly harasses us and endangers our safety. Vows had better be restricted to the voluntary assumption and promise to observe, with the help of divine grace, duties imposed by God and plainly revealed in the Scriptures .

01.23. Of the Civil Magistrate

Chapter Twenty-three

Of the Civil Magistrate

SECTION 1: God, the supreme Lord and King of all the world, hath ordained civil magistrates, to be, under him, over the people, for his own glory, and the public good: and, to this end, hath armed them with the power of the sword, for the defense and encouragement of them that are good, and for the punishment of evildoers.(1) (1) Romans 13:1-4; 1 Peter 2:13-14

SECTION 2: It is lawful for Christians to accept and execute the office of a magistrate, when called thereunto:(2) in the managing whereof, as they ought especially to maintain piety, justice, and peace, according to the wholesome laws of each commonwealth;(3) so, for that end, they may lawfully, now under the new testament, wage war, upon just and necessary occasion.(4)

(2) Genesis 41:39-43; Nehemiah 12:26; Nehemiah 13:15-31; Daniel 2:48-49; Proverbs 8:15-16; Romans 13:1-4 (3) Psalms 2:10-12; Psalms 82:3-4; 1 Timothy 2:2; 2 Samuel 23:3; 1 Peter 2:13 (4) Luke 3:14; Romans 13:4; Matthew 8:9-10; Acts 10:1-2

THESE sections teach as follows: --

1. Civil government is a divine institution, and hence the duty of obedience to our legitimate rulers is a duty owed to God as well as to our fellow-men. Some have supposed that the right or legitimate authority of human government has its foundation ultimately in "the consent of the governed," "the will of the majority," or in some imaginary "social compact" entered into by the forefathers of the race at the origin of social life. It is self-evident, however, that the divine will is the source of all government; and the obligation to obey that will, resting upon all moral agents, the ultimate ground of all obligation to obey human governments. This is certain -- (1.) Because God is the Creator and absolute Possessor of all men. (2.) Because he has formed their constitution as intelligent, morally responsible, free agents, and is the Lord of the conscience. (3.) Because he is the supreme moral Governor of a11 moral agents, and because his all-embracing moral law of absolute perfection requires all that is morally right of every kind, and forbids all that is morally wrong. Hence every moral obligation of every kind is a duty owed to God. (4.) Because God has constituted man a social being in his creation, and has providentially organized him in families and communities, and thus made civil government an absolute necessity. (5.) Because as the providential Ruler of the world God uses civil government as his instrument in promoting the great ends of redemption in the upbuilding of his kingdom in the world. (6.) This is explicitly affirmed in Scripture: "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." Romans 13:1-2. To the good the magistrate is "the minister of God for good; " and to the evil he is a " minister of God, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.' Romans 13:4. Of course God has not prescribed for all men any particular form or order of succession of civil government. He has laid the general foundation both for the duty and necessity of government in the consciences and in the social

natures of all men, and in the circumstances of all communities, while he has left every people free to choose their own form of government in their own way, according to their various degrees of civilization, their social and political condition, their historical antecedents, and as they are instructed by his Word, and led and sustained by his providence. In this sense God as Creator, as revealed in the light of nature, has established civil government among men from the beginning, and among all peoples and nations, of all ages and generations. But in the development of the plan of redemption the God-man as mediatorial King has assumed the government of the universe. Matthew 28:18; Php 2:9-11; Ephesians 1:17-23. As the universe constitutes one physical and moral system, it was necessary that his headship as Mediator should extend to the whole and to every department thereof, in order that all things should work together for good to his people and for his glory, that all his enemies should be subdued and finally judged and punished, and that all creatures should worship him, as his Father had determined. Romans 8:28; 1 Corinthians 15:25; Hebrews 10:13; Hebrews 1:6; Revelation 5:9-13. Hence the present providential Governor of the physical universe and "Ruler among the nations" is Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews, to whose will all laws should be conformed, and whom all nations and all rulers of men should acknowledge and serve. "He hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS. Revelation 19:16.

2. The proximate end for which God has ordained magistrates is the promotion of the public good, and the ultimate end is the promotion of his own glory. This evidently follows from the revealed fact that the glory or manifested excellence of the Creator is the chief end he had in the general system of things, and hence the appointed chief end of each intelligent agent. Romans 9:22-23; Romans 11:36; Colossians 1:16; Ephesians 1:5-6; 1 Peter 4:11. If the glory of God is the chief end of every man, it must be the chief end equally of all nations and communities of men; and it ought to be made the governing purpose of every individual in all his relations and actions, public and official, as well as private and personal. And if the glory of God is his chief end, it is that to which all other objects and designs are subordinated as ends. The specific way in which the civil magistrate is to endeavour to advance the glory of God is through the promotion of the good of the community (Romans 13:4) in temporal concerns, including education, morals, physical prosperity, the protection of life and property, and the preservation of order. And --

3. Christian magistrates should also seek in their influential positions to promote piety as well as order. 1 Timothy 2:1-2. This they are to do, not by assuming the functions of the Church, nor by attempting by endowments officially to patronize or control the Church, but personally by their example, and officially by giving impartial protection and all due facility for the Church in its work; by the explicit recognition of God and of Jesus Christ "as Ruler among the nations;" and by the enactment and enforcement of all laws conceived in the true spirit of the Gospel, touching all questions upon which the Scriptures indicate the will of God specifically or in general principle, and especially as touching questions of the Sabbath-day, the oath, marriage and divorce, capital punishments, etc., etc.

4. It is lawful for Christians to accept and execute the once of a magistrate. This is evident enough. Indeed, in the highest sense, it is lawful for none other than Christians to be magistrates or any thing else, since it is a violation of God’s will that any man is not a Christian. And the greater the number and the importance of the relations a man assumes, the greater becomes his obligation to be a Christian, in order that he may be qualified to discharge them all for the glory of God and the

good of all concerned.

5. Christian magistrates may lawfully, under the New Testament, wage war upon just and necessary occasions. The right and duty of self-defense is established by the inalienable instincts of nature, by reason, conscience, the Word of God, and the universal consent of mankind. If it is right for an individual to take life in self-defense, it must be equally right for a community to do so on the same principle.

It is very difficult to decide in particular cases when it is right for a Christian nation to go to war, and it is not our place to consider such questions. But the following general principles are very plain and very certain: -- War is an incalculable evil, because of the lives it destroys, the misery it occasions, and the moral degradation it infallibly works on all sides -- upon the vanquished and the victor, the party originally in the right and the party in the wrong. In every war one party at least must be in the wrong, involved in the tremendous guilt of unjustifiable war, and in the vast majority of cases both parties are in the wrong. No plea of honour, glory or aggrandizement, policy or profit, can excuse, much less justify, war; nothing short of necessity to the end of the preservation of national existence. In order to make a war right in God's sight, it is not only necessary that our enemy should aim to do us a wrong, but also (1.) That the wrong he attempts should directly or remotely threaten the national life; and (2.) That war be the only means to avert it. Even in this case every other means of securing justice and maintaining national safety should be exhausted before recourse is had to this last resort. A war may be purely defensive in spirit and intent while it is aggressive in the manner in which it is conducted. The question of right depends upon the former, not the latter -- upon the purpose for which, and not upon the mere order in which, or theatre upon which, the attack is made.

SECTION 3: Civil magistrates may not assume to themselves the administration of the Word and sacraments; or the power of the keys of the kingdom of heaven;(5) or, in the least, interfere in matters of faith.(6) Yet, as nursing fathers, it is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the church of our common Lord, without giving the preference to any denomination of Christians above the rest, in such a manner that all ecclesiastical persons whatever shall enjoy the full, free, and unquestioned liberty of discharging every part of their sacred functions, without violence or danger.(7) And, as Jesus Christ hath appointed a regular government and discipline in his church, no law of any commonwealth should interfere with, let, or hinder, the due exercise thereof, among the voluntary members of any denomination of Christians, according to their own profession and belief.(8) It is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the person and good name of all their people, in such an effectual manner as that no person be suffered, either upon pretense of religion or of infidelity, to offer any indignity, violence, abuse, or injury to any other person whatsoever: and to take order, that all religious and ecclesiastical assemblies be held without molestation or disturbance.(9)

(5) 2 Chronicles 26:18; Matthew 16:19; Matthew 18:17; 1 Corinthians 4:1, 1 Corinthians 4:12; 1 Corinthians 12:28-29; Ephesians 4:11-12; Romans 10:15; Hebrews 5:4 (6) John 18:36; Acts 5:29; Ephesians 4:11-12

(7) Isaiah 49:23; Romans 13:1-6 (8) Psalms 105:15 (9) Romans 13:4; 1 Timothy 2:2

SECTION 4: It is the duty of people to pray for magistrates (10), to honor their persons,(11) to pay them tribute or other dues,(12) to obey their lawful commands, and to be subject to their authority, for conscience' sake.(13) Infidelity, or difference in religion, doth not make void the magistrates' just and legal authority, nor free the people from their due obedience to them :(14) from which ecclesiastical persons are not exempted,(15) much less hath the pope any power and jurisdiction over them in their dominions, or over any of their people; and, least of all, to deprive them of their dominions, or lives, if he shall judge them to be heretics, or upon any other pretense whatsoever.(16)

(10) 1 Timothy 2:1-3 (11) 1 Peter 2:17 (12) Matthew 22:21; Romans 13:6-7 (13) Romans 13:5 Titus 3:1 (14) 1 Peter 2:13-16 (15) Romans 13:1; Acts 25:9-11; 2 Peter 2:1, 2 Peter 2:10-11; Jude 1:8-11 (16) Mark 10:42-44; Matthew 23:8-12; 2 Timothy 2:24; 1 Peter 5:3

These sections teach that the Church and the State are both divine institutions, having different objects and spheres of action, different governments and officers, and hence, while owing mutual good offices, are independent of each other. This is opposed --

1. To the Papal doctrine of the relation of the State to the Church. According to the strictly logical ultramontane view, the whole nation being in all its members a portion of the Church universal, the civil organization is comprehended within the Church for certain ends subordinate to the great end for which the Church exists, and is therefore ultimately responsible to it for the exercise of the authority delegated. Hence, whenever the Pope has been in a condition to vindicate his authority, he has put kingdoms under interdict, released subjects from their vow of allegiance, and deposed sovereigns because of the assumed heresy or insubordination of the civil rulers of the land. Our Confession teaches that the State is in its sphere entirely independent of the Church, and that it has civil jurisdiction over all ecclesiastical persons, on the same principles and to the same extent it has over any other class of persons whatsoever.

2. The statements of these sections are opposed also to the Erastian doctrine as to the relation of the State to the Church, which has prevailed in all the nations and national churches of Europe. This doctrine regards the State as a divine institution, designed to provide for all the wants of men, spiritual as well as temporal, and that it is consequently charged with the duty of providing for the dissemination of pure doctrine and for the proper administration of the sacraments and of discipline. It is the duty of the civil magistrate, therefore, to support the Church, to appoint its officers, to define its laws, and to superintend their administration. Thus in the State Churches of Protestant Germany and England the sovereign is the supreme ruler of the Church as well as of the State, and the civil magistrate has chosen and imposed the confessions of faith, the system of government, the order of worship, and the entire course of ecclesiastical administration. In opposition to this, our Confession teaches that religious liberty is an inalienable prerogative of mankind (chapter 20.), and that it involves the unlimited right upon the part of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. Hence, ecclesiastical rulers, although endowed with the power of the keys, are not allowed to apply any civil pains or disabilities to coerce men to obey the laws they administer. Hence, also, the civil magistrate, while bound to protect church members and ecclesiastical organizations in the peaceful enjoyment of their rights and discharge of their functions, is nevertheless allowed no official jurisdiction whatever in the affairs of the Church. The same person may be a civil magistrate and a church member. In

the one case he is a ruler -- in the other a subject. Or the same person may be a civil magistrate and a church officer, and rule at the same time in both spheres. But his jurisdiction in each case would have entirely independent grounds, objects, spheres, modes and subjects of operation.

These sections also teach that obedience to civil magistrates, when making or executing laws within the proper sphere of the State, is a duty binding upon all the subjects of government for conscience' sake by the authority of God. This follows directly from the fact, as before shown, that civil government is an ordinance of God -- that the powers that be are ordained of God for certain ends; hence obedience to them is obedience to God. It follows hence -- (1.) That this obedience ought to be from the heart and for conscience' sake, and not of constraint. Hence we will pray for and voluntarily assist our rulers, as well as render mere technical obedience. (2.) Rebellion is a grievous sin, since it is disobedience to God, and since it necessarily works such permanent physical ruin and social demoralization among our fellow-men. The limit of this obligation to obedience will be found only when we are commanded to do something contrary to the superior authority of God (Acts 4:19; Acts 5:29); or when the civil government has become so radically and incurably corrupt that it has ceased to accomplish the ends for which it was established. When that point has unquestionably been reached, when all means of redress have been exhausted without avail, when there appears no prospect of securing reform in the government, itself, and some good prospect of securing it by revolution, then it is the privilege and duty of a Christian people to change their government -- peacefully if they may, forcibly if they must.

01.24. Of Marriage and Divorce

Chapter Twenty-four

Of Marriage and Divorce

SECTION 1: Marriage is to be between one man and one woman: neither is it lawful for any man to have more than one wife, nor for any woman to have more than one husband, at the same time.(1) (1) Genesis 2:24; Matthew 19:4-6; Romans 7:3; Proverbs 2:17

SECTION 2: Marriage was ordained for the mutual help of husband and wife,(2) for the increase of mankind with legitimate issue, and of the church with an holy seed;(3) and for preventing of uncleanness.(4)

(2) Genesis 2:18; Ephesians 5:28; 1 Peter 3:7 (3) Genesis 1:28; Genesis 9:1; Malachi 2:15 (4) 1 Corinthians 7:2, 1 Corinthians 7:9

SECTION 3: It is lawful for all sorts of people to marry, who are able with judgment to give their consent. (5) Yet it is the duty of Christians to marry only in the Lord.(6) And therefore such as profess the true reformed religion should not marry with infidels, papists, or other idolaters: neither should such as are godly be unequally yoked, by marrying with such as are notoriously wicked in their life, or maintain damnable heresies.(7)

(5) Hebrews 13:4; 1 Timothy 4:3; 1 Corinthians 7:36-38; Genesis 24:57-58 (6) 1 Corinthians 7:39 (7) Genesis 34:14; Exodus 34:16; see 2 Corinthians 6:14; Deuteronomy 7:3-4; 1 Kings 11:4; Nehemiah 13:25-27; Malachi 2:11-12

IT is taught in these sections: --

1. That marriage was ordained. of God, and is therefore a divine institution, involving a religious as well as a civil contract.

2. The ends designed to be promoted by marriage are specified.

3. It is affirmed that the law of marriage allows it to be contracted only between one man and one woman, and that a man can have but one wife and a woman but one husband at the same time.

4. The pre-eminent sanctity of a life of celibacy is denied, and the lawfulness of marriage for all classes of men is affirmed.

5. It is taught that persons of different religions should not intermarry, and that true believers should not be unequally yoked with the ungodly.

1. Marriage was ordained of God, and is therefore a divine institution. This is so -- (1.) Because God created man male and female, and so constituted them, physically and morally, that they are mutually adapted to each other and are mutually helpful to each other under the law of marriage, and not otherwise; and (2.) Because the law of marriage, the conditions of its contract,

continuance and dissolution, are laid down in the Word of God.

Hence it follows that marriage is a religious as well as a civil contract. No State has any right to change the law of marriage, or the conditions upon which it, may be lawfully constituted or dissolved, as these have been ordained by God. Neither has any man or woman a right to contract any relation different in any respect, as to its character or duration, from that which God has ordained as marriage. Hence marriage is a human contract under the limits and sanctions of a divine constitution, and the parties contracting pledge their vows of truth and constancy to God as well as to each other and to society. But it is also a civil contract, because every State is bound to protect the foundations upon which social order reposes, and every marriage involves many obvious civil obligations and leads to many civil consequences touching property, the custody of children, etc. The State must therefore define the nature and civil effects of marriage, and prescribe conditions upon which and modes in which it shall be publicly acknowledged and ratified or dissolved. It is of the highest importance that the laws of the State do not contravene the laws of God upon this subject, but be made in all respects to conform to them. In all cases of such conflict Christians and Christian ministers must obey God rather than men. In Great Britain the civil authorities have transgressed the authority of God in this matter, chiefly by declaring marriages, really binding in God's sight, to be null and void ab initio, because of some trivial illegality as to the time in which or the persons by whom it was solemnized. In this country (America) the sin is chiefly committed in the matter of allowing the marriage bond to be dissolved for many causes not recognized as valid in the Word of God. The law of the land is to be obeyed for conscience sake whenever it does not contravene the higher law of God. When it plainly does so, then Christian men and church sessions are to act themselves and to treat others just as if the ungodly human enactment had no existence, and then take the consequences.

2. The main ends designed to be promoted by marriage are stated to be -- (1.) The mutual help of husband and wife. (2.) The increase of mankind with a legitimate issue. (3.) The increase of the Church of Christ with a holy seed. (4.) The prevention of uncleanness.

3. The law of God makes marriage a contract for life between one man and one woman. The proof of this is as follows: --

(1.) God instituted marriage at first between one man and one woman.

(2.) He has providentially preserved in all ages and among all nations an equal number of births of each sex.

(3.) Experience shows that physically, economically, and morally, polygamy defeats all the ends for which marriage was designed, and is inconsistent with human nature and the relations of the sexes, while monogamy proves in the highest degree adapted to effect those ends.

(4.) This original law of God and of nature is of course dispensable in special cases and under peculiar conditions by the Lawgiver; and whenever, and to whatsoever extent, it is thus dispensed it ceases to be binding, and its non-observance ceases to be sin. Thus Moses, as God's agent, allowed a dispensation of this law of monogamy, which had been long disregarded among the ancestors of the Israelites, "but from the beginning it was not so." Matthew 19:8.

(5.) Christ expressly withdraws this dispensation, and restores the law of marriage to its original basis: " Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery." Matthew 19:9. It is obvious that it is not the putting away a wife improperly, but it is the marrying another before she is dead, that is the act of adultery. And on the woman's side the adultery cannot consist in being put away, but in marrying another man while her husband lives. Hence for a man to have two wives, or a woman two husbands, living at the same time, divorced or not, is adultery, with the sole exceptions noted above.

4. Our Confession teaches that marriage is lawful for all sorts of people who have intelligence sufficient to consent. The Romish Church allows that marriage is lawful for the great mass of men as a concession to the weakness of the flesh, but maintains that a life of celibacy is both meritorious and more conducive to spiritual elevation. Hence they say a life of celibacy is recommended by Christ (Matthew 19:10-12) as one of his evangelical counsels, by-the observance of which supererogatory merit may be attained; and hence the Romish Church imposes it as a universal and imperative obligation upon its clergy. This all Protestants deny for the following reasons: --

(1.) God created man male and female, and constituted the relation of the sexes, and ordained marriage in Paradise when man was innocent. Marriage, therefore, must be purely good, and a means of good in itself, except when abused by man.

(2.) The relation is honoured in being selected as the highest earthly type of the grandest heavenly fact -- namely, the mystical union of the eternal Word with his Bride the Church. Ephesians 5:28-33. (3.) Reason and experience unite in showing that the relation is the best conceivable condition for the bringing out and educating the noblest moral instincts and faculties of human nature. The best and noblest men of the Old World and the New have been formed in the family.

(4.) The vast experiment of celibacy on the part of the priesthood and of the monastic houses of the Roman Church proves our position by showing the impoverishing and degrading tendency of the opposite system. The true meaning of what is taught by our Saviour, Matthew 19:10-12, and by Paul, 1 Corinthians 7:1-40, is, that the unmarried are exposed to less worldly care than the married; therefore, that in times of persecution and public danger, and with reference to some special kind of service to which God providentially calls a man, it may be both his interest and his duty not to marry. It appears evident that, even in the present age, some kinds of missionary service both at home and abroad might be more efficiently accomplished for the glory of God and the good of men if our younger ministers would consent to regard marriage as less than absolutely essential, and in this respect also "seek' first the kingdom of God and his righteousness."

5. The principle that professors of the true should not intermarry with professors of a false religion, and that true believers should not intermarry with the ungodly, touches not that which is essential to the validity of marriage, but that which belongs to its perfection, and brings in question not the reality of the marriage when formed, but the propriety of forming it. Paul teaches that if one of the parties of a previous marriage becomes a Christian, the other remaining a heathen, the Christian brother or sister remains bound by the marriage-tie as before, unless the heathen party voluntarily abandon them, and so dissolve the relation, when the Christian is no longer bound. 1 Corinthians 7:12-15. On the same principle, the marriages at present so common between the converted and

the unconverted are unquestionably valid, and to be respected as such.

It nevertheless remains true that true Christians owe it both to Christ and to their own souls not to contract such alliances. For how can one who possesses the mind and the spirit of Christ, whose affections are as a practical fact set upon things above, whose motives, aims and aspirations are heavenly, become one flesh and heart, dwell in the most intimate of all possible communion, with a soul dead in trespasses and sins? (See 2 Corinthians 6:14-18.) If such a union is formed, it must follow, either that the sacred ordinance of marriage is desecrated by a union of bodies where there is no union of hearts, or in the intimate fellowship of soul with soul the believer will be greatly depressed in his inward, spiritual life, and greatly hindered in his attempts to serve his Master in the world. 1 Corinthians 7:39.

SECTION 4: Marriage ought not to be within the degrees of consanguinity or affinity forbidden by the Word.(8) Nor can such incestuous marriages ever be made lawful by any law of man or consent of parties, so as those persons may live together as man and wife.(9) The man may not marry any of his wife's kindred, nearer in blood then he may of his own: nor the woman of her husband's kindred, nearer in blood than of her own.

(8) Leviticus 18:6-17; Leviticus 18:24-30; Leviticus 20:19; 1 Corinthians 5:1; Amos 2:7 (9) Mark 6:18; Leviticus 18:24-28

SECTION 5: Adultery or fornication committed after a contract, being detected before marriage, giveth just occasion to the innocent party to dissolve that contract.(10) In the case of adultery after marriage, it is lawful for the innocent party to sue out a divorce:(11) and, after the divorce, to marry another, as if the offending party were dead.(12) (10) Matthew 1:18-20; see Deuteronomy 22:23-24 (11) Matthew 5:31-32 (12) Matthew 19:9; Romans 7:2-3

SECTION 6: Although the corruption of man be such as is apt to study arguments unduly to put asunder those whom God hath joined together in marriage: yet, nothing but adultery, or such willful desertion as can no way be remedied by the church, or civil magistrate, is cause sufficient of dissolving the bond of marriage:(13) wherein, a public and orderly course of proceeding is to be observed; and the persons concerned in it not left to their own wills, and discretion, in their own case.(14) (13) Matthew 19:8-9; 1 Corinthians 7:15; Matthew 19:6 (14) Deuteronomy 24:1-4 These sections teach the divine law of marriage as to incest and as to divorce. I. INCEST consists of sexual intercourse between parties forbidden by the divine law to marry, because of their relationship. Marriage between these parties is impossible; and no matter what may be the provisions of human laws or the decisions of human courts, such pretended marriages are void ab initio -- invalid in essence as well as improper and injurious. Since the degrees of relationship within which marriage is excluded differ in nearness, so the crime of incest differs, according to these varying degrees, from the highest to the least measure of criminality. The obligation to avoid intermarriage between near blood-relations is a dictate of nature as well as of the Word of God. The only law on this subject in the Scriptures is the Levitical law recorded in Leviticus 17:6-23; Leviticus 20:10-21. If this law is still binding, it carries with it the principle that it is incest for a man to cohabit with any one of his deceased wife's relations nearer in blood. than it is lawful for him to do of his own. If this law is not binding now, there is no other law of God remaining on the subject of incest except the law of nature. The Greek and Roman Catholic Churches agree in holding that this law is still binding, since the reason of the law rests upon permanent relationships, and not

upon any special circumstances peculiar to society among the Jews. All branches of the Protestant Church -- Episcopal, Lutheran, and Presbyterian -- have maintained the same principle in their Confessions of Faith or canons of discipline. It is asserted in these sections of our Confession. But a great diversity of sentiment and practice prevails in different parts of our (the American) Church, on this subject, and for the most part the enforcement of this rule has been left to the discretion of the majority of each local church court. Several efforts have been made, in 1826 and 1827, and 1843, 1845, and 1847, to have this section of this chapter changed, but without effect.

2. The divine law as to DIVORCE is, that marriage is a contract for life between one man and one woman, and that it is,ipso facto, dissolved only by death (Romans 7:2, Romans 7:8); and that the only causes upon which any civil authority can dissolve the union of those whom God has joined together are (a.) adultery, (b.) willful, causeless, and incurable desertion.

(1.) The only causes upon which it is lawful to grant a divorce are -- (a.) adultery; this is explicitly allowed by Christ Matthew 5:31-32; Matthew 19:9); and (b.) willful, causeless, and incurable desertion. This is allowed by Paul to the Christian husband, or wife deserted by their heathen partner. 1 Corinthians 7:15. The reason in the case is also self-evident, since such desertion, being total and incurable, makes the marriage an empty name, void of all reality; and, being causeless, leaves the deserting party without remaining rights to be defended.

(2.) Such causes, however, do not, ipso facto, dissolve the marriage bond, but only give the right to the innocent party, if they so elect, to demand that it shall be dissolved by competent authority. And if they do demand the dissolution, they are not left to their own discretion in the case, but they must seek for the vindication of their rights at the hands of the public authorities and according to the law of the land.

(3.) The civil law, however, has no authority to grant divorces upon any other grounds than those above defined as allowed by the law of God. Whenever they do so, as is constantly done in fact, the civil authorities put themselves into direct conflict with the law of God in the case. Hence all Christians and church courts are bound in such cases to disregard the judgment of the civil authority, and to regard and treat such unlawful divorces as null and void. And if the parties to a marriage unrighteously dissolved marry again, they are to be regarded and treated by those who fear God as living in those new marriages in the sin of adultery. Matthew 19:8-9; Acts 4:19; Acts 5:29.

01.25. Of the Church

Chapter Twenty-five

Of the Church

SECTION 1: The catholic or universal church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect, that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the Head thereof; and is the spouse, the body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all.(1) (1) Ephesians 1:10, Ephesians 1:22-23; Ephesians 5:23, Ephesians 5:27, Ephesians 5:32; Colossians 1:18

SECTION 2: The visible church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel (not confined to one nation, as before under the law), consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion;(2) and of their children:(3) and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ,(4) the house and family of God,(5) out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.(6)

(2) 1 Corinthians 1:2; 1 Corinthians 12:12-13; Psalms 2:8; Revelation 7:9; Romans 15:9-12 (3) 1 Corinthians 7:14; Acts 2:39; Genesis 17:7-12; Ezekiel 16:20-21; Romans 11:16; see Galatians 3:7, Galatians 3:9, Galatians 3:14; Romans 4:12, Romans 4:16, Romans 4:24 (4) Matthew 13:47; Isaiah 9:7; Luke 1:32-33; Acts 2:30-36; Colossians 1:13 (5) Ephesians 2:19; Ephesians 3:15 (6) Acts 2:47

SECTION 3: Unto this catholic visible church Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints, in this life, to the end of the world: and doth, by his own presence and Spirit, according to his promise, make them effectual thereunto. (7) (7) 1 Corinthians 12:28; Ephesians 4:11-13; Matthew 28:19-20; Isaiah 59:12 THE word catholic means universal, and therefore is the proper title of the true Church of Christ, viewed as one body, composed of many members, existing in different places and at different times; and is consequently very improperly applied to that corrupt and schismatical body, the Church of Rome. The word in the New Testament corresponding to the English word church is ecclesia (ekklesia); this is derived from the word calein (kalein), to call, to call out, and thus constitute a separate body; which word is used to express the effectual call of the Holy Spirit, whereby he brings dead souls to life in the world of regeneration. Romans 8:28-30; 1 Peter 2:9; 1 Peter 5:10. The word " church," therefore, is a collective term including the whole body of the " called " (kletoi) or the " elect " (eklektoi), or of " believers." Revelation 17:14; 1 Corinthians 1:2, 1 Corinthians 1:24. To this Church, or collective body of the "effectually called," all the promises of the Gospel are addressed. It is said to be the "pillar and ground of the truth " (1 Timothy 3:15); the "body" and "fulness of Christ" (Ephesians 1:22-23); "the Bride, the Lamb’s wife" (Revelation 21:2, Revelation 21:9); and it is affirmed that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Matthew 16:18 As every part of this entire body possesses the common nature of the whole, the common term " Church " is naturally applied sometimes to the entire body, of all nations and ages, conceived of as a unit (Colossians 1:18); and sometimes to the church of a particular province or city, as "the church of the Thessalonians," or "the church of Ephesus " (2 Thessalonians 1:1; Revelation 2:1); or in the

plural for the several individual churches of a province, as "the churches in Asia," or " the churches of Macedonia," or of " Galatia" (1 Corinthians 16:1; 2 Corinthians 8:1; Revelation 1:4); and sometimes the word is applied to designate some Christian family, as " the church in the house of Priscilla and Aquila." Romans 16:5; Colossians 4:15; Philemon 1:2. Our Confession teaches in these sections --

1. That there is a collective body, comprising all the elect of God of all nations and generations, called the Church invisible. The fact that there is such a body must be believed by every person who believes that all men, of every age and nation since Adam, who received Christ and experienced the power of his redemption, are to be saved, and that all who reject him will be lost. That this entire body in its ideal completeness, not one true member wanting, not one false member marring its symmetry, has been constantly present to the mind of God from eternity, must be believed by all persons who acknowledge either or both the divine foreknowledge and foreordination. This body, thus seen in its absolute fulness and perfection by God from eternity, will be at last revealed to the universe in all its completeness and glory, so that it will transcend all the other works of God in its visible excellences. And it is seen in part by us now in the successive ages as it is gathered in, because every member of it is a man or woman living and acting in the world, and the spiritual life whereby they are constituted members of the Church makes itself manifest by its fruits. This Church is called "invisible," however, (1.) Because the portions of it at any time or place visible are immeasurably small in comparison with the body as a whole in its full complement of saints of all nations and generations; and (2.) Because even in the sections of this body visible to us its outlines are very uncertain. Many who appear as parts of it do not really belong to it, and many may really belong to it whose union with it is not manifest. The lines are not to human eye drawn with any degree of accuracy between the Church and the world. In the meantime, the true Church, not yet perfectly developed and manifested, lurks in the phenomenal Church, as the grain of the growing corn lurks in the ear, and in this sense it is invisible. For that which constitutes the essence of this Church is not the visible profession or fruitfulness, but that invisible indwelling divine life, from which the profession and the fruitfulness proceed.

2. These sections teach that there is also a catholic or universal visible Church, consisting of those of every nation who profess the true religion, together with their children. This proposition involves -- (1.) The truth that the true Church, consisting of persons, a part of whom are always living, and, with more or less faithfulness, bringing forth visible fruits of holiness on the earth, of course is itself always in part, and with greater or less clearness, visible. The universal visible Church is therefore not a different Church from that which has just been described as invisible. It is the same body, as its successive generations pass in their order and are imperfectly discriminated from the rest of mankind by the eye of man. (2.) The truth that God has commanded his people to organize themselves into distinct visible ecclesiastical communities, with constitutions, laws and officers, badges, ordinances and discipline, for the great purpose of giving visibility to his kingdom, of making known the gospel of that kingdom, and of gathering in all its elect subjects. Each one of these distinct organized communities which is faithful to the great King is an integral part of the visible Church; and all together, of all names and nations, constitute the catholic or universal visible Church. The conditions of human life, physical, political, and social, and the imperfections of Christians, render impossible a practical organic union of all these organized bodies; yet that they all are one visible Church is self-evident, from the fact that they are all visible parts of the true

spiritual or invisible Church, which, being "the body of Christ," can never be divided. (3.) The truth also that since the Church is rendered visible by the profession and outward obedience of its members; and since no class of men are ever endowed with the power of discriminating with absolute accuracy the genuineness of Christian characteristics, it necessarily follows that a credible profession, as presumptive evidence of real religion, constitutes a person a member of the visible Church. By a credible profession is meant a profession of the true religion sufficiently intelligent and sufficiently corroborated by the daily life of the professor to be credited as genuine. Every such profession is ground for the presumption that the person is a member of the true Church, and consequently constitutes him a member of the visible Church, and lays an obligation upon all other Christians to regard and treat him accordingly. This visible Church is called "the kingdom of heaven" on the earth; and its nature and progress are set forth in the parables of the "sower and the seed," the "wheat and the tares," the "mustard seed," the "leaven," the "net which was cast into the sea and gathered fish of every kind," etc. Matthew 13:1-58. (4.) Also the truth that the children of all professors of the true religion are, on that account, fellow-members with their parents of the visible Church. This important principle will properly come up for discussion and proof under chapter 27. section 4.

3. These sections teach that God has given to this universal visible Church, in all its branches and constituent elements -- (1.) The inspired Scriptures as an infallible oracle and rule of faith and practice; (2.) The Gospel ministry -- an order not qualified and indicated by manual contact, but by the gifts and graces of the Holy Ghost; (3.) The ordinances, such as preaching, prayer, singing of praise, and the holy sacraments of Baptism, and the Lord’s Supper, and discipline. And (4.) That the great end designed to be accomplished by this grant is (a.) the gathering in of the elect from the children of the Church or from the world, and (b.) the perfecting of the saints when thus gathered. Ephesians 4:11-13. And (5.) That the success of these agencies in attaining this end is secured beyond peradventure by the promise of Christ to be with them and to render them effectual until the end of the world. Matthew 28:20.

4. These sections teach that out of the bounds of this universal visible Church there is no ordinary possibility of salvation. This proposition is believed by our Church and by all other evangelical Christians to apply only to adults who are out of the pale of the visible Church. All the members of the human race dying in infancy are believed to be saved through the merits of Christ. Since, then, the universal visible Church consists of all the professors of the true religion in the world, to say that out of it there is ordinarily no possibility of salvation is only saying -- (1.) That God has never in any way revealed his intention of saving any sane adult destitute of the personal knowledge of Christ. (2.) That an unexceptional experience in heathen lands leads us to the conviction that none in such a condition are saved. (3.) That God has very emphatically declared that those who deny his Son before men shall not be saved. Matthew 10:33. (4.) That every man who hears the gospel is commanded to confess Christ before men -- that is, to become a public, visible professor of the true religion. Matthew 10:32. The conditions of salvation laid down in Romans 10:9-10 are --" If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe with thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." There are obviously various ways in which Christ may be publicly acknowledged and confessed. In some way every person having the love of Christ in his heart will confess him. But our Confession intends in these

sections to teach further that ordinarily, where there is the knowledge and opportunity, God requires every one who loves Christ to confess him in the regular way of joining the community of his people and of taking the sacramental badges of his discipleship. That this is commanded will be shown under chapters 27-29. And that when providentially possible every Christian heart will be prompt to obey in this matter, is self-evident. When shame or fear of persecution is the preventing consideration, then the failure to obey is equivalent to the positive rejection of Christ, since the rejection of him will have to be publicly pretended in such case in order to avoid the consequences attending upon the public acknowledgment of him.

SECTION 4: This catholic church hath been sometimes more, sometimes less visible.(8) And particular churches, which are members thereof, are more or less pure, according as the doctrine of the gospel is taught and embraced, ordinances administered, and public worship performed more or less purely in them.(9)

(8) Romans 11:3-5; Acts 2:41, Acts 2:47; Acts 9:31; Acts 18:8-10 (9) Acts 2:41-42; 1 Corinthians 5:6-7; Revelation 2:1-29, Revelation 3:1-22

SECTION 5: The purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error;(10) and some have so degenerated, as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan.(11) Nevertheless, there shall be always a church on earth, to worship God according to his will.(12)

(10) 1 Corinthians 13:12; Rev. ch. 2-3; Matthew 13:24-30, Matthew 13:47 (11) Matthew 23:37-39; Romans 11:18-22 (12) Matthew 16:18; Psalms 45:16-7; Psalms 72:17; Matthew 28:19-20; 1 Corinthians 15:51-52; 1 Thessalonians 4:17

SECTION 6: There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ.(13) Nor can the pope of Rome, in any sense, be head thereof;(14) but is that Antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalts himself, in the Church, against Christ and all that is called God.

(13) Colossians 1:18; Ephesians 1:22 (14) Matthew 23:8-10; 1 Peter 5:2-4

All that is taught in these sections necessarily follows from what we have above ascertained as to the nature of the visible Church: --

1. Since the catholic or universal visible Church consists of all the professors of the true religion in the world, and of all the particular ecclesiastical organizations which continue loyal to the Head, and maintain doctrines essentially sound, it must necessarily follow that the Church as a whole is in any age more or less visible, and any particular constituent church more or less pure in proportion -- (1.) To the purity of the doctrine they profess and the worship they maintain; (2.) To their zeal and spiritual character and energy; and (3.) To the purity of their membership maintained by discipline. In proportion as these are all advanced in perfection, and prevail generally throughout the whole body, in the same degree will the entire Church appear more visibly discriminated from the world and manifest in her entire outline. In the same measure, also, will every individual ecclesiastical organization be pure -- that is, free from heterogeneous elements -- and consecrated to the accomplishment of the ends for which it is designed.

2. It follows, also, from the very nature of the visible Church and its condition in this world, that its purity is a matter of degree, varying at different times and in different sections. The teaching of Scripture as to the nature of the kingdom under the present dispensation (Matt. xiii.), the nature of

man yet imperfectly sanctified, and the universal experience of the churches, lead us to the conclusion that the very purest churches are yet very imperfect, and will continue so to the end, and that some will become so corrupt as to lose their character as true churches of Christ altogether. This was the case with the ancient Church under the reign of Ahab, when the children of Israel had apostatized from the service of the true God to such an extent that Elijah thought he was the only one left faithful. Even in that state of affairs the Lord declared, "Yet I have left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal." 1 Kings 19:18. Even more entire deterioration has happened to the ancient churches founded by the apostles in the East and by their successors in Northern Africa. The churches which acknowledge the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome have abandoned the faith and obscured the glory of their Lord in one direction, while many professedly Protestant churches -- as the English and American Socinians and the German Rationalists -- have made an equal apostasy in another. The Church of Rome maintains that the promise of Christ secures the infallible orthodoxy and purity of the visible organization, in subjection to apostolically-ordained bishops, to the end of the world. But the Church whose infallible orthodoxy and purity is guaranteed by the divine promise is no outward visible organization or succession of bishops or priests; it is the particular Church of no nation or generation, but it is the true invisible body of the elect or of true believers of all nations and ages. That it is so is proved -- (1.) From the fact that for eighteen hundred years the promise has been fulfilled in the sense we have defined, but has never been fulfilled in the sense the Romish Church demands. They have themselves led the defection from the faith and practice of the apostolic Church. And among Romanists and Protestants alike, visible ecclesiastical organizations are continually changing their characters and relations to the truth. (2.) Several of the Epistles are addressed to "the Church," and the salutations explain that phrase by the equivalents "the called," "the saints," etc. See the salutations of First and Second Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, First and Second Peter, and Jude. The same attributes are ascribed to the members of the true Church in the body of the Epistles. 1 Corinthians 1:30; 1 Corinthians 3:16; 1 Corinthians 6:11; Ephesians 2:3-8, Ephesians 2:19-22; Colossians 1:21-22; Colossians 2:10; 1 Peter 2:9. (3.) The attributes ascribed to the true Church prove it to be spiritual, and, in the sense explained, invisible, and not an outward organized succession. Ephesians 5:27; 1 Peter 2:5; John 10:27; Colossians 1:18, Colossians 1:24.

3. It follows, nevertheless, from the relation which the visible Church sustains to the invisible Church, that since, according to divine promise, the latter can never entirely fail from the earth (Matthew 16:18), so likewise, however the former may be obscured by heresies or lessened by defection, it can never be entirely wanting. Wherever the true Church is, it will be more or less visible; not in proportion, however, to the size or pretension of the organization with which it may be associated, but in proportion to the purity of its faith and the spiritual activity and fruitfulness of its membership.

4. That the Lord Jesus Christ is the only absolute and supreme Head of the Church is self-evident, is abundantly asserted in Scripture (Colossians 1:18, and Zephaniah 1:20-23), and has never been denied by any Christians.

Many have, however, maintained that, as the visible Church on earth has a government and laws, and since these must be administered by a visible authority, so the Church must have an earthly visible head, acting upon authority delegated by Christ and is his representative. The Church of

Rome claims this for the Pope: "So has Christ -- the Head and Spouse -- placed over his Church, which he governs by his most inward Spirit, a man to be the vicar and minister of his power; for as a visible church requires a visible head, our Saviour appointed Peter head and pastor of all the faithful." Cat. Rom., part i. ch. x., q. 11. The Erastian State Churches of Germany and Great Britain have acknowledged their respective sovereigns as supreme heads of the Church as well as of the State. Henry VIII. was recognized as "supreme head of the Church of England," and it was enacted "That the king, his heirs, etc., shall be taken, accepted, and reputed the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England, called Anglicana Ecclesia; and shall have and enjoy, annexed and united to the imperial crown of this realm, as well the style and title thereof, as all honours, dignities, immunities, profits and commodities to the said dignity of supreme head of the said. Church belonging and appertaining." 26 Henry VIII., cap. i. This supremacy of the reigning sovereign over the Church is even made an article of faith, being incorporated into the Thirty-seventh Article of the Church of England: "The Queen's majesty has the chief power in this realm of England, and other her dominions; unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain." In both these cases, and in all cases of like claims to ecclesiastical supremacy, it is a mere question of fact and evidence. If, as a matter of fact, Christ delegated his authority either to the Pope or to national Sovereigns, and made them, as his victors, visible heads of his Church, then we ought to obey them, and our disobedience is treason to Christ. On the contrary, if they have no such authority, and are unable to prove their claims by unquestionable credentials, then their assumption of such power is a blasphemous intrusion upon divine prerogatives and treason to the human race. It is obvious that neither party can show any plausible foundation for their claims, and that upon the slightest interrogation they fall of their own weight. In the absence of any duly accredited visible head of the Church, we are forced back to direct dependence for law and its administration, as well as for redemption, upon the great invisible Head. He presides over and governs his Church -- (1.) Through his inspired Word, which is, as we have seen, an infallible, complete, and perspicuous rule of faith and practice. (2.) Through the apostolical institutions transmitted to us, as the ministry, the sacraments, the ordinances, etc. Ephesians 4:11. And (3.) Through his own spiritual presence, which extends to all his members, and endures to the end of the world. Matthew 18:20; Matthew 28:20. The word "Antichrist" occurs in the New Testament in 1 John 2:18, 1 John 2:22; 1 John 4:3; 2 John 1:7. The coming of the "man of sin," the "son of perdition," is predicted in 2 Thessalonians 2:3-4. Interpreters have differed as to whether these phrases were intended to designate a personal opponent of the Lord, or principles and systems antagonistic to him and his cause. The authors of our Confession can hardly have intended to declare that each individual Pope of the long succession is the personal Antichrist, and they probably meant that the Papal system is in spirit, form, and effect, wholly antichristian, and that it marked a defection from apostolical Christianity foreseen and foretold in Scripture. All of which was true in their day, and is true in ours. We have need, however, to remember that as the forms of evil change, and the complications of the kingdom of Christ with that of Satan vary with the progress of events, "even now are there many Antichrists." 1 John 2:18.

01.26. Of the Communion of the Saints

Chapter Twenty-six

Of the Communion of the Saints

SECTION 1: All saints, that are united to Jesus Christ their Head, by his Spirit, and by faith, have fellowship with him in his graces, sufferings, death, resurrection, and glory:(1) and, being united to one another in love, they have communion in each other's gifts and graces,(2) and are obliged to the performance of such duties, public and private, as do conduce to their mutual good, both in the inward and outward man.(3)

(1) 1 John 1:3; Ephesians 2:5-6; Ephesians 3:16-18; John 1:16; Php 3:10; Romans 6:5-6; Romans 8:17; 2 Timothy 2:12 (2) Ephesians 4:15-16; 1 Corinthians 3:21-23; 1 Corinthians 12:7, 1 Cor. 12; Colossians 2:19 (3) 1 Thessalonians 5:11, 1 Thessalonians 5:14; Romans 1:11-12, Romans 1:14; 1 John 3:16-18; Galatians 6:10

SECTION 2: Saints by profession are bound to maintain an holy fellowship and communion in the worship of God, and in performing such other spiritual services as tend to their mutual edification;(4) as also in relieving each other in outward things, according to their several abilities and necessities. Which communion, as God offereth opportunity, is to be extended unto all those who, in every place, call upon the name of the Lord Jesus.(5)

(4) Hebrews 10:24-25; Acts 2:42, Acts 2:46; Isaiah 2:3; 1 Corinthians 11:20 (5) 1 John 3:17; 2 Corinthians 8:1-24, 2 Corinthians 9:1-15; Acts 2:44-45; Acts 11:29-30

SECTION 3: This communion which the saints have with Christ, doth not make them in any wise partakers of the substance of his Godhead; or to be equal with Christ in any respect: either of which to affirm is impious and blasphemous.(6) Nor doth their communion one with another, as saints, take away, or infringe the title or propriety which each man hath in his goods and possessions.(7)

(6) Colossians 1:18-19; 1 Corinthians 8:6; Psalms 45:6-7; Hebrews 1:6-9; John 1:14; John 20:17 (7) Exodus 20:15; Ephesians 4:28; Acts 5:4

COMMUNION is a mutual interchange of offices between parties, which flows from a common principle in which they are united. The nature and degree of the communion will depend upon the nature and intimacy of the union from which it proceeds. This chapter teaches: --

1. Of the union of Christ and his people.

2. The fellowship between him and them resulting therefrom.

3 The union between the true people of Christ growing out of their union with him.

4. The communion of saints growing out of their union with each other.

5. The mutual duties of all who profess to be saints with regard to all their fellow-professors.

1. All saints are united to the Lord Jesus. We need to know what is the foundation and what is the nature of this union, and how it is established.

(1.) As to the foundation of the union subsisting between the true believer and the Lord Jesus, the Scriptures teach that it rests in the eternal purpose of the Triune God, expressed in the decree of election (we were "chosen in him before the foundation of the world," Ephesians 1:4), and the eternal covenant of grace formed between the Father and his Word as the mediatorial head of his people, treating with the Head for the members, and with the members in the Head, and providing for their salvation in him. John 17:2, John 17:6.

(2.) As to the nature of this union of the believer with Christ, the Scriptures teach -- (a.) That it is federal and representative, whereby Christ acts in all things as our federal Head, in our stead, and for our benefit. Hence our legal status is determined by his, and his rights, honours, relations, all are made ours in copartnership with him. (b.) That it is a vital and spiritual union. Its actuating source and bond is the Spirit of the Head, who dwells and works in the members. 1 Corinthians 6:17; 1 Corinthians 12:13; 1 John 3:24; 1 John 4:13. Hence our spiritual life is derived from him and sustained and determined by his life, which we share. Galatians 2:20. (c.) That it is a union between our entire persons and Christ, and therefore one involving our bodies through our souls. 1 Corinthians 6:15, 1 Corinthians 6:19.

(3.) As to the manner in which this union is established, the Scriptures teach that the elect, having been in the divine idea comprehended under the headship of Christ from eternity, are in time actually united to him -- (a.) By the powerful operation of his Spirit, whereby they are " quickened together with Christ" Ephesians 2:5); which Spirit evermore dwells in them as the organ of Christ's presence with them, the infinite medium through which the fulness of his love and life, and all the benefits purchased by his blood, pass over freely from the Head to the members. (b.) By the actings of faith upon their part, whereby they grasp Christ and appropriate him and his grace to themselves, and whereby they ever continue to live in him and to draw their resources from him. Ephesians 3:17. This union is illustrated in Scripture by the relation subsisting between a foundation and its superstructure (1 Peter 2:4-6); a, tree and its branches (John 15:5); the members of the body and the head (Ephesians 4:15-16); a husband and wife (Ephesians 5:31-32); Adam and his descendants. Romans 5:12-19. This union has been called by theologians a " mystical" union, because, it never could have been known unless revealed by the Lord himself, and because it is so incomparably intimate and excellent that it transcends all other unions of which we have experience. Nevertheless it is not mysterious in the sense of involving any confusion between Christ's personality and ours, nor does it make us in any wise partakers of his Godhead or to be equal with him in any respect. It is a union between persons in which each retains his separate identity, and in which the believer, although immeasurably exalted and blessed, nevertheless is entirely subordinated to and continues dependent upon his Lord.

2. On the basis of this union a most intimate fellowship or interchange of mutual offices ever continues to be sustained between believers and Christ.

(1.) They have fellowship with Christ (a.) In all the covenant merits of his active and passive obedience. Forensically they are " complete in him." Colossians 2:10. His Father, his inheritance,

his throne, his crown, are theirs. As their mediatorial Head he acts as prophet, priest, and king. In union with him they are also prophets, priests, and kings. 1 John 2:27; 1 John 2:1 Peter 2:5; Revelation 3:21; Revelation 5:10. They have fellowship with Christ also (b.) In the transforming, assimilating power of his life. " Of his fulness have all we received, and grace for grace." John 1:16. Thus they have the " Spirit," and " the mind" of Christ, and bear his " likeness " or " image." Romans 8:9; Php 2:5; 1 John 3:2. This includes the bodies also, making them temples of the Holy Ghost; and in the resurrection our glorified bodies are to be like his. 1 Corinthians 6:19; 1 Corinthians 15:43, 1 Corinthians 15:49. They have fellowship with Christ (c.) In all their experiences, inward and outward, in their joys and victories, in their labours, sufferings, temptations, and death. Romans 8:37; 2 Corinthians 12:9; Galatians 6:17; Php 3:10; Hebrews 12:3; 1 Peter 4:13.

(2.) Christ has fellowship with them. They belong to him as the purchase of his blood. They are devoted to his service. They are co-workers together with him in building up his kingdom. They bear fruit to his praise, and shine as stars in his crown. Their hearts, their lives, their possessions, are all consecrated to him, and are held by them in trust for him. Proverbs 19:17; Romans 14:8; 1 Corinthians 6:19-20.

3. Since all true believers are thus intimately united to Christ as the common Head of the whole body, and the Source of a common life, it follows that they must be intimately united together. If they have but one Head, and are all members of one body, they must have one common life, and be all members one of another. The Romish and Ritualistic view is, that individuals are united to the Church through the sacraments, and through the Church to Christ. The true view is, that the individual is united to Christ the Head by the Holy Ghost and by faith; and by being united to Christ he is, ipso facto, united to all Christ’s members, the Church. The holy catholic Church is the product of the Holy Ghost. Wherever the Spirit is, there the Church is. The presence of the Spirit is known by his fruits, which are "love, joy, peace," etc. Galatians 5:22-23. All believers receiving the same Spirit are by him baptized into " one body;" and thus they all become, " though many members," but " one body," " the body of Christ " and " members in particular." 1 Corinthians 12:13-27.

4. Hence true believers, all being united in one living body, sustain many intimate relations, and discharge many important offices for one another, which are summarily expressed by the general phrase, " The communion of saints."

(1.) They have a common Head, and common duties with respect to him; a common profession, a common system of faith to maintain, a common gospel to preach, a common worship and service to maintain.

(2.) They have a common life, and one Holy Ghost dwelling in and binding together in one the whole body. Hence they are involved in the ties of sympathy and identity of interest. One cannot prosper without all prospering with him -- one cannot suffer without all suffering with him.

(3.) As they constitute one body in the eyes of the world, they have a common reputation, and are all severally and collectively honoured or dishonoured with each other. Hence all schisms in the body, injurious controversies, malignant representations of Christian by Christian, are self-defaming as well as wicked.

(4.) The body of saints is like the natural body in this also, that, although one body, each several member is an organ of the Holy Ghost for a special function, and has his own individual difference of qualification, and consequently of duty. Hence, in the economy of the body, each member is to contribute his special function and his special grace or beauty, and has in his turn fellowship in the gifts and complementary graces of all the rest. Ephesians 4:11-16; 1 Corinthians 12:4-21. This shall be perfectly realized in heaven. John 10:16; John 17:22.

5. Since this is the union of all true believers with the Lord and with each other, and since, consequently, a " communion of saints" so intimate necessarily nourishes among true believers in proportion to their intelligence and their advancement in grace, it follows that all branches of the visible Church, and all the individual members thereof, should do all within their power to act upon the principle of the "communion of saints" in their intercourse with all who profess the true religion. If the Church is one, the churches are one. If all saints are one, and are embraced in this holy "communion," then all who profess to be saints should regard and treat all their fellow-professors on the presumption that they are saints and " heirs together with them of the grace of life." Think of it! In spite of all controversies and jealousies, one in the eternal electing love of God! -- one in the purchase of Christ’s sacrificial blood! -- one in the beatifying indwelling of the Holy Ghost! -- one in the eternal inheritance of glory! Surely we should be also one in all the charities, sympathies, and helpful offices possible, in these short and evil days of earthly pilgrimage. These mutual duties are, of course, some of them public -- as between different evangelical churches -- and may of them private and personal. Many of them relate to the souls, and many also to the bodies of the saints. The rule is, the law of love in the heart, and the principles and examples of saints recorded in Scripture applied to the special circumstances of every individual case. But while these mutual relations and offices of the saints sanctify, they are not designed to supersede the fundamental principles of human society, as the rights of property and the family tie.

01.27. Of the Sacraments

Chapter Twenty-seven

Of the Sacraments

SECTION 1: Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace,(1) immediately instituted by God,(2) to represent Christ, and his benefits; and to confirm our interest in him:(3) as also, to put a visible difference between those that belong unto the church, and the rest of the world;(4) and solemnly to engage them to the service of God in Christ, according to his Word.(5)

(1) Romans 4:11; Genesis 17:7, Genesis 17:10-11 (2) Matthew 28:19; 1 Corinthians 11:23 (3) Romans 6:3-4; Colossians 2:12; 1 Corinthians 10:16; 1 Corinthians 11:25-26; Galatians 3:27 (4) Exodus 12:48; Genesis 34:14; 1 Corinthians 10:21 (5) Romans 6:3-4; Galatians 3:27; 1 Peter 3:21; 1 Corinthians 5:7-8; 1 Corinthians 10:16

SECTION 2: There is, in every sacrament, a spiritual relation, or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified: whence it comes to pass, that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other.(6) (6) Genesis 17:10; Matthew 26:27-28; 1 Corinthians 10:16-18

LARGER CATECHISM, q. 168.-- What are the parts of a sacrament? -- The parts of a sacrament are two; the one an outward and sensible sign, used according to Christ’s own appointment; the other, an inward and spiritual grace thereby signified. (7) (7) Matthew 3:11; 1 Peter 3:21.; Romans 2:28-29. The word " sacrament" does not occur in the Scriptures. In its classical usage it designated anything which binds or brings under obligations, as a sum of money given in pledge, or an oath, and especially the oath of military allegiance. In its ecclesiastical usage, the word, while retaining its general sense of something binding as sacred, was at an early period used as the Latin equivalent of the Greek word mysterion (musterion}, that which is unknown until revealed; and hence any symbol, type, or rite having a latent spiritual meaning. Hence the word naturally came to be applied in a general and vague sense to the Christian ordinances of Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, and with them also to many other religious doctrines and ordinances.

It is plainly, therefore, impossible to determine the nature or the number of the sacraments from either the etymology or the usage of the word "sacrament." We want a thorough definition of the thing, not of the name. This we can get only by taking Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, which all men acknowledge to be genuine sacraments, and, by a strict examination of their origin, nature, and uses, determine (a.) the true character of the class of ordinances to which they belong, and (b.) whether any other ordinances belong to the same class or not. In this way the definition of a sacrament given in our Standards was formed. This definition involves the following points: -- 1. A sacrament is an ordinance immediately instituted by Christ. L. Cat., q. 162, and S. Cat., q. 92.

2. A sacrament always consists of two elements -- (1.) An outward, sensible sign; and (2.) 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 designed to represent, seal, and apply the benefits of Christ and the new covenant to believers. S. Cat., q. 92.

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.

1. The first section of this chapter says that a sacrament is an ordinance "immediately instituted by God, to represent Christ," etc. This is true if the word " sacrament" is used in its general sense to include also the Old Testament sacraments of Circumcision and the Passover. But it is an important distinction of the New Testament sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper that they were both immediately instituted by Christ himself. Therefore both the Larger (q. 162) and the Shorter (q. 92) Catechisms have it, "A sacrament is an holy ordinance instituted by Christ in his Church." This should be remembered, because it serves to exclude most of the pretended sacraments of the Church of Rome from any right to a place in this class of Christian ordinances.

2. Every sacrament consists of two elements -- (1.) An outward, sensible sign; and (2.) an inward, spiritual grace, thereby signified. In Baptism the outward sensible sign is -- (1.) Water, and (2.) The water applied in the name of the Triune God to the person of the subject baptized. The inward, spiritual grace, thereby signified is -- (1.) Primarily, spiritual purification by the immediate personal power of the Holy Ghost in the soul; and hence, (2.) Secondarily, the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, hence the union of the baptized with Christ, hence regeneration, justification, sanctification, perseverance to the end, glorification, etc.-- i.e., all the benefits of the new covenant. In the Lord's Supper, the outward, sensible signs, are -- (1.) Bread and wine; and (2.) The consecration, and the bread broken, and the wine poured out, distributed to, and received and eaten and drunk by, the communicants. The inward, spiritual grace, thereby signified is -- (1.) Primarily, Christ crucified (his flesh and blood shed) for us, and giving himself to us to be spiritually received and assimilated as the principle of a new life; and hence, (2.) Secondarily, union with Christ, the indwelling of the Spirit, regeneration, justification, sanctification, etc.-- i.e., all the benefits secured by the sacrificial death of Christ.

3. "There is in every sacrament a spiritual relation or sacramental union between the sign and the thing signified." This sacramental union between the sign and the grace which it signifies, the Romish and Lutheran Churches understand to be, at least in the case of the Lord's Supper, a literal identity. Thus when Christ took the bread and said, "This is my body," they insist that it means that the bread is his body. All other Christians understand the phrase to mean, " This bread represents sacramentally my body." This sacramental union, therefore, between the sign and the thing signified is (1.) Symbolical and representative -- the one symbolizes and so represents the other; and (2.) Instrumental, because by divine appointment, through the right use of the sign, the grace signified is really conveyed. The grounds of this sacramental union are -- (1.) The natural fitness of the sign to symbolize the grace signified, as washing with water to symbolize spiritual purification by the Holy Ghost. (2.) The authoritative appointment of Christ that these signs, rightly used, shall truly represent and convey the grace they signify. (3.) The spiritual faith of the believing

recipient, a gift of the Spirit of Christ, whereby, in the proper use of the sign, he is enabled to "discern the Lord's body." 1 Corinthians 11:29.

Out of this spiritual relation, or sacramental union between the sign and the grace signified, which we have thus explained by a natural and legitimate use of language, the one is put for the other, and whatever is true of the grace signified is asserted of the sign which signifies it. Thus, to eat the bread and drink the wine in the Lord's Supper is to eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ; that is, to participate in the sacrificial virtue of his death. And whatever is true at Baptism with the Holy Ghost is attributed to Baptism with water. Ananias said to Paul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Acts 22:16. "Christ gave himself for the Church, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word." Ephesians 5:26. "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Acts 2:38. Hence Romanists and Ritualists have inferred that the sign is inseparable from the grace signified, and that these spiritual effects are due to the outward ordinance. Hence the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. But it must be observed that the Scriptures do not assert these spiritual attributes of water baptism in itself considered, but of water baptism as the sign or emblem of baptism by the holy Ghost. These spiritual attributes belong "only to baptism by the Spirit, and they accompany the sign only when the sign is accompanied by that which it signifies. It does not follow, however, that the sign is inseparable from the grace. The grace is sovereign; and experience teaches us that it is often absent from the sign, and that the sign is least frequently honoured by the presence of the grace when it is itself most implicitly relied upon.

4. The sacraments were designed --

(1.) To represent the benefits of Christ and the new covenant. They are as signs or pictures of the truths they represent, and hence present those truths to the eyes and other senses of the recipients in a manner analogous to that in which they are presented to the ears in the preaching of the Word. This follows from what has just been shown as to their beings outward, sensible signs, signifying inward and spiritual grace.

(2.) They were designed to be "seals" of the benefits of the new covenant. The gospel is presented under the form of a covenant. Salvation and all the benefits of Christ's redemption are offered upon the condition of faith. In the sacraments God sensibly and authoritatively pledges himself to invest us with this grace if we believe and obey. In receiving the sacrament we actively assume all the obligations implied in the gospel, and bind ourselves to fulfil them. " Circumcision," Paul says, is " the seal of the righteousness of faith," Romans 4:11; and Baptism is declared to be "the circumcision of Christ." Colossians 2:11-12. We are said to be actually "buried with Christ by baptism" (Romans 6:4); i.e., united to him in his death. Jesus says, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood" (Luke 22:20); that is, This cup represents my blood, by which the new covenant was ratified; and therefore it is a visible confirmation of the covenant, since it is a visible representative of the blood. If a man was circumcised, he was "a debtor to do the whole law." Galatians 5:3. "As many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Galatians 3:27.

(3.) The sacraments were designed to "apply "-- i.e., actually to convey -- to believers the benefits of the new covenant. If they are " seals" of the covenant, they must of course, as a legal form of investiture, actually convey the grace represented to those to whom it belongs. Thus a deed conveys an estate, or the key handed over in the presence of witnesses the possession of a house

from the owner to the renter. Our Confession is explicit and emphatic on this subject. The old English word "exhibit," there used, does not mean to show forth; but, in the sense of the Latin exhibere, from which it is derived, to administer, to apply. Compare the following: "A sacrament is an holy ordinance instituted by Christ; wherein, by sensible signs, Christ, and the benefits of the new covenant, are represented, sealed, and applied to believers." S. Cat., q. 92. "A sacrament is an holy ordinance instituted by Christ in his Church, to signify, seal, and exhibit unto those that are within the covenant of grace, the benefits of his mediation." L. Cat., q. 162. "The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments, rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them." Conf. Faith, ch. xxvii., section 3. "The efficacy of Baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered; yet notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost," etc. Conf. Faith, ch. 27., section 6. This the Confession carefully guards in the third section of this chapter, showing that the sacraments have no inherent power or virtue at all, but that the right use of the sacrament is by divine appointment the occasion upon which the Holy Ghost conveys the grace to those to whom it belongs. So that this grace-conferring virtue depends upon two things: (1.) The sovereign will and power of the Holy Spirit. (2.) The lively faith of the recipient. The sacrament is a mere instrument; but IT IS AN INSTRUMENT OF DIVINE APPOINTMENT.

5. The sacraments being seals of the covenant of grace -- at once pledges of God’s faithfulness to us and of our obligation to him -- they of course (1.) Mark us as the divine property, and bind, us to the performance of our duty; and hence are (2.) Badges of our profession, and, putting a visible difference between those who belong to the Church and the rest of the world, give visibility to the Church, and separate its members from the world.

SECTION 3: The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them; neither doth the efficacy of a sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it:(7) but upon the work of the Spirit,(8) and the word of institution, which contains, together with a precept authorizing the use thereof, a promise of benefit to worthy receivers.(9)

(7) Romans 2:28-29; 1 Peter 3:21 (8) 1 Corinthians 12:13 (9) Matthew 26:26-28; Matthew 28:19-20; Luke 22:19-20; 1 Corinthians 11:26

Having asserted that the sacraments actually confer the grace which they represent to worthy recipients, our Confession in this section proceeds to guard this important truth from abuse, by carefully showing upon what this grace-conveying efficacy of the sacraments does not, and upon what it does depend.

1. This grace is not contained in the sacraments themselves, nor is it "conferred by any power in them." According to the Romish and Ritualistic view, the grace signified is contained in the sacrament itself, as qualities inhere in substances, and it is together with the outward sign presented in a real, objective sense, to every recipient, whether believer or unbeliever. They hold also that the sacrament confers this grace upon every recipient who does not positively resist, as an opus operatum the sole force of the sacramental action, as hot iron burns. This whole view is explicitly rejected as false by our Confession; and the whole efficacy of the sacrament is said to depend, not upon any part of it separately, nor upon the whole together, but upon the sovereign power of the Holy Ghost, who is always present, and uses the sacrament as his instrument and

medium.

2. The efficacy of the sacraments does not depend upon either the personal piety or the "intention" of the person who administers them. The Romanists admit that the efficacy of the sacraments does not depend upon the personal piety of the administrator; but they insist that it depends -- (1.) Upon the fact that the administrator is canonically authorized; (2.) Upon the fact that the administrator exercises at the moment of administration the secret "intention" of doing thereby what the Church intends in the definition of the sacrament. The priest may outwardly pronounce every word and perform every action prescribed in the ritual, and the recipient may fulfil every condition required of him, and yet if the priest fails in the secret intention of conferring the grace through the sacrament then and there, the recipient goes away destitute of the grace he supposes himself to have received, and which the priest has ostensibly professed to confer.

3. But the efficacy of the sacraments depends -- (1.) Upon their divine appointment as means and channels of grace. They were not devised by man as suitable in themselves to produce a moral impression. But they were appointed by God, and we are commanded to use them as means of grace; and hence God virtually promises to meet every soul who uses them rightly in the sacrament. Christ seals his gracious covenant by them, and hence in their use invests with the grace of that covenant every soul to which it belongs. (2.) The efficacy of the sacrament resides in the sovereign and ever-present personal agency of the Holy Ghost, who uses the sacraments as his instruments and media of operation. The Spirit is the executive of God. He takes of the things of Christ and shows them unto us. Through him even the humanity of Jesus is virtually omnipresent, and all the benefits secured by his sacrifice are revealed and applied.

SECTION 4: There be only two sacraments ordained by Christ our Lord in the Gospel; that is to say, baptism, and the Supper of the Lord: neither of which may be dispensed by any, but by a minister of the Word lawfully ordained.(10) (10) Matthew 28:19; 1 Corinthians 4:1; 1 Corinthians 11:20, 1 Corinthians 11:23; Ephesians 4:11-12 As we have seen, the word "sacrament" was used very indefinitely in the early Church to include any religions rite which had a latent spiritual meaning. A pre-eminence was always awarded to Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, as forming a class by themselves; but the number of ordinances to which the term "sacrament" was applied varied at different times and in different places from two to twelve. At last the number seven was suggested during the twelfth century, and determined authoritatively by the Council of Florence, 1439, and by the Council of Trent, 1562. These are Baptism, Confirmation, the Lord’s Supper, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, Marriage. In order to prove that "there be only two sacraments ordained by Christ our Lord in the gospel -- that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord" -- we have only to show that the other five so-called sacraments claimed by the Romanists do not belong to the same class of ordinances with Baptism and the Lord’s Supper; and we do this by applying the definition of a sacrament above given. Thus --

Penance, Confirmation, and Extreme Unction are not divine institutions in any sense.

Marriage was instituted, not by Christ, but by God; and Orders were instituted by Christ: but neither of these ordinances (a.) consists of an outward, visible sign, signifying an inward, spiritual grace; nor (b.) does either of them "represent, seal, or confer Christ and the benefits of the new covenant." Our Confession also adds that no one has a right to administer the sacraments save a lawfully ordained minister. This is not said in the interest of any priestly theory of the ministry, as if

there were any grace or grace-conferring virtue transmitted by ordination in succession from the apostles to the person ordained. But since the Church is an organized society, under laws executed by regularly appointed officers, it is evident that ordinances -- which are badges of Church membership, the gates of the fold, the instruments of discipline, and seals of the covenant formed by the great Head of the Church with his living members -- can properly be administered only by the highest legal officers of the Church, those who are commissioners as ambassadors for Christ to treat in his name with men. 1 Corinthians 4:1; 2 Corinthians 5:20.

SECTION 5: The sacraments of the old testament, in regard of the spiritual things thereby signified and exhibited, were, for substance, the same with those of the new.(11) (11) 1 Corinthians 10:1-4; Romans 4:11; Colossians 2:11-12

We saw, under chapter vii., sections 5 and 6, that the old and the new dispensations were only two different modes in which the one changeless covenant of grace was administered and its blessings dispensed. The sacramental seals of the covenant must, therefore, be essentially the same then and now. The difference is -- (1.) That they were more prospective and typical then, and that they are more commemorative now. They signified a grace to be revealed then; they signify a grace already revealed now. (2,) They were, as to form, more gross and carnal then, and more spiritual now.

Thus Baptism has taken the place of Circumcision as the rite of initiation. They both signify spiritual regeneration. Deuteronomy 10:16; Deuteronomy 30:6. Circumcision was Jewish baptism, and Baptism is Christian circumcision. Galatians 3:27, Galatians 3:29; Colossians 2:10-12.

Thus the Lord’s Supper grew out of the Passover. He took the old bread and the old cup, and gave them a new consecration and a new meaning. Matthew 26:26-29. "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." 1 Corinthians 5:7.

01.28. Of Baptism

Chapter Twenty-eight

Of Baptism

SECTION 1: Baptism is a sacrament of the new testament, ordained by Jesus Christ,(1) not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church;(2) but also, to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace,(3) of his ingrafting into Christ,(4) of regeneration,(5) of remission of sins,(6) and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life.(7) Which sacrament is, by Christ's own appointment, to be continued in his church until the end of the world.(8)

(1) Matthew 28:19 (2) 1 Corinthians 12:13; Galatians 3:27-28 (3) Romans 4:11; Colossians 2:11-12 (4) Galatians 3:27; Romans 6:5 (5) John 3:5; Titus 3:5 (6) Mark 1:4; Acts 2:38; Acts 22:16

(7) Romans 6:3-4 (8) Matthew 28:19-20

SECTION 2: The outward element to be used in this sacrament is water, wherewith the party is to be baptized, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, by a minister of the gospel, lawfully called thereunto.(9) (9) Acts 8:36, Acts 8:38; Acts 10:47; Matthew 28:19

SECTION 3: Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary; but baptism is rightly administered by pouring, or sprinkling water upon the person.(10) (10) Hebrews 9:10, Hebrews 9:13, Hebrews 9:19, Hebrews 9:21; Mark 7:2-4; Luke 11:38 IN these sections we are taught the following propositions: --

I. Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, instituted immediately by Christ, and by his authority to continue in the Church until the end of the world.

2. As to the action which constitutes Baptism, it is a washing of the subject with water (the manner of the washing not being essential), in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, by a lawfully ordained minister.

3. It is done with the design and effect of signifying and sealing our ingrafting into Christ, our partaking of the benefits of his covenant, and our engagement to be his.

1. Christian Baptism is an ordinance immediately instituted by Christ himself, and designed to be observed in the Church until the end of the world. Washing the body with water, to represent spiritual purification and consecration, was a natural symbol which prevailed among all ancient Eastern nations -- as the Persians, Hindoos, Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans, and pre-eminently among the Jews. Paul summarily describes the ancient ceremonial as consisting "in meats and drinks, and divers baptisms." Hebrews 9:10. John, the forerunner of Jesus, came baptizing also. But this was not Christian Baptism, because -- (1.) John was the last Old Testament prophet, and not a New Testament apostle (Luke 1:17); (2.) He did not baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; (3.) His baptism was unto repentance, not into the faith of Christ;

(4.) He did not by baptism introduce men into the fellowship of the Christian Church, as the apostles did at Pentecost (Acts 2:41, Acts 2:47); (5.) Those baptized by John were baptized over again by the apostles when they were admitted to the Christian Church (Acts 18:24-28; Acts 19:1-5). For analogous reasons we believe that the baptism performed by his disciples previous to the crucifixion of the Lord (John 3:22; John 4:1-2) was not the permanent Christian sacrament of Baptism, binding its subjects to the faith and obedience of the Trinity, and initiating them into the Christian Church; but that, on the contrary, like the baptism of John, it was a purifying rite, binding to repentance, and preparing the way for the coming kingdom.

It is certain that we have the true warrant of the Christian sacrament of Baptism from the lips of the great Head of the Church in person, in Matthew 28:18-20 : "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

Some, as the Quakers, have not understood that this command imposes the obligation of the perpetual observance of this ordinance. That the observance is to endure until the second coming of Christ is plain -- (1.) From the universal maxim that every law continues binding until it is abrogated, or until the reason for it has ceased. But this command has never been recalled, and the reason for its observance remains precisely what it was when the command was given. (2.) The plain terms of the command reach (a.) to all nations, and (b.) until the end of this world (aion). (3.) The example of the apostles. Acts 2:38; Acts 16:33. (4.) The constant practice of all branches of the Christian Church from the beginning to the present time.

2. As to the action which constitutes it, Baptism is a washing with water (the manner of washing being indifferent) in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, by a lawfully ordained minister. The reason that Baptism should be administered only by a lawfully ordained minister has been considered under the last chapter. The Confession teaches that the command to baptize is a command to wash with water in the name of the Trinity. It is often, but erroneously, supposed that the controversy between our baptist brethren and the rest of the Christian Church with respect to Baptism is a question of mode; they affirming that the only right mode is to immerse -- we affirming that the best mode is to sprinkle. This is a great mistake. The real Baptist position -- as stated by Dr. Alexander Carson (p. 55) -- is, that the command to baptize is a simple and single command to immerse, in order to symbolize the death, burial, and resurrection of the believer with Christ. The true position maintained by other Christians is, that Baptism is a simple and single command to wash with water, in order to symbolize the purification wrought by the Holy Ghost. Hence the mode of washing has nothing to do with it. It is necessarily perfectly indifferent, so that it be decent. According to our view, the essential matter is the water, and the application of the water in the name of the Trinity. According to their view, the essential matter is the burial, total immersion, in water or sand, as the case may be. The evidence of the truth of the view entertained by the vast majority of Christ's Church is as follows: --

(1.) The word baptizo, in its classical usage, means to dip, to moisten, to wet, to purify, to wash. Dr. Carson admits that he has all the lexicons against him.

(2.) In the Septuagint, Bapto and baptizo occur five times. Thus, Daniel 4:33, Nebuchadnezzar is said to have been wet (baptized) with the dew of heaven. Ecclus. xxxiv. 30[1]: "He that baptizeth

himself after the touching of a dead body;" -- but this purification was performed by sprinkling. Numbers 19:9, Numbers 19:13, Numbers 19:20. See also 2 Kings 5:14, and Jdt 12:7.

[1] Ecclesiasticus 34:30: He that washeth himself after touching the dead, if he toucheth him again, what doth his washing avail?

(3.) In the New Testament, baptizo is used interchangeably with nipto, which only means to wash. Compare Mark 7:3-4; Luke 11:38; Matthew 15:2, Matthew 15:20 : and observe -- (a.) That to baptize is there used interchangeably with to wash. (b.) The washing was to effect purification, for the unbaptized hands are called the unwashed and unclean hands. (c.) The common mode of washing hands in those countries is to pour water upon them. The rich have servants to pour the water on their hands; the poor pour the water on their own hands.

(4.) When John's disciples disputed about baptism, it is expressly said to have been a dispute about purification. John 3:25; John 4:2.

(5.) The same idea is uniformly expressed by the word baptism, or baptisms, in-the New Testament. In Mark 7:2-8 we read of the baptisms of cups, pots, brazen vessels, and tables (couches upon which several persons reclined at table). These things could not be, and were not, immersed. The whole object of the service was not burial, but purification. In Hebrews 9:10 Paul says that the first tabernacle "stood only in meats and drinks, and divers baptisms;" and below, in Hebrews 9:13, Hebrews 9:19, Hebrews 9:21, he specifies some of these divers baptism--" For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh;" -- and " Moses sprinkled both the book and all the people, and the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry."

(6.) Baptism with water is emblematical of baptism by the Holy Ghost, the object of which is spiritual purification. Matthew 3:11; Mark 1:8; Luke 3:16; John 1:26, John 1:33; Acts 1:5; Acts 11:16. Spiritual baptism is called "the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Titus 3:5. Baptism with water symbolizes baptism by the Holy Ghost. But baptism by the Holy Ghost unites us to Christ, and makes us one with him in his death, in his resurrection, in his new life unto God, his righteousness, his inheritance, etc., etc. Spiritual baptism carries all these consequences, and water baptism represents spiritual baptism; therefore we are said to be baptized into Christ, into his death, into one body -- to be buried with him, to rise with him, so as to walk with him in newness of life -- to put on Christ (as a garment), to be planted together with him (as a tree), etc. None of these have anything to do with the mode of baptism because it is simply absurd to suppose that the same action can at the same time symbolize things so different as burial, putting on clothes, and planting trees. The real order is: washing with water represents washing of the Spirit; washing of the Spirit unites to Christ; union with Christ involves all the consequences above mentioned.

(7.) Baptism of the Holy Ghost, of which water baptism is the emblem, is never set forth in Scripture as an "immersion," but always as a " pouring" and " sprinkling." Acts 2:1-4, Acts 2:32-33; Acts 10:44-48; Acts 11:15-16. Of the gift of the Holy Ghost it is said, he " came from heaven," was " poured out," " shed forth," " fell on them." Isaiah 44:3 : " I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed." Isaiah 52:15 : " So shall he sprinkle many nations." Ezekiel 36:25-27 : "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean," etc. Joel 2:28-29 : " I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh."

(8.) The universally prevalent manner of effecting the rite of purification among the Jews -- from the analogy of which Christian Baptism was taken -- was by sprinkling, and not by immersion. The hands and feet of the priests were to be washed at the brazen laver, from which water poured out through spouts or cocks. Exodus 30:18-21; 2 Chronicles 4:6; 1 Kings 7:27-39. See also Leviticus 8:30; Leviticus 14:7, Leviticus 14:51; Exodus 24:5-8; Numbers 8:6-7; Hebrews 9:12-22.

(9.) In 1 Corinthians 10:1-2, the Israelites are said to have been "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Compare Exodus 14:19-31. But the Egyptians who were immersed were not baptized; and the Israelites who were baptized were not immersed. Dr. Carson (p. 413) says Moses got "a dry dip!" In 1 Peter 3:20-21, it is said that Baptism is the antitype of the salvation of the eight souls in the ark. Yet the very gist of their salvation consisted in their not being immersed.

(10.) Among all the recorded instances of Baptism performed by John the Baptist and the apostles, there is not one in which immersion is asserted, while there are many in which it was highly improbable -- (a.) Because the apostles baptizing and the early converts baptized were all Jews, accustomed to purify by pouring and sprinkling. (b.) Because of the vast multitudes baptized at one time, and the known scarcity of water in Jerusalem and generally in the situations spoken of. The eunuch was baptized on the roadside in a desert country. Acts 8:26-39. Three thousand were baptized in one day in the dry city of Jerusalem, which depends upon rain-water stored in tanks and cisterns. Acts 2:37-41. Vast multitudes swarmed to John. Matthew 3:5-6. The jailer was baptized in prison at midnight Acts 16:25-33. Paul was baptized by Ananias right at his bedside. Ananias said, " Standing up, be baptized;" and " standing up he was baptized." Acts 9:18; Acts 22:16. (c.) The earliest pictorial representations of baptism, dating from the second or third century, all indicate that the manner of applying the water to the body of the baptized was by pouring. (d.) It is done in the same way universally by Eastern Christians at the present time. That it is essential that this baptismal washing should be done in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is plain -- (1.) From the explicit command to that effect expressed in the words of institution. Matthew 28:18-20. (2.) From the fact that Baptism, as a seal of the covenant of grace, and as the divinely appointed rite of initiation into the Christian Church, introduces the baptized into covenant with, and the public profession of, the true God, who is none other than the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

3. The design of Baptism is -- (1.) To signify, seal, and confer, to those to whom they belong, the benefits of Christ’s redemption. Thus -- (a.) It signifies or symbolizes the " washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost," whereby we are united to Christ and made participants in all his redemptive grace. (b.) Christ herein seals the truth of his covenant, and thereby conveys to all the beneficiaries of that covenant the grace intended for them. The design of Baptism is, (2.) That it be a visible sign of our covenant to be the Lord’s, and devoted to his service; and hence it is a public profession of our faith and badge of our allegiance, and hence of our formal initiation into the Christian Church, and a symbol of our union with our fellow Christians. 1 Corinthians 12:13.

SECTION 4: Not only those that do actually profess faith in and obedience unto Christ,(11) but also the infants of one, or both, believing parents, are to be baptized.(12)

(11) Acts 2:41; Acts 8:12-13; Acts 16:14-15 12. Genesis 17:7-14; Galatians 3:9, Galatians 3:14; Colossians 2:11-12; Acts 2:38-39; Romans 4:11-12; Matthew 19:13; Matthew 28:19; Mark

10:13-16; Luke 18:15-17; 1 Corinthians 7:14 As to the subjects of Baptism, our Standards teach --

l. As to adults: "Baptism is not to be administered to any that are out of the visible Church, and so strangers from the covenant of promise, till they profess their faith in Christ, and obedience to him." L. Cat., q. 166, and S. Cat., q. 95. This is of course self-evident, since the intelligent and honest reception of Baptism itself obviously involves precisely this profession of faith in Christ and obedience to him. And in order to secure this, the usage of the Presbyterian Church requires that the pastors and church session should inform the applicant that only a person who has experienced the grace of regeneration, and who has consequently truly repented of sin and exercised faith in Christ, can honestly do what all necessarily profess to do when they are baptized. And to this end the pastor and session must require of the applicant the evidence (1.) Of a competent knowledge of the fundamental truths of Christianity, and of the nature and binding obligation of Baptism; (2.) Of the fact that he makes a consistent profession of a personal experimental faith and promise of obedience to the Lord, and of due subjection to the constituted authorities of the Church; (3.) Of the fact that his outward walk and conversation do not belie his profession. After this, the entire responsibility of the step must lie upon the person talking it. The church officers have no authority to sit in judgment upon the genuineness of his Christian character, because God has given to no class of men the ability to judge aright of such matters. Some Churches, as, for instance, our Covenanting Presbyterian brethren, demand, as a condition of adult baptism -- or, what is the same thing, admission to the Church -- in addition to the profession of faith in the fundamental truths of the Gospel, adherence to certain "Testimonies" embodying non-fundamental, denominational peculiarities. This we believe to be entirely unauthorized. The Church is Christ's fold, designed for all his sheep. Baptism and the Lord's Supper are the common rights of all the Lord's people. If any man holds the fundamentals of the gospel and professes allegiance to our common Lord, and acts consistently therewith, we have no right to exclude him from his Father's house. It is just as presumptuous to make terms of communion which Christ has not made as it would be to make terms of salvation which he does not require.

2. As to infants, our Standards teach that an infant, one or both of whose parents are believers (Conf. Faith, ch. 28. section 4) -- -- i.e., one or both of whose parents profess faith in Christ and obedience to him (L. Cat., q. 166) -- is to be baptized. A bare outline of the abundant Scriptural evidence of this truth may be stated as follows: --

(1.) In constituting human nature and ordaining the propagation of infant children from parents, God has in all respects made the standing of the child while an infant to depend upon that of the parent. The sin of the parent carries away the infant from God; so the faith of the parent brings the infant near to God.

(2.) Every covenant God has ever formed with mankind has included the child with the parent; -- e.g., the covenants formed with Adam; with Noah, Genesis 9:9-17; with Abraham, Genesis 12:1-3; Genesis 17:7; with Israel through Moses, Exodus 20:5; and again, Deuteronomy 29:10-13; and in the opening sermon of the New Testament dispensation men are exhorted to repent and believe, " because the promise (covenant) is unto you and to your children," etc. Acts 2:38-39.

(3.) The Old Testament Church is the same as the New Testament Christian Church. (a.) Paul says (Galatians 3:8) that the covenant made with Abraham (Genesis 17:7) is the "gospel;" and in

the whole epistle to the Hebrews he shows that the Old Testament ritual was a setting forth of the person and work of Christ. See above, under chapter vii. (b.) Faith was the condition of salvation then as well as now. " Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness" (Romans 4:3); so that he was the great typical believer, "the father of all them that believe" (Romans 4:11); and all who believe in Christ "are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Galatians 3:29. See also the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. All the Israelites, even those only "according to the flesh," professed to believe. And all "true" Israelites did believe. "He is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter." Romans 2:28-29. (c.) Circumcision, precisely in the same sense and to the same extent as Baptism, represented a spiritual grace and bound to a spiritual profession. This is taught in the Old Testament, as witness Deuteronomy 10:16; Deuteronomy 30:6. It was the seal of the Abrahamic covenant, which Paul says is the gospel. Genesis 12:3; Genesis 17:7, Genesis 17:10; Galatians 3:8. It was the seal of the righteousness of faith. Romans 2:28-29; Romans 4:11. True Circumcision unites to Christ and secures all the benefits of his redemption. Colossians 2:10-11. And Baptism has now taken the precise place of Circumcision: " For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.....And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Galatians 3:27-29. (d.) This Church is identically the same with the New Testament Church. It has the same foundation; the same condition of membership, faith and obedience; sacraments of the same spiritual significancy and binding force, The ancient prophecies declare that the same old Church is to be enlarged, not changed. Isaiah 49:13-23; Isaiah 60:1-14. The ancient covenant, which was the fundamental charter of the Church, included "many nations" (Genesis 17:4; Romans 4:17-18; Galatians 3:8), which was never fulfilled until after the expansion of the Church in the New Testament dispensation. And Paul says that the Jewish Church, instead of being abrogated, remains the same through all change -- the Jewish branches being cut off, the Gentile branches being grafted in; and that hereafter the Jews are to be restored, not to a new Church, but "into their own olive tree." Romans 11:18-24. See also Ephesians 2:11-22.

(4.) Infants were members of the Church under the Old Testament from the beginning, being circumcised upon the faith of their parents. Now, as the Church is the same Church; as the conditions of membership were the same then as now; as Circumcision signified and bound to precisely what Baptism does; and since Baptism has taken precisely the place of Circumcision -- it follows that the church membership of the children of professors should be recognized now as it was then, and that they should be baptized. The only ground upon which this conclusion could be obviated would be that Christ in the gospel explicitly turns them out of their ancient birth-right in the Church.

(5.) On the contrary, Christ and his apostles uniformly, without exception, speak of and treat children on the assumption that they remain in the same church relation they have always occupied. Christ, speaking to Jewish apostles, who had all their lives never heard of any other than the old Padobaptist Church, into which they had been themselves born and circumcised (and their infant circumcision was the only baptism they ever received), never once warns them that he had changed this relation. On the contrary, he says, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven" (i.e., new dispensation of the old Church). Matthew 19:14; Luke 18:16. He commissioned Peter to feed the

lambs as well as the sheep of the flock (John 21:15-17); and all the apostles to "disciple all nations," by first baptizing and then teaching them. Matthew 27:18-19. If only one of the parents is a Christian, the children are said to be "holy," or "saints;" which is a common designation of church members in the New Testament. 1 Corinthians 7:14. In the old Jewish Church every proselyte from the heathen brought his children into the Church with him. So the Jewish apostles write the brief history of their missionary labours precisely as all modern Padobaptist missionaries write theirs, and as no Baptist missionary ever wrote from the first rise of their denomination. There are only eleven cases of Baptism recorded in the Acts and the Epistles. In the case of two of these, Paul and the Ethiopian eunuch, there were no children to be baptized. Five of the cases were large crowds. After Stephanas was baptized with the crowd among "the many Corinthians," Paul baptized his household. Also were the households of Lydia, of the jailer, of Crispus, and probably of Cornelius, baptized. Thus in every case in which the household existed it was baptized. The faith of the head of the household is mentioned, but not that of the household itself, except in one case, and that as a general fact. The apostles also address children as members of the Church. Compare Ephesians 1:1 with Ephesians 6:1-3, and Colossians 1:1-2 with Colossians 3:20.

(6.) This has been the belief and practice of a vast majority of God's people from the first. The early Church, in unbroken continuity from the days of the apostles, testify to their custom on this subject. The Greek and the Roman, and all branches of the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches, agree in this fundamental point. The Baptist denomination, which opposes the whole Christian world in this matter, is a very modern party, dating from the Anabaptists of Germany, A.D. 1687. Our Standards teach that precisely the same requirements are made the condition on the part of the parent of having his child baptized that are made the condition of approach to the Lord's table. S. Cat. q. 95: "Infants of such as are members of the visible Church are to be baptized." This is explained, L. Cat., q. 166: "Infants descending from parents, either both, or but one of them, professing faith in Christ;" and Conf. Faith, ch. xxviii., section 4: " Infants of one or both believing parents." In the (American) Directory for Worship, ch. vii., the minister is to require of the parents, among other things, "that they pray with and for (the child); that they set an example of piety and godliness before it; and endeavour by all means of God's appointment to bring up their child in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." The (American) General Assembly in 1794, in answer to an overture on the subject, declared that the above passage in the Directory is to be understood as bringing the parent under an express engagement to do as there required by the minister.

Some have supposed, since the church-membership of the child follows from that of the parent, that every person who was himself introduced into the Church by Baptism in infancy has an indefeasible right to have his children baptized, whether he professes personal faith in Christ or not. But this is manifestly absurd -- (a.) Because all members of the Church have not a right to all privileges of church-membership. Thus baptized members have no right to come to the communion until they make a profession of personal faith. Until they do this they are like citizens under age, with their rights held in suspension, as a just punishment for their refusal to believe. These suspended rights are those of communing and having their children baptized. (b.) A person destitute of personal faith can only commit perjury and sacrilege by making the solemn professions and talking the obligations involved in the baptismal covenant. It is a sin for him to do it, and a sin for the minister to help him to do it.

SECTION 5: Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance,(13) yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated, or saved, without it;(14) or, that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated.(15)

(13) Genesis 17:14; Matthew 28:19; Acts 2:38; see Luke 7:30 (14) Romans 4:11; Acts 10:2, Acts 10:4, Acts 10:22, Acts 10:31, Acts 10:45, Acts 10:47 (15) Acts 8:13, Acts 8:23

SECTION 6: The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered;(16) yet, notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited, and conferred, by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will, in his appointed time.(17) (16) John 3:5, John 3:8 (17) Romans 6:3-6; Galatians 3:27; 1 Peter 3:21; Acts 2:38, Acts 2:41 SECTION 7: The sacrament of baptism is but once to be administered unto any person.(18) (18) Romans 6:3-11

These sections teach: --

1. That grace and salvation are not so inseparably united to Baptism that only the baptized are saved, or that all the baptized are saved.

2. That, nevertheless, it is a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance; for its observance is commanded and, in the right use of it, the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost to such (whether of age or infants) as the grace belongeth unto.

3. That the efficacy of Baptism, even in cases in which the grace signified is really conveyed, is not tied down to the moment of time wherein the sacrament is administered, but is conveyed to the recipient according to the counsel of God's own will, in his appointed time.

4. The sacrament of Baptism is to be administered but once to any person. The ground taken here is intermediate between two opposite extremes --

(1.) The extreme held by Papists and Ritualists of baptismal regeneration. (a.) This is not taught in Scripture. The language relied upon to prove it (John 3:5; Acts 2:38) is easily explained on the principle that, in virtue of the sacramental union between the sign and the grace signified, what is true of the one is metaphorically predicated of the other. There is nothing said of the efficacy of Baptism which is not likewise said of the efficacy of the truth. James 1:18; John 17:19; 1 Peter 1:28. But the mere hearing of the truth saves no one. (b.) Baptism cannot be the only or ordinary means of regeneration, because faith and repentance are the fruits of regeneration, but the prerequisites of Baptism. Acts 2:38; Acts 8:37; Acts 10:47. (c.) Universal experience in Romanist and Ritualistic communities proves that the baptized are not generally regenerated. Our Saviour says, " By their fruits ye shall know them." Matthew 7:20. (2.) Our Standards oppose the other extreme, that Baptism is a mere sign of grace and badge of Christian profession. Their doctrine is --

(a.) That Baptism does not only signify, but really and truly seal and convey, grace to those to whom it belongs according to the covenant -- that is, to the elect.

(b.) But that this actual conveyance of the grace sealed is not tied to the moment in which the sacrament is administered, but is made according to the precise provisions as to time and

circumstance predetermined in the eternal covenant of grace. So property may be sealed and conveyed in a deed to a minor, but the minor may not actually enter into the fruition of it until such time and upon such conditions as are predetermined in his father's will.

(c.) The efficacy of the sacrament is not due to any spiritual or magical quality communicated to the water.

(d.) But this efficacy does result (1.) From the moral power of the truth which the rite symbolizes. (2.) From the fact that it is a seal of the covenant of grace, and a legal form of investing those persons embraced in the covenant with the graces promised therein. (3.) From the personal presence and sovereignly gracious operation of the Holy Spirit, who uses the sacrament as his instrument and medium.

(e.) That through these channels the grace signified is really conveyed to the persons to whom, according to the divine counsel, it truly belongs; yet this grace and the influences of the Holy Ghost are not so tied to the sacrament that they are never, or even infrequently, conveyed in any other way. The very grace conveyed by the sacrament must be possessed by the adult as a prerequisite to Baptism, and is often subsequently experienced through other channels.

(f.) Hence the necessity for being baptized arises (1.) From the divine command. Obedience is of course necessary where there is knowledge. (2.) It is the proper and only efficient method of making a profession of faith and allegiance to Christ. (3.) It is eminently helpful as a means of grace. That Baptism is never to be administered more than once to any person appears (1.) From the symbolical significance of the rite. It signifies spiritual regeneration -- the inauguration of the divine life. Of course it can have but one commencement. (2.) It is the rite of initiation into the Christian Church, and as there is no provision made for getting out of the Church when once in, so there is no provision made for coming in more than once. (3.) The apostles baptized each individual but once.

01.29. Of the Lord's Supper

Chapter Twenty-nine

Of the Lord’s Supper

SECTION 1: Our Lord Jesus, in the night wherein he was betrayed, instituted the sacrament of his body and blood, called the Lord’s Supper, to be observed in his church, unto the end of the world, for the perpetual remembrance of the sacrifice of himself in his death; the sealing all benefits thereof unto 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.(1) (1) 1 Corinthians 10:16-17, 1 Corinthians 10:21; 1 Corinthians 11:23-26; 1 Corinthians 12:13 THIS section teaches us -- 1. Of the time in which, and the person by whom, the Lord’s Supper was instituted. 2. Of its perpetual obligation. 3. Of its design and effect.

1. Of the fact that it was instituted by our Lord in person on the night in which he was betrayed there can be no doubt. The fact is explicitly declared by three of the evangelists (Matthew 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:19-20) and by Paul (1 Corinthians 11:23-25); and it remains to this day a monument of the truth of the Gospel history with which it is associated.

2. That it was designed to be observed perpetually to the end of the world is evident -- (1.) From the words of the institution, "This do in remembrance of me," Luke 22:19; and again, "This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." 1 Corinthians 11:25. (2.) The apostolic example. Acts 2:42. (3.) The frequent references to this ordinance which occur in the apostolic writings, and which all imply that it is of perpetual obligation. (4.) The uniform and universal practice of the Christian Church, in all its branches, from the beginning.

3. As to the design of the Lord’s Supper, the teaching of our Standards may be exhibited under the following heads: --

(1.) The Lord’s Supper is a commemoration of the death of Christ. This is evident -- (a.) From the fact that the bread is an emblem of his body broken, and the wine of his blood shed upon the cross for us. Matthew 26:26-28; Luke 22:19-20. (b.) From the fact that the act of eating the bread and of drinking the wine is declared, both by Christ and by Paul, to be done "in remembrance" of Christ, and to "shew his death till he come." Luke 22:19; 1 Corinthians 11:26.

(2.) It is a seal of the gospel covenant wherein all the benefits of the new covenant are signified, sealed, and applied to believers. Conf. Faith, ch. 29., section 1; L. Cat., q. 162; S. Cat. q. 92. Christ says, "This cup is the new testament (covenant) in my blood, which is shed for you" (Luke 22:20); i.e., My blood is the seal of the covenant of grace, and this cup is the symbol of my blood, and as such is offered to you. In its use Christ ratifies his promise to save us on the condition of faith, and to endow us with all the benefits of his redemption. We, in taking this pledge, solemnly bind ourselves to entire self-consecration and to all that is involved in the requirements of the

gospel of Christ, not as we understand them, but as he intends them. It is a universal principle that all oaths bind in the sense in which they are understood by the persons who impose them.

(3.) Hence it is a badge of Christian profession -- a mark of allegiance of a citizen of the kingdom of heaven.

(4.) It was designed to signify and effect our communion with Christ, in his person, in his offices, and in their precious fruits. Paul says (1 Corinthians 10:16), "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion (koinonia) of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" L. Cat., q. 170: " So they that worthily communicate in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, do therein feed upon the body and blood of Christ, not after a corporal and carnal, but in a spiritual manner; yet truly and really, while by faith they receive and apply unto themselves Christ crucified, and all the benefits of his Death." The bread represents his flesh, and the wine represents his blood. We receive the symbol with the mouth corporally; we receive the flesh and blood symbolized by faith, yet really. "Whoso eateth my lesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life.....For my flesh is meat indeed, and nay blood is drink indeed." John 6:54-55.

(5.) It was designed to show forth and to effect the mutual communion of believers with each other, as members of one body and of one blood. 1 Corinthians 10:17 : " For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread." Union with the common Head necessarily implies communion with each other in that Head.

SECTION 2: In this sacrament, Christ is not offered up to his Father; nor any real sacrifice made at all, for remission of sins of the quick or dead;(2) but only a commemoration of that one offering up of himself, by himself, upon the cross, once for all: and a spiritual oblation of all possible praise unto God, for the same:(3) so that the popish sacrifice of the mass (as they call it) is most abominably injurious to Christ's one, only sacrifice, the alone propitiation for all the sins of his elect.(4)

(2) Hebrews 9:22, Hebrews 9:25-26, Hebrews 9:28; Hebrews 10:10-14 (3) 1 Corinthians 11:24-26; Matthew 26:26-27; Luke 22:19-20 (4) Hebrews 7:23-24, Hebrews 7:27; Hebrews 10:11-12, Hebrews 10:14, Hebrews 10:18

SECTION 3: The Lord Jesus hath, in this ordinance, appointed his ministers to declare his word of institution to the people; to pray, and bless the elements of bread and wine, and thereby to set them apart from a common to an holy use; and to take and break the bread, to take the cup, and (they communicating also themselves) to give both to the communicants;(5) but to none who are not then present in the congregation.(6)

(5) Matthew 26:26-28; Mark 14:22-24; Luke 22:19-20; 1 Corinthians 10:16-17; 1 Corinthians 11:23-27

(6) Acts 20:7; 1 Corinthians 11:20

SECTION 4: Private masses, or receiving this sacrament by a priest, or any other, alone;(7) as likewise, the denial of the cup to the people,(8) worshiping the elements, the lifting them up, or carrying them about, for adoration, and the reserving them for any pretended religious use; are all contrary to the nature of this sacrament, and to the institution of Christ.(9) (7) 1 Corinthians 10:16

(8) Matthew 26:27-28; Mark 14:23; 1 Corinthians 11:25-29 (9) Matthew 15:9

SECTION 5: The outward elements in this sacrament, duly set apart to the uses ordained by Christ, have such relation to him crucified, as that, truly, yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the name of the things they represent, to wit, the body and blood of Christ;(10) albeit, in substance and nature, they still remain truly and only bread and wine, as they were before. (11) (10) Matthew 26:26-28 (11) 1 Corinthians 11:26-28; Matthew 26:29

SECTION 6: That doctrine which maintains a change of the substance of bread and wine, into the substance of Christ's body and blood (commonly called transubstantiation) by consecration of a priest, or by any other way, is repugnant, not to Scripture alone, but even to common sense, and reason; overthroweth the nature of the sacrament, and hath been, and is, the cause of manifold superstitions; yea, of gross idolatries.(12) (12) Acts 3:21; 1 Corinthians 11:24-26; Luke 24:6, Luke 24:39 The form in which the statements made in these sections are put is rather negative than positive -- rather designed to oppose certain Romish and Ritualistic errors than to make a simple statement of the true doctrine of the sacrament. The errors which are here opposed are -- (1.) The doctrine of transubstantiation, or the change of the entire substance of the bread and wine into the body, blood, soul, and divinity of the Lord Jesus. (2.) The sacrifice of the mass. (3.) The worshipping and reservation of the elements for any pretended religious use. (4.) Denying the cup to the laity. (5.) Private communion of the priest alone, or the sending of the elements to persons not present at the administration of the ordinance. In order to make the statements of these sections plain, we will first state the true doctrine -- (1.) As to what elements and actions are essential to the sacrament, and (2.) As to the true relation between the sign and the grace signified; and, secondly, present the opposing Papal errors upon the points above stated.

1. The true doctrine (1.) As to the elements. These are -- (a.) Bread. This is essential, because it is in the command; and because bread, as the staff of life for the body, is the proper symbol of that spiritual food that nourishes the soul. Christ instituted the Supper at the passover, when the only bread at hand was unleavened. The early Church always used the common bread of daily life. The Romish and Lutheran Churches hold that unleavened bread should be used: the Reformed Churches have uniformly held that the bread intended, and that best fulfils the conditions of the symbol, is the common bread of daily life -- not the sweet cake used in so many of our old churches. (b.) Wine; that is oinos, the fermented juice of the grape. Matthew 9:17; John 2:3-10; Romans 14:21; Ephesians 5:18; 1 Timothy 3:8; 1 Timothy 5:23; Titus 2:3. This is made essential by the command and example of Christ, and by the uniform custom of the Christian Church from the beginning.

(2.) As to the sacramental actions which are essential to this ordinance. (a.) The consecration. This includes the repetition of the words of Christ used in the institution, together with a prayer in which the divine blessing is invoked upon the worshippers in the use of the ordinance, and so much of the elements as shall be used in the sacrament set apart from a common to a sacred use. (See section 3. of this chapter.) The words which express this in the Scripture are eucharisteo Luke 22:19; and eulogeo, Matthew 26:26, and 1 Corinthians 10:16. (b.) The breaking of the bread. This is symbolical of the rending of Christ's body on the cross, and of all the communicants, being many, feeding upon one Christ, as upon one bread. It is particularly mentioned in every account given of the institution by the evangelists. Matthew 26:26; Mark 14:22; Luke 22:19; 1 Corinthians

11:24. See 1 Corinthians 10:16. In Acts 2:42 the whole ordinance is designated from this constituent action. (c.) The distribution and reception of the elements. This is an essential part of the ordinance, which is not completed when the minister consecrates the elements, nor until they are actually received and eaten and drunk by the people. Christ says, "This do in remembrance of me." Paul adds, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." Luke 22:19; 1 Corinthians 11:26. So that the essence of the sacrament consists in the eating and the drinking.

2. The Papal errors condemned in these sections are -- (1.) Their doctrine of transubstantiation, or conversion of substance. The Council of Trent teaches (sess. xiii. cans. 1-4) that the whole substance of the bread is changed into the literal body, and the whole substance of the wine is changed into the literal blood, of Christ; so that only the appearance or sensible properties of the bread and wine remain, and the only substances present are the true body and blood, soul and divinity, of our Lord. And thus he is objectively presented to, and is eaten and drunk by, every recipient, believer and unbeliever indifferently; and thus he remains before and after the communion, his very body and blood, Godhead and manhood, shut up in a vessel, carried about, elevated, worshipped, etc. The Lutherans hold that while the bread and the wine remain, nevertheless at the words of consecration the real body and blood of Christ, though invisible, are really present in, with, and under the bread and wine. The only ground of this doctrine is the word of our Lord, "This is my body." They hold the word "is" is literal: all the Reformed churches hold it must mean "represents," " symbolizes." This is a frequent usage of the word in Scripture. " The seven good kine are seven years; and the seven good ears are seven years." Genesis 41:26-27; Ezekiel 37:11; Daniel 7:24; Luke 12:1; Revelation 1:20. Besides, when our Lord said this, and gave them the bread to eat, he was sitting by them in his sound, undivided flesh, eating and drinking with them. This doctrine, then, is false (a.) Because it is not taught in Scripture. (A.) Because it confounds the very idea of sacrament, making the sign identical with the thing it signifies. (c.) It contradicts our senses, since we see, smell, taste, and feel bread and wine, and do never either see, or smell, or taste, or feel flesh and blood. (d.) It contradicts reason; for reason teaches that qualities cannot exist except as they inhere in some substance, and that substance cannot be known and cannot act except by its qualities. But this doctrine supposes that the qualities of bread and wine remain without any substance, and that the substance of flesh and blood remains without any qualities. (e.) It is absurd and impossible; because Christ's glorified body is still material and therefore finite, and therefore not omnipresent in all places on earth, but absent at the right hand of God in heaven.

(2.) Their doctrine as to the mass as a sacrifice. The Council of Trent teaches (sess. xxii., cans. 1 -- 3) that the Eucharist is both a sacrament and a sacrifice. As a sacrament, the soul of the recipient is nourished by the real body, blood, soul and divinity of Christ, which he eats in the form of a wafer. As a sacrifice, it is "an external oblation of the body and blood of Christ offered to God, in recognition of his supreme lordship, under the appearance of bread and wine visibly exhibited by a legitimate minister, with the addition of certain prayers and ceremonies prescribed by the Church, for the greater worship of God and edification of the people." This is not a mere act in commemoration of the one sacrifice upon the cross, but a constantly repeated real, although bloodless, expiatory sacrifice, atoning for sin and propitiating God. (Counc. Trent, sess. xxii., can. 3.) This doctrine is false, because -- (a.) It is nowhere taught in Scripture. (b.) The Christian

ministry are never called or spoken of as priests, but as " teachers" and " rulers." (c.) The one sacrifice of Christ on the cross was perfect, and excludes all others. Hebrews 9:25-28; Hebrews 10:10-27. (d.) The same ordinance cannot be both a sacrament and a sacrifice. Christ says that by eating and drinking we are to "shew forth his death," and to "do this in remembrance of him." The same act cannot be a commemoration of one sacrifice, and itself an actual sacrifice having intrinsic sin-expiating efficacy.

(3.) Since the Papists hold that the entire substance of the bread and wine is permanently changed into the body, blood, soul and divinity of Christ, they consequently maintain that the principal intention of the ordinance is accomplished when the words of consecration are pronounced and the change effected. Hence they preserve the host carefully shut up in the pyx, elevate and adore and carry it about in their processions. All this stands or falls with the doctrine of transubstantiation, before refuted.

(4.) After the establishment of the doctrine of transubstantiation, there arose the natural fear lest some of the august person of the Lord should be spoiled or lost from the crumbling of the bread or the spilling of the wine. Hence the bread is prepared in little wafers which cannot crumble, and the cup is denied to the laity and confined to the priests. To comfort the laity, they teach that as the blood is in the flesh, and as the soul is in the body, and as the divinity is in the soul of Christ, the whole person -- body, blood, soul and divinity -- of Christ is equally in every particle of the bread; so that he who receives the bread receives all. (Counc. Trent, sess. xxi., cans. 1 -- 3.)

(5.) In opposition to the manifold abuses of this ordinance which prevail among the Romanists, our Standards, in common with the general judgment of the Reformed Churches, teach that the Lord's Supper is essentially a communion, in which the fellowship of the believer with Christ and with his fellow-believers is set forth by their eating and drinking of the same bread and the same cup. It follows that it should not be sent to persons not present at the administration, nor administered by the officiating priest to himself alone. In particular cases, however, it may be administered in private houses, for the benefit of Christians long confined by sickness, provided that the officers and a sufficient number of the members of the Church be present to preserve the true character of the ordinance as a communion.

SECTION 7: Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements, in this sacrament,(13) do then also, inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally but spiritually, receive, and feed upon, Christ crucified, and all benefits of his death: the body and blood of Christ being then, not corporally or carnally, in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet, as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses.(14) (13) 1 Corinthians 11:28 (14) 1 Corinthians 10:16; see 1 Corinthians 10:3-4

SECTION 8: Although ignorant and wicked men receive the outward elements in this sacrament; yet, they receive not the thing signified thereby; but, by their unworthy coming thereunto, are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, to their own damnation. Wherefore, all ignorant and ungodly persons, as they are unfit to enjoy communion with him, so are they unworthy of the Lord's table; and cannot, without great sin against Christ, while they remain such, partake of these holy mysteries,(15) or be admitted thereunto.(16)

(15) 1 Corinthians 10:21; 1 Corinthians 11:27-29; 2 Corinthians 6:14-16 (16) 1 Corinthians 5:6-7, 1 Corinthians 5:13; 2 Thessalonians 3:6, 2 Thessalonians 3:14-15; Matthew 7:6

These sections teach the Reformed doctrine as to the relation which in the Lord's Supper subsists between the sign and the grace signified; that is, as to the nature of the presence of Christ in the sacrament, and the sense in which, consequently, the worthy recipient is said to feed upon the body and blood of the Lord. This Reformed doctrine may be stated as follows: --

1. The bread and wine -- always remaining mere bread and wine, without change -- represent, by the divine appointment, the flesh and blood of the Redeemer offered as a sacrifice for sin. The relation between the bread and wine and the body and blood is purely moral or representative.

2. The body and blood are present, therefore, only virtually; that is, the virtues and effects of the sacrifice of the body of the Redeemer on the cross are made present and are actually conveyed in the sacrament to the worthy receiver by the power of the Holy Ghost, who uses the sacrament as his instrument according to his sovereign will.

3. When it is said, therefore, that believers receive and feed upon the body and blood of Christ, it is meant that they receive, not by the mouth, but through faith, the benefits secured by Christ's sacrificial death upon the cross -- that this feeding upon Christ is purely spiritual, accomplished through the free and sovereign agency of the Holy Ghost and through the instrumentality and in the exercise of faith alone; so that in no case is it ever done by the unbeliever. The unbeliever, therefore, receiving the outward sign with his mouth while he fails to receive the inward grace in his soul, only increases his own condemnation and hardens his own heart by the exercise. All, therefore, who are known to be unbelievers, and whose unbelief is made manifest either by their ignorance or their ungodliness, should be prevented, both for their own sake and for the Church's sake, from coming to the Lord's table until they are able to make a credible profession of their faith.

4. Hence, also, it follows that believers do, in the same sense, receive and feed upon the body and blood of Christ at other times without the use of the sacrament, and in the use of other means of grace -- as prayer, meditation on the Word, etc.

01.30. Of Church Censures

Chapter Thirty

Of Church Censures

SECTION 1: The Lord Jesus, as King and Head of his church, hath therein appointed a government, in the hand of church officers, distinct from the civil magistrate.(1)

(1) Isaiah 9:6-7; Colossians 1:18; 1 Timothy 5:17; 1 Thessalonians 5:12; Acts 20:17, Acts 20:28; Hebrews 13:7, Hebrews 13:17, Hebrews 13:24; Ephesians 4:11-12; 1 Corinthians 12:28; Matthew 28:18-20; John 18:36 THE principle designated Erastianism, which has been practically embodied in all the State Churches of the 0ld World, includes the following elements: -- 1. That the Church is an organ of the State to accomplish one of its general functions; and consequently that there is no government of the Church independent of that of the State, but that its officers, its laws, and their administration, are in all things subject to the civil government. 2. That all the subjects of the State are, ipso facto, members of the Church, and entitled to all its ordinances. 3. That the duties and prerogatives of church officers include simply the functions of teaching and administering the ordinances, and do not include discipline, because, according to this view, to exclude a man from church ordinances is to deny him his civil rights as a citizen. In opposition to this doctrine, our Confession in this section teaches -- 1. That our Lord Jesus Christ, as mediatorial King, has appointed a government for his Church; and -- 2. That this church government is distinct in all respects from the civil government.

1. Christ the God-man, as mediatorial King, by his inspired apostles and their writings appointed a government for his Church; and by his providence and Spirit he continues graciously to administer it to the end of time. Hence the Church is a Theocratic kingdom. All authority and power descends, and does not ascend. Pastors and elders teach and rule in the name of God, and not of man. It is the commission of Christ, and not of the Church, that the minister carries with him, and by authority of which he acts. The Church only witnesses to the genuineness of this commission, and sees that it is faithfully discharged by the bearer of it. Hence all the power of church officers, either in their several or collective capacity, is ministerial and declarative. They have only to define what Christ has taught, to carry that teaching to all men, and to execute the laws he has given, and to administer the penalties he has designated, according to his will and in his name.

2. This Theocratic government of the Church which Christ has established is entirely independent of the civil government. To very many in Europe it appeared impossible that two independent governments should exercise jurisdiction at the same time over the same subjects without constant collision. But the experience of the dissenting bodies and free churches of Great Britain, and of all the churches in America, abundantly proves that there is no danger of interference whatever, when both the Church and the State confine themselves to their respective provinces. The persons subject to the jurisdiction of the government of the Church are also subject to the jurisdiction of the government of the State; but the ends, the laws, the methods and the sanctions

of the two are so different, that the one never can any more interfere with the other than waves of colour can interfere with vibrations of sound.

While all Christians, with the exception of the Erastians, agree with the two principles taught in this section as thus generally stated, they differ very much as to the human agents with whom Christ has deposited this power, and whom he uses as his instruments in administering it. There are four radically different theories on this subject: -- "(1.) The Popish theory, which assumes that Christ, the apostles, and believers constituted the Church while our Saviour was on earth, and that this organization was designed to be perpetual. After the ascension of our Lord, Peter became his vicar, and took his place as the visible head of the Church. This primacy of Peter, as the universal bishop, is continued in his successors, the bishops of Rome; and the apostleship is perpetuated in the order of prelates. As in the primitive Church no one could be an apostle who was not subject to Christ, so now no one can be a prelate who is not subject to the Pope. And as then no one could be a Christian who was not subject to Christ, and the apostles, so now no one can be a Christian who is not subject to the Pope and the prelates. This is the Romish theory of the Church: A vicar of Christ, a perpetual college of apostles, and the people subject to their infallible control.

"(2.) The Prelatical theory assumes the perpetuity of the apostleship as the governing power in the Church, which therefore consists of those who profess the true religion and are subject to apostle-bishops. This is the Anglican or High Church form of this theory. In its Low Church form the prelatical theory simply teaches that there was originally a threefold order in the ministry, and that there should be now. But it does not affirm that mode of organization to be essential.

" (3.) The Independent or Congregational theory includes two principles: first, that the governing and executive power in the Church is in the brotherhood; and secondly, that the church organization is complete in each worshipping assembly, which is independent of every other.

" (4.) The fourth theory is the Presbyterian..... This includes the following affirmative statement: (a.) The people have a right to a substantive part in the government of the Church. (b.) Presbyters, who labour in word and doctrine, are the highest permanent officers of the Church, and all belong to the same order. (c.) The outward and visible Church is, or should be, one, in the sense that a smaller part is subject to a larger, and a larger to the whole. It is not holding one of these principles that makes a man a Presbyterian, but his holding them all." Christ has in fact vested all ecclesiastical power in the Church as a whole, none of its members being excluded; yet not in the Church as a mob, but as an organized body consisting of members, their representative ruling elders, and ministers or bishops. Elders or bishops were ordained by the apostles, have always continued in the Church, and were designed to be perpetuated as the highest class of officers in the Church. 1 Timothy 3:1; Ephesians 4:11-12. All Church power vests, then, jointly in the lay and clerical elements, in the ministers together with the people.

" Ruling elders are properly the REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PEOPLE, chosen by them for the purpose of exercising government and discipline in conjunction with pastors or ministers." "The powers, therefore, exercised by our ruling elders are powers which belong to the lay members of the Church." " They are chosen by them to act in their name in the government of the Church. A representative is one chosen by others to do in their name what they are entitled to do in their own persons; or rather to exercise the powers which radically inhere in those for whom they act. The members of a State Legislature or of Congress, for example, can exercise only those powers

which are inherent in the people."

SECTION 2: To these officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed; by virtue whereof, they have power, respectively, to retain, and remit sins; to shut that kingdom against the impenitent, both by the Word, and censures; and to open it unto penitent sinners, by the ministry of the gospel; and by absolution from censures, as occasion shall require.(2) (2) Matthew 16:19; Matthew 18:17-18; John 20:21-23; 2 Corinthians 2:6-8

SECTION 3: Church censures are necessary, for the reclaiming and gaining of offending brethren, for deterring of others from the like offenses, for purging out of that leaven which might infect the whole lump, for vindicating the honor of Christ, and the holy profession of the gospel, and for preventing the wrath of God, which might justly fall upon the church, if they should suffer his covenant, and the seals thereof, to be profaned by notorious and obstinate offenders.(3) (3) 1 Corinthians 5:1-13; 1 Corinthians 11:27-34; 1 Timothy 1:20; 1 Timothy 5:20; Matthew 7:6; Jude 1:23

SECTION 4: For the better attaining of these ends, the officers of the church are to proceed by admonition; suspension from the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper for a season; and by excommunication from the church; according to the nature of the crime, and demerit of the person.(4)

(4) 1 Thessalonians 5:12; 2 Thessalonians 3:6, 2 Thessalonians 3:14-15; 1 Corinthians 5:4-5, 1 Corinthians 5:13; Matthew 18:17; Titus 3:10 These sections teach --

1. As to the nature and extent of the power conferred upon the Church of admitting and excluding from the fold, and of disciplining its members.

2. As to the ends of this discipline.

3.. As to the methods through which it should be administered.

1. All Church power must be exercised in an orderly manner through the officers spoken of above, freely chosen for this purpose by the brethren; and it relates --" (1.) To matters of doctrine. She has a right to set forth a public declaration of the truths which she believes, and which are to be acknowledged. by all who enter her communion. That is, she has a right to frame creeds or confessions of faith, as her testimony for the truth and her protest against error. And as she has been commissioned to teach all nations, she has the right of selecting teachers, of judging of their fitness, of ordaining and sending them forth into the field, and of recalling and deposing them when unfaithful. (2.) The Church has power to set down rules for the ordering of public worship. (3.) She has power to make rules for her own government; such as every Church has in its book of discipline, constitution or canons, etc. (4.) She has power to receive into fellowship, and to exclude the unworthy from her own communion." This last power is commonly styled "the power of the keys;" i.e., of operating and closing the doors of the Church, of admitting or excluding from sealing ordinances. Matthew 16:19. In view of two unquestionable facts -- (a.) to forgive sin is an incommunicable attribute of God and Christ; (b.) God has given to no class of men the faculty of absolutely discriminating the good from the bad -- it follows that the Church power of opening and shutting, of binding and loosing, spoken of in Matt. xvi. 19 and in the second section of this chapter, is purely ministerial and declarative. Church censures declare simply what is, to the best

of their knowledge, in the opinion of the Church officers pronouncing them, the mind and will of Christ in the case. And they have direct binding effect only in so far as the relation of the person censured to the visible Church is concerned. They can have effect upon the relations of the censured to God and to Christ only in so far as they represent the will of Christ in the case, and because they do.

2. The ends of Church discipline are declared. to be -- (1.) The purity of the Church, and hence the glory and approbation of God. (2.) The recovery of the erring brother himself. (3.) The force of example to deter others from like sin. (4.) The exhibition of righteousness and fidelity to principle presented to the world without.

3. The better to attain all these ends, for which the discipline is intended, the Church officers should --

(1.) Proceed in a regular order to administer discipline, using, according to their character, first all means of moral reclamation before they proceed to absolute exclusion. The proper method of procedure, under all circumstances, is plainly stated in the "Book of Discipline," which forms part of the Confession of Faith of our Church. The successive stages of discipline there unfolded are -- (a.) private admonition, (b.) public admonition, (c.) suspension, (d.) excommunication.

(2.) The discipline should be wisely and justly proportioned "to the nature of the crime and demerit of the person."

01.31. Of Synods and Councils

Chapter Thirty-one

Of Synods and Councils

SECTION 1: For the better government, and further edification of the church, there ought to be such assemblies as are commonly called synods or councils:(1) and it belongeth to the overseers and other rulers of the particular churches, by virtue of their office, and the power which Christ hath given them for edification and not for destruction, to appoint such assemblies;(2) and to convene together in them, as often as they shall judge it expedient for the good of the church. (3) (1) Acts 15:2, Acts 15:4, Acts 15:6 (2) Acts 15:1-35 (3) Acts 15:1-35; Acts 20:17 As we have seen in the last chapter, all Church power is vested by Christ in the Church as a whole -- not as a mob, but as an organized body. As organized, the Church consists of presbyters or bishops and the people, and the people as represented by lay or ruling elders. This necessarily gives origin to the session or parochial presbytery, consisting of the bishop or pastor, and the ruling elders or representatives of the people. In this body the entire ecclesiastical power of the whole congregation is vested. It admits candidates to sealing ordinances, exercises pastoral care and discipline over the members, provides for the instruction of the flock, and regulates public worship. In the Episcopal Church this governing power vests with the rector. In the Congregational Churches it is exercised immediately by the whole body of the brotherhood in person. In the Presbyterian Church it vests with pastor and people -- the people, however, acting only through their permanent representatives, the ruling elders. But the third great principle of Presbyterianism, as stated in the preceding chapter, is, that the whole Church of Christ on earth "is one in such a sense that a smaller part is subject to a larger, and a larger to the whole. It has one Lord, one faith, one baptism. The principles of government laid down in the Scriptures bind the whole Church. The terms of admission and the legitimate grounds of exclusion are everywhere the same. The same qualifications are everywhere to be demanded for admission to the sacred office, and the same grounds for deposition. Every man who is properly received as a member of a particular church becomes a member of the Church universal; every one rightfully excluded from a particular church is excluded from the whole Church: everyone rightfully ordained to the ministry in one church is a minister of the universal Church; and when rightfully deposed in one he ceases to be a minister in any. Hence, while every particular church has a right to manage its own affairs and administer its own discipline, it cannot be independent and irresponsible in the exercise of that right. As its members are the members of the Church universal, and those whom it excommunicates are, according to the Scriptural theory, delivered unto Satan and cut off from the communion of the saints, the acts of a particular church become the acts of the whole Church, and therefore the whole has a right to see that they are performed according to the law of Christ. Hence, on the one hand, the right of appeal; and, on the other, the right of review and control." The principle contained in the above statement was certainly acted upon in the apostolic age, and it has been practically recognized and acted upon with more or less fidelity in all branches of the Christian Church ever since.

" A controversy having arisen in the church at Antioch concerning the Mosaic law, instead of settling it among themselves as an independent body, they referred the case to the apostles and elders at Jerusalem; and there it was authoritatively decided (not by the apostles alone, but ' by the apostles and elders, with the whole church,' Acts 15:22) -- not for that church (Antioch) only, but for all others. Paul, therefore, in his next missionary journey, as he passed through the cities, ' delivered to them,' it is said, ' the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem.' Acts 16:4." Hence, in carrying these principles into effect, the constitution of the Presbyterian Church provides for the erection and operation of a regularly graduated series of ecclesiastical councils.

1. Every particular congregation is governed, as we have seen, by a Session or Parochial Presbytery, consisting of its pastor and the ruling elders as the representatives of the people. The whole governmental power of that particular church vests in that session, and all trials for, e discipline of any of its members must originate there. Its decisions are final with respect to the matters subject to its jurisdiction, except when, after having been regularly carried up by appeal, they have been reversed by a superior court.

2. There is the Classical Presbytery, which consists of all the pastors or bishops and the churches in a city or neighbourhood who can conveniently meet together and unite in the exercise of ecclesiastical government. The churches appear in the Presbytery by representatives from the sessions of particular churches, so regulated that the number of lay representatives shall exactly equal the number of pastors; and these representatives of the people in all respects exercise equal power with the pastors. All the powers of these bodies vest in them as bodies, and not in the members severally. Whatever they are competent to decide or to execute can be done only by the members jointly while in session, and not at all by them separately, or even jointly in any other capacity. Ordained ministers are not members of particular churches, but belong in the first instance to the Presbytery. The Presbytery, therefore, in the first instance, examines and decides upon the qualifications of candidates and licenses and ordains them; and in the case of the discipline of a minister the process originates in the Presbytery, to which alone the pastor is directly responsible. A licentiate is in no sense or degree a minister, He is purely a layman -- i.e., a private member of a particular church -- taken under care of a Presbytery experimentally, and as a part of his trials or tests temporarily allowed to preach before the people, that they may pass their final judgment upon his qualifications and acceptability as a candidate for the ministry.

3. Synods are only large Presbyteries, consisting of all the Presbyteries in full of a province.

4. The General Assembly of the whole Church, which, like all the other bodies, consists of an equal number of pastors and of the representatives of the people, of necessity is composed of the representatives of the constituent Presbyteries, instead of the Presbyteries themselves in full. In virtue of the principle of APPEAL, any question originating in a church session, or in any other subordinate court, may be carried up in succession through all the series to the General Assembly, whose decisions when once made are final. In virtue of the principle of REVIEW AND CONTROL, each church court of every grade above a church session has the right, and is under obligation, to review "the records of the proceedings of the judicatory next below;" and of course to judge of those proceedings, and secure their correction when wrong. And each court, including the church session, is an executive as well as a judicial body; and therefore has an inherent right of

supervision and of governmental control over the entire field subject to its jurisdiction. Hence a superior judicatory, in default of the proper action of the inferior judicatory to which the case more immediately belongs, may inaugurate investigation and apply discipline immediately in the case of any person within its legitimate bounds.

SECTION 2: It belongeth to synods and councils, ministerially to determine controversies of faith, and cases of conscience; to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the public worship of God, and government of his church; to receive complaints in cases of maladministration, and authoritatively to determine the same: which decrees and determinations, if consonant to the Word of God, are to be received with reverence and submission; not only for their agreement with the Word, but also for the power whereby they are made, as being an ordinance of God appointed thereunto in his Word.(4) (4) Acts 15:15, Acts 15:19, Acts 15:24, Acts 15:27-31; Acts 16:4; Matthew 18:17-20

SECTION 3: All synods or councils, since the Apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err; and many have erred. Therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith, or practice; but to be used as a help in both.(5) (5) Ephesians 2:20; Acts 17:11; 1 Corinthians 2:5; 2 Corinthians 1:24; cf. Isaiah 8:19-20; Matthew 15:9

SECTION 4: Synods and councils are to handle, or conclude nothing, but that which is ecclesiastical: and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth, unless by way of humble petition in cases extraordinary; or, by way of advice, for satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate.(6) (6) Luke 12:13-14; John 18:36; Matthew 22:21

These sections state -- 1. The different subjects which come before these Church courts for decision. 2. The grounds upon which, and the conditions under which, their decisions are to be regarded as requiring submission, and the extent to which that submission is to be carried.

1. Negatively. Synods and councils have no right whatever to intermeddle with any affair which concerns the commonwealth; and they have no right to presume to give advice to, or to attempt to influence, the officers of the civil government in their action as civil officers, except (1.) in extraordinary cases, where the interests of the Church are immediately concerned, by the way of humble petition, or (2.) by way of advice for satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate.

2. Negatively. The powers of synods and councils are purely ministerial and declarative; i.e., relate simply to the declaration and execution of the will of Christ. They are therefore wholly judicial and. executive, and in no instance legislative.

3. Positively. It belongs to synods and councils at proper times (1.) To form creeds and confessions of faith, and to adopt a constitution for the government of the Church. (2.) To determine particular controversies of faith and cases of conscience. (3.) To prescribe regulations for the public worship of God, and for the government of the Church. (4.) To take up and issue all cases of discipline; and, in the case of the superior courts, to receive appeals and complaints in all cases of maladministration in the case of individual officers or subordinate courts, and authoritatively to determine the same.

4. Positively. While ecclesiastical courts have no right to handle or advise upon matters which belong to the jurisdiction of the civil magistrate, they, on the other hand, evidently possess an inalienable right of teaching church members their duty with respect to the civil powers, and of enforcing the performance of it as a religious obligation. "The powers that be are ordained of God.....Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake." Romans 13:1-7. That is, obedience to the civil authorities is a religious duty, and may be taught and enforced by Church courts upon Church members.

5. Negatively. All synods and councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular, may err, and many have erred; therefore they are not to be made the rule of faith or practice; but to be used as a help in both. That is, these synods and councils, consisting of uninspired men, have no power to bind the conscience, and their authority cannot exclude the right, nor excuse the obligation, of private judgment. If their judgments are unwise, but not directly opposed to the will of God, the private member should submit for peace' sake. If their decisions are opposed plainly to the Word of God, the private member should disregard them and take the penalty.

6. Positively. But in every case in which the decrees of these ecclesiastical courts are consonant to the Word of God, they are to be received by all subject to the jurisdiction of said court, not only because of the fact that they do agree with the Word of God, but also because of the proper authority of the court itself as a court of Jesus Christ, appointed by him, and therefore ministerially representing him in all of its legitimate actions.

01.32. Of the State of Men after Death, and of the Resurrection of the Dead

Chapter Thirty-two

Of the State of Men after Death, and of the Resurrection of the Dead

SECTION 1: The bodies of men, after death, return to dust, and see corruption:(1) but their souls, which neither die nor sleep, having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them: (2) the souls of the righteous, being then made perfect in holiness, are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God, in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies.(3) And the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torments and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day.(4) Besides these two places, for souls separated from their bodies, the Scripture acknowledgeth none.

(1) Genesis 3:19; Acts 13:36 (2) Luke 23:43; Ecclesiastes 12:7 (3) Hebrews 12:23; 2 Corinthians 5:1, 2 Corinthians 5:6, 2 Corinthians 5:8; Php 1:23; Acts 3:21; Ephesians 4:10; Romans 8:23 (4) Luke 16:23-24; Acts 1:25; Jude 1:6-7; 1 Peter 3:19 This section teaches --

1. That man consists of two distinct elements, a soul and a body; and that death consists in their temporary separation.

2. That while the body is resolved into its constituent chemical elements, the soul of the believer is (1.) Immediately made perfect in holiness; (2.) During all the intermediate state, from death until the resurrection, continues conscious, active, and happy; and (3.) Is in the presence of Christ, who, after his ascension, sat down at the right hand of God.

3. That the souls of the wicked also continue, during this intermediate state, conscious and active, but in a state of penal torment, reserved to the judgment of the great day.

4. These conditions, though not final, are irreversible -- i.e., none of those with Christ will be ever lost, and none of those in torment will be ever saved.

5. The Scriptures afford no ground whatever for the Romish doctrine that there are other places or conditions occupied by deceased men than the two above mentioned.

1. The duality of human nature, as consisting of two separable elements -- a soul and a body -- having distinct and independent attributes and subsistence, is taken for granted and constantly implied in the language of Scripture. Thus God made the body out of the dust of the earth, and breathed into it the breath of life; "and so man became a living soul." Genesis 2:7. Christ bids us not to "fear them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." Matthew 10:28. And death is defined in Ecclesiastes 12:7, as a dissolution of the personal union of these two elements; for " then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it." In like manner Paul (2 Corinthians 5:8; Php 1:22-24) defines it as a departing, a being with Christ, a ceasing to abide in the flesh, a being absent from the body on the part of the conscious personal

soul.

2. We know that when the soul leaves it the body is resolved into its original chemical elements, which are gradually incorporated with the shifting currents of matter on the surface of the Earth. The Scriptures teach us, however, that, in spite of this flux of their material constituents, the real identity of our bodies is preserved; and that, as members of Christ, all that is essential to them will be ultimately preserved and brought to a glorious resurrection. As to the condition and location of the souls of men during the interval which elapses between the death of each individual and the general and simultaneous resurrection of the bodies of all, what the Scriptures teach us may be summed up under the following heads: --

(1.) The souls of both believers and the reprobate continue after death conscious and active, although they remain until the resurrection separate from their bodies.

(2.) The souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness.

(3.) The souls of believers, thus perfected, are immediately introduced into the presence of Christ, and continue to enjoy bright revelations of God and the society of the holy angels.

(4.) The souls of the reprobate are at once introduced into the place provided for the devil and his angels, and continue in unutterable misery.

(5.) This state of both classes admits of no exchange or transfer, but their present condition is the commencement of an inevitable progression in opposite directions. Nevertheless, it is intermediate in the sense (a.) That the persons of men continue incomplete while their souls and bodies are separate. (b.) That neither the redemption of the saved nor the perdition of the lost has yet reached its final stage. (c.) That possibly in the case of the latter, and very probably in the case of the redeemed, the localities in which they are at present are not the same as those in which they are to dwell permanently after the final award.

(6.) As to the location of the place in which the souls of the reprobate suffer, the Scriptures give us no clue. In Jude 1:6, it is said, "The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." In Matthew 25:41, the Judge at the last day says to those on the left hand, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." The rich man " lifted up his eyes in hell, being in torments," while his brethren were still alive on earth. Luke 16:23. But where these places are situated, and whether the locality of torment now is identical with the locality of torment after the judgment, no man can tell, because God has not revealed it. Of course, the terms "up" or "down," "under" or "above," applied to such a subject, must be simply metaphorical, and cannot indicate absolute direction when addressed promiscuously to the inhabitants of a revolving and rotating sphere.

(7.) As to the location of the place where the redeemed are now gathered, absolutely nothing is revealed, except that it is wherever the glorified humanity of Christ is. They are with him, and behold his glory. 2 Corinthians 5:1-8. See, also, all the scenes opened in the Apocalypse. And Christ, at his ascension, sat down at "the right hand of God," "the right hand of the Majesty on high." Mark 16:19; Romans 8:34; Hebrews 1:3; Hebrews 10:12, etc. This must be a locality, because, the humanity of Christ being finite, his presence marks a definite place; yet the phrase

"right hand of God" evidently marks rather the condition of honour and power to which Christ is raised as mediatorial King. As to the location of the place in which Christ and his glorified spouse will hold their central home throughout eternity, a strong probability is raised that it will be our present Earth; first burned with fire and then gloriously replenished. See Romans 8:19-23; 2 Peter 3:5-13; Revelation 21:1. The proof of the main propositions above stated -- viz., that the intermediate state of souls is one of conscious activity, the redeemed being perfectly holy and happy with Christ, and the reprobate being with the devil and his angels in torment, and that these conditions are for ever irreversible -- can be better presented collectively than distributively. It is as follows: The reappearance of Samuel in a conscious state, in the use of all his faculties, at the call of Saul and the witch of En-dor (1 Samuel 27:7-20); the appearance of Moses and Elias at the transfiguration of Christ on the mount (Matthew 17:3); Christ's address to the thief on the cross --" Today shalt thou be with me in paradise" (Luke 23:43); the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke 16:23-24) -- Lazarus is conscious and active in Abraham's bosom -- the rich man is in conscious torment in Hell (Hades), while his brethren are still living in the flesh. Of dying Stephen it is declared (Acts 7:55-59) that, being full of the Holy Ghost, he saw the heavens opened, and Jesus Christ standing at the right hand of God; and so seeing he cried, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," and so died. In 2 Corinthians 5:1-8, Paul declares that to be " at home in the body" is to be "absent from the Lord;" and to be "absent from the body" is to the believer to be " present with the Lord:" and hence he says (in Php 1:21-24) that for him "to die is gain," and that he was "in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and be with Christ; which is far better: nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you." In 1 Thessalonians 5:10, Paul declares that the sleep of death is a "living together with Christ." In Ephesians 3:15, the Church is declared to be one whole family, of which at present part is in heaven and part on earth. In Hebrews 6:12-20, it is declared that after Abraham (and other ancient saints) "had patiently endured, he obtained the promises;" which promises, we know, were in their true meaning spiritual and heavenly. In Acts 1:25, Judas is said to have gone "to his own place." In Jude 1:6-7, the lost angels are said to be "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." In Hebrews 12:23, the spirits of the just are represented as "made perfect," and happy with the angels in heaven. In Revelation 6:9-11, the souls of the martyrs are represented as under the altar in heaven, praying for the punishment of their former persecutors on earth, which of course must be before the resurrection. In Revelation 5:9; Revelation 7:9; Revelation 14:1, Revelation 14:3, the souls of believers are represented as being now with Christ and the holy angels.

3. Our Standards declare that there is no foundation whatever, in Scripture, for the Romish doctrine as to the intermediate state of deceased men. The Papists hold that Hades or the under world embraces several distinct regions, to which different classes of human souls are destined: (1.) The souls of unbaptized infants go to the "Limbus Infantum," where they remain without suffering, and yet without the vision of God. (2.) Old Testament believers were gathered in the " Limbus Patrurm," where, without suffering, and yet without the vision of God, they remained the "spirits in prison," until Christ, during the three days he continued under the power of death, went and released them. 1 Peter 3:19-20. (3.) All unbaptized adults, and those who have subsequently lost the grace of baptism, and die unreconciled to the Church, go immediately to the permanent Hell. (4.) All Christians who have attained a state of Christian perfection go immediately to Heaven. (5.) The great mass of partially sanctified Christians, dying in communion with the

Church, still cumbered with imperfections, go to Purgatory. (Cat. Rom., pt. i., ch. vi.)

Concerning purgatory, the Council of Trent teaches -- (a.) That there is a purifying fire through which imperfect Christians must pass. (b.) That souls in purgatory may be benefited by the prayers and masses offered in their behalf on earth. (Counc. Trent, sess. xxv.) This doctrine is false, because -- (1.) It is nowhere taught in Scripture. (2.) It is opposed to the teaching of Scripture as to the intermediate state, as above shown. (3.) It rests upon Anti-Christian principles as to the efficacy of the atonement of Christ, as to the sin-expiating and soul-purifying efficacy of temporary suffering, as to the sacrifice of the mass, and as to prayers for the dead, etc.

SECTION 2: At the last day, such as are found alive shall not die, but be changed:(5) and all the dead shall be raised up, with the selfsame bodies, and none other (although with different qualities), which shall be united again to their souls forever.(6)

(5) 1 Thessalonians 4:17; 1 Corinthians 15:51-52 (6) John 5:25-29; Acts 24:15; Job 19:26-27; Daniel 12:2; 1 Corinthians 15:42-44

SECTION 3: The bodies of the unjust shall, by the power of Christ, be raised to dishonor: the bodies of the just, by his Spirit, unto honor; and be made conformable to his own glorious body.(7)
(7) Acts 24:15; John 5:25-29; 1 Corinthians 15:43; Php 3:21

These sections teach --

1. That at the last day there will be a simultaneous resurrection of all the dead, both of the just and of the unjust.

2. That those who then remain living on the Earth shall not die, but be changed.

3. That the very same bodies that are buried in the earth shall be raised and reunited to their souls, their identity preserved, although their qualities will be changed.

4. That the bodies of believers shall be made like Christ’s glorious body --" a spiritual body."

5. That the bodies of the reprobate shall be raised to dishonour.

1. At the last day there will be a simultaneous resurrection of all the dead, both of the just and the unjust: "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. "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 two classes are to be judged simultaneously, immediately after their resurrection, upon the second coining of the Lord. The sheep shall stand on the right side, and the goats upon the left. "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." Matthew 25:31-46; Romans 2:6-16; 2 Thessalonians 1:6-10; Revelation 20:11-15.

2. Those who are alive and remain unto the conning of the Lord shall not outstrip 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 Thessalonians 4:15-17. " 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." 1 Corinthians 15:51-52.

3. The very same bodies that are buried in the earth shall be raised and reunited to their souls -- their identity preserved, although their qualities are changed. This is explicitly declared in Scripture: " Our vile body is to be changed." Php 3:21. " This corruptible is to put on incorruption." 1 Corinthians 15:53-54. "A11 that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth." John 5:28. "They who are asleep, ... the dead in Christ shall rise." 1 Thessalonians 4:13-17. Our bodies are now members of Christ, and they are to be raised in a manner analogous to his resurrection, which we know to have been of his identical body by the print of the nails and of the spear. It was seen and handled for the space of forty days in order to establish this very fact. Luke 24:39; Acts 1:3; 1 Corinthians 15:4.

There are many changes in the material elements and form of the human body between birth and death, and yet no one can for a moment doubt that the body remains one and the same throughout all. There is no difficulty in believing, upon the authority of God’s Word, that, in spite of the lapse of time and of all the changes, whether of matter or of form, it undergoes, the body of the resurrection will be in the same sense and to the same degree one with the body of death as the body of death is one with the body of birth.

4. These changes will doubtless be very great. The body of the believer is to be made " like unto Christ’s glorious body." Php 3:21. The body of man now is " an animal body "-- unhappily translated "a natural body" (1 Corinthians 15:44). It is suited to the present wants of man; to his present stage of development, intellectual, moral, social, and spiritual; and to the physical conditions of the world he inhabits. But "flesh and blood" -- bone, muscle, and nerve --" cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." 1 Corinthians 15:50. But this shall be " changed; "-- not a new body substituted for the old, but the old changed into the new. As the seed gives birth to a new organism, so the corruptible will give birth to the incorruptible; for "there is an animal body, and there is a spiritual body." The spiritual body will be still material and identical with the body which was once animal: but it will be suited to the new wants of "the spirits of just men made perfect;" to their new stage of development, intellectual and spiritual; to their social relations; and to the physical conditions of the " new heavens and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." 2 Peter 3:12-13.

5. The bodies of the reprobate shall be raised to dishonour. "All that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth,.....they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." John 5:28-29.

01.33. Of the Last Judgment

Chapter Thirty-three

Of the Last Judgment

SECTION 1: God hath appointed a day, wherein he will judge the world, in righteousness, by Jesus Christ (1), to whom all power and judgment is given of the Father.(2) In which day, not only the apostate angels shall be judged.(3) but likewise all persons that have lived upon earth shall appear before the tribunal of Christ, to give an account of their thoughts, words, and deeds; and to receive according to what they have done in the body, whether good or evil.(4)

(1) Acts 17:31 (2) John 5:22, John 5:27 (3) Jude 1:6; 2 Peter 2:4 (4) 2 Corinthians 5:10; Ecclesiastes 12:14; Romans 2:16; Romans 14:10, Romans 14:12; Matthew 12:36-37

SECTION 2: The end of God's appointing this day is for the manifestation of the glory of his mercy, in the eternal salvation of the elect; and of his justice, in the damnation of the reprobate, who are wicked and disobedient. For then shall the righteous go into everlasting life, and receive that fullness of joy and refreshing, which shall come from the presence of the Lord; but the wicked who know not God, and obey not the gospel of Jesus Christ, shall be cast into eternal torments, and be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.(5) (5) Matthew 25:21, Matthew 25:31-46; Romans 2:5-6; Romans 9:22-23; Acts 3:19; 2 Thessalonians 1:7-10; Mark 9:48 THESE sections teach --

1. That God has appointed a day of general judgment.

2. That he has committed this judgment into the hands of the God-man in his character as Mediator.

3. That the persons to be judged include apostate angels and the whole human race, good and bad.

4. That these persons are to be judged as to all their thoughts, words, and deeds.

5. That the great end of God in the appointment of this day is the manifestation of his glorious justice in the condemnation of the reprobate, and of his glorious grace in the glorification of believers.

6. That the righteous are to be awarded admission to the presence of the Lord, which is to be consciously enjoyed by them in a state of unending holiness, happiness, and honour.

7. That the reprobate are to be awarded a place with the devil and his angels, to be endured with conscious torment and shame through a ceaseless eternity.

1. It is a dictate of natural reason and conscience that in some way, formally or informally, severally or collectively, God will call all the subjects of his moral government to an exact account

for their character and actions. It is obvious -- as the author of the seventy-third Psalm declares, and as many other perplexed souls have thought -- that justice is not executed upon men in this world. All this suggests the probability that God will at a future time adjust the disturbed balances and call all men to a strict account. This presumption of reason and conscience is confirmed and declared to be a fact in the Word of God; and the additional information is conveyed that this judgment of men and angels shall be general and simultaneous, and shall be conducted on a certain predetermined day in the future. " The times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent: because he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance to all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." Acts 17:30-31; Romans 2:16; Matthew 25:31-46.

2. The Judge on this great occasion is to be, not God absolutely considered, but the God-man in his office as mediatorial King. All judgment is said to be, not inherently his, but committed to him by the Father. John 5:22, John 5:27. As Judge he is called "the Son of man" and "the man ordained by God." Matthew 25:31-32; Acts 17:31. He conducts the judgment as "the King," and as Head of his members who have lived on earth. "For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink..... And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." Matthew 25:35, Matthew 25:40. And thus, as mediatorial King, he will consummate his work in the destruction of his enemies, the complete redemption of his friends, and "the restitution of all things." 2 Thessalonians 1:7-10; Revelation 1:7; Acts 3:21.

3. The subjects of the judgment will embrace the entire human race of every generation, each individual appearing immediately after his resurrection, in the completeness of his reintegrated person, both soul and body. All the generations of the dead are to be raised and the then living " changed." "Before him shall be gathered all nations." " We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed; ..... the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed." "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." "And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God..... And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell (Hades) delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged, every man according to their works." Matthew 25:31-40; 1 Corinthians 15:51-52; 2 Corinthians 5:10; 1 Thessalonians 4:16; Revelation 20:11-15. All evil angels are also to be arraigned in this judgment. " The angels which kept not their first estate ..... he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." Jude 1:6; 2 Peter 2:4. Good angels will be concerned in it as attendants and ministers. Matthew 13:41-42; 2 Thessalonians 1:7-8.

4. The judgment will not rest upon appearances, nor testimony, nor any partial knowledge of the facts, nor upon technical grounds of law, nor specific actions dissociated from the state of the heart and the motives which prompted them. The heathen who has sinned without the law " shall be judged without the law;" that is, without the law supernaturally revealed, but by the law written upon the heart, which made him a law unto himself. Luke 12:47-48; Romans 2:12-15. The Jew who "sinned in the law shall be judged by the law." Romans 2:12. Every man who has lived under the dispensation of the gospel shall be judged by the gospel. Hebrews 2:2-3; Hebrews 10:28-29. We are told not to judge according to the appearance (John 7:24); and therefore to "judge nothing

before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts." 1 Corinthians 4:5; Ecclesiastes 12:14. " There is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known. Therefore whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness shall be heard in the light; and that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed upon the house-tops." Luke 8:17; Luke 12:2-3; Mark 4:22. This shall be done to manifest the righteousness of God in the condemnation of his enemies, and his glorious grace in the sanctification of his people. The saints will not be acquitted in the day of judgment on the ground of their own good deeds, but because their names are found "written in the book of life," or the book of God's electing love, and on the ground of their participation in the righteousness of Christ. Their good deeds will be publicly cited as the evidences of their union with Christ. Their union with Christ is the ground of their justification. Their faith is the instrument of their union with Christ; and their faith, as the Apostle James says, is shown by their works. Php 4:3; Revelation 3:5; Revelation 13:8; Revelation 20:12, Revelation 20:15.

5. The great end of God in this public unveiling of secrets and manifestation of character in connection with his final disposition of his creatures, is, of course, the manifestation of his own glorious excellencies as moral Governor and Redeemer. The redeemed are for ever "vessels of mercy," prepared beforehand, in order that in them might be "made known the riches of his glory." And the reprobate in like manner are exhibited as the "vessels of wrath," to show his righteous wrath and " make his power known." Romans 9:22-23. It has already been proved, under chapter iv., section 1, that the chief end of God in the original creation was the manifestation of his own glorious perfections. If this was his end in the original creation, it of course must be so in every subsequent step consequent upon it.

6. Immediately upon the close of the judgment, the righteous, being honourably acquitted, are to be awarded admission to the presence of the Lord, with whom they are ever to continue in a state of conscious and exalted happiness, excellence, and honour, for an absolutely unending eternity. Of the blessed estate of the saints, the Scriptures teach -- (1.) Their blessedness flows from their perfect freedom from sin, and from their being with God and Christ, and their sharing the glory of Christ as joint heirs with him. John 17:24; Romans 8:17; 1 Thessalonians 4:17; Revelation 21:3. (2.) It shall be perfectly free from all evil of every kind (Revelation 21:4), and it shall involve every form of blessedness in an inconceivably great degree (1 Corinthians 2:9) and exalted in kind (Colossians 1:12). (3.) It is to endure for an absolutely unending eternity. It is called " eternal life" and " everlasting life," an " eternal weight of glory," "eternal salvation," an "everlasting kingdom," an "eternal inheritance." Matthew 19:16, Matthew 19:29; Matthew 25:46; Romans 2:7; 2 Corinthians 4:17; Hebrews 5:9; 2 Peter 1:11; 1 Peter 1:4; Hebrews 9:15. From such passages as Romans 8:19-23; 2 Peter 3:5-13, and Revelation 21:1, it appears not improbable that after the great conflagration of the Earth and all that inhabits its surface, which the Scriptures reveal shall accompany the judgment, this world will be reconstituted, and as the "new heaven" and the "new earth" be gloriously adapted to be the permanent residence of Christ and his Church.

7. The reprobate will be immediately driven to the place prepared for the devil and his angels (Matthew 25:41); and are there to continue in the conscious endurance of torment and shame for an absolutely unending eternity. The strongest terms which the Greek language affords are employed in the New Testament to express the unending duration of the penal torments of the lost. The same words (aion, aionios, and aidios) are used to express the eternal existence of God

(1 Timothy 1:17; Romans 1:20; Romans 16:26), of Christ (Revelation 1:18), of the Holy Ghost (Hebrews 9:14), and the endless duration of the happiness of the saints (John 6:58; Matthew 19:29; Matthew 25:40, etc.. etc.), and the endless duration of the sufferings of the lost. Matthew 25:46; Jude 1:6. Besides, their condition is constantly set forth by such terms as, the "fire that shall not be quenched," "fire unquenchable," "the worm that never dies," "bottomless pit," the necessity of paying "the uttermost farthing," "the smoke of their torment ascending up for ever and ever." Luke 3:17; Mark 9:45-46; Revelation 9:1; Matthew 5:26; Revelation 14:10-11. Of the unpardonable sin, Christ says that it shall never be pardoned, "neither in this world nor in that which is to come." Matthew 12:32. The entire Christian Church, Greek and Roman, Lutheran and Reformed, have agreed in holding this truth that the penal sufferings of the lost are to last for ever. Certain individuals and heretical societies, however, have denied it, and substituted in its place one or other of the following hypotheses: --

(1) That the "second death" spoken of in Revelation 20:14, to which the wicked shall be subjected after their condemnation in the judgment, involves the total and absolute destruction of their being -- i.e., annihilation. But the Scriptures always consistently speak of the future of the lost as a state of conscious suffering enduring for ever. The "worm dieth not" --" everlasting fire"-- "unquenchable fire" --" weeping and gnashing of teeth"--" the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever, and they have no rest day nor night."

(2.) The other hypothesis supposes that, sooner or later, God will secure the repentance and consequent reformation and restoration of all sinners, even of the devil himself. This is to result either through the atoning and purifying efficacy of protracted though temporary suffering, or through other moral influences which God will bring to bear upon them in another world. But remember -- (a.) That suffering per se, while it may expiate guilt, has no tendency to purify the soul from pollution or to enkindle spiritual life. (b.) The atonement of Christ and the sanctifying power of his Spirit are the only appointed means of bringing men to repentance, and indeed the highest possible means to that end. In the case of the reprobate these have been finally rejected, and hence "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." Hebrews 10:26-27. (c.) There is not the slightest trace in Scripture of such an ultimate restoration, either in the design of it, or the means of it, or the results of it. On the contrary, as we have seen, the Scriptures positively affirm the precise reverse to be true.

SECTION 3: As Christ would have us to be certainly persuaded that there shall be a day of judgment, both to deter all men from sin; and for the greater consolation of the godly in their adversity:(6) so will he have that day unknown to men, that they may shake off all carnal security, and be always watchful, because they know not at what hour the Lord will come; and may be ever prepared to say, Come Lord Jesus, come quickly, Amen.(7)

(6) 2 Peter 3:11, 2 Peter 3:14; 2 Corinthians 5:10-11; 2 Thessalonians 1:5-7; Luke 21:27-28; Romans 8:22-25

(7) Matthew 24:36, Matthew 24:42-44; Mark 13:35-37; Luke 12:35-36; Revelation 22:20 This section teaches --

1. That God has made the fact absolutely certain that there will be a future judgment, in order that this knowledge may act upon all men as a wholesome motive deterring them from sin; and, at the same time, that it may console the godly in the midst of their adversity. With reference to the first object, Paul says, " 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. Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men." 2 Corinthians 5:10-11. And Peter says, "Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, 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? " 2 Peter 3:11-12. With reference to the second object, Paul says, "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you; and to you that are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels." 2 Thessalonians 1:6-7.

2. That, on the other hand, God has left us in absolute uncertainty with respect to the time at which this great event shall occur; in order to prevent carnal security, and to keep his people ever on the alert and constantly prepared. That the time is intentionally left unknown is expressly affirmed again and again in Scripture: "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the, Father." Mark 13:32; Matthew 24:36. "Be ye therefore ready also; for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not." Luke 12:40. "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power." Acts 1:7. " The day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the night." 1 Thessalonians 5:2; 2 Peter 3:10. "Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments." Revelation 16:15. The designed effect of the attitude of uncertainty with regard to the time of the second advent and general judgment in which the saints are placed is, that they should regard it as always immediately impending; that they should look forward to it with solemn awe, and yet with joyful confidence; and hence, in view of it, be incited to the performance of duty and the attainment of holiness, and. comforted in sorrow. Php 3:20; Colossians 3:4-5; James 5:7. It is their duty also to love, watch, wait for, and hasten unto the coming of our Lord. Luke 12:35-37; 1 Corinthians 1:7-8; 1 Thessalonians 1:9-10; 2 Timothy 4:8; 2 Peter 3:12; Revelation 22:20 .

Chapter 37

02.0.1. OUTLINES OF THEOLOGY

OUTLINES OF THEOLOGY

A. A. Hodge

1860

02.0.2. Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Preface 1. Christian Theology; Its Several Branches; And Their Relation To Other Departments Of Human Knowledge 2. The Origin Of The Idea Of God And Proof Of His Existence 3. The Sources Of Theology 4. The Inspiration Of The Bible 5. The Scriptures Of The Old And New Testaments The Only Rule Of Faith And Judge Of Controversies 6. A Comparison Of Systems 7. Creeds And Confessions 8. The Attributes Of God

9. The Holy Trinity, Including The Divinity Of Christ, The Eternal Generation Of The Son, The Personality, Divinity, And Eternal Procession Of The Holy Ghost, And The Several Properties And Mutual Relations Of The Persons Of The Godhead 10. The Decrees Of God In General 11. Predestination 12. The Creation Of The World

13. Angels

14. Providence 15. The Moral Constitution Of The Soul Will, Conscience, Liberty, Etc.

16. Creation And Original State Of Man 17. The Covenant Of Works 18. The Nature Of Sin And The Sin Of Adam 19. Original Sin

20. Inability 21. The Imputation Of Adam's S First Sin To His Posterity 22. The Covenant Of Grace 23. The Person Of Christ 24. The Meditatorial Office Of Christ 25. The Atonement:Its Nature, Necessity, Perfection, And Extent 26. The Intercession Of Christ 27. The Mediatorial Kingship Of Christ 28. Effectual Calling 29. Regeneration

30. Faith 31. Union Of Believers With Christ 32. Repentance, And The Romish Doctrine Of Penance 33. Justification

34. Adoption, And The Order Of Grace In The Application Of Redemption, In The Several Parts Of Justification, Regeneration, And Sanctification 35. Sanctification 36. Perseverance Of The Saints 37. Death, And The State Of The Soul After Death 38. The Resurrection 39. The Second Advent And General Judgment 40. Heaven And Hell 41. The Sacraments

42. Baptism 43. The Lord's Supper

02.0.3. Preface to First Edition

Preface to First Edition In introducing this book to the reader, I have only a single word to say upon two points:first as to the uses which I regard this form of exhibiting theological truth as being specially qualified to subserve; and, secondly as to the sources from which I have drawn the materials composing these “Outlines.” As to the first point, I have to say, that the conception and execution of this work originated in the experience of the need for some such manual of theological definitions and argumentation, in the immediate work of instructing the members of my own pastoral charge. The several chapters were in the first instance prepared and used in the same form in which they are now printed, as the basis of a lecture delivered otherwise extemporaneously to my congregation every Sabbath night. In this use of them, I found these preparations successful beyond my hopes. The congregation, as a whole, were induced to enter with interest upon the study even of the most abstruse questions. Having put this work thus to this practical test, I now offer it to my brethren in the ministry, that they may use it, if they will, as a repertory of digested material for the doctrinal instruction of their people, either in Bible classes, or by means of a congregational lecture. I offer it also as an attempt to supply an acknowledged public want, as a syllabus of theological study for the use of theological students generally, and for the use of those many laborious preachers of the gospel who cannot command the time, or who have not the opportunity, or other essential means, to study the more expensive and elaborate works from which the materials of this compend have been gathered. The questions have been retained in form, not for the purpose of adapting the book in any degree for catechetical instruction, but as the most convenient and perspicuous method of presenting an “outline of theology” so condensed. This same necessity of condensation I would also respectfully plead as in some degree an excuse for some of the instances of obscurity in definition and meagerness of illustration, which the reader will observe. In the second place, as to the sources from which I have drawn the materials of this book, I may for the most part refer the reader to the several passages, where the acknowledgment is made as the debt is incurred. In general, however, it is proper to say that I have, with his permission, used the list of questions given by my father to his classes of forty–five and six. I have added two or three chapters which his course did not embrace, and have in general adapted his questions to my new purpose, by omissions, additions, or a different distribution. To such a degree, however, have they directed and assisted me, that I feel a confidence in offering the result to the public which otherwise would have been unwarrantable. In the frequent instances in which I have possessed his published articles upon the subjects of the following chapters, the reader will find that I have drawn largely from them. It is due to myself, however, to say, that except in two instances, “The Scriptures the only Rule of Faith and Judge of Controversies” and the “Second Advent,” I have never heard delivered nor read the manuscript of that course of theological lectures which he has prepared for the use of his classes subsequently to my graduation. In the instances I have above excepted, I have attempted little more, in the preparation of the respective chapters of this book bearing those titles, than to abridge my father’s lectures. In every instance I have endeavored to acknowledge the full extent of the assistance I have derived from others, in which I have, I believe, uniformly succeeded, except so far as I am

now unable to trace to their original sources some of the materials collected by me in my class manuscripts, prepared fourteen years ago, while a student of theology. This last reference relates to a large element in this book, as I wrote copiously, and after frequent oral communication with my father, both in public and private.

A. A. HODGE. fredericksburg, may, 1860.

02.0.4. Preface to Revised and Enlarged Edition

Preface to Revised and Enlarged Edition. The Preface to the original edition gives a perfectly accurate and somewhat circumstantial account of the origin of this work. Since its first publication the evidences of the fact that it met a public need have been multiplying. Its sale in America and Great Britain has continued. It has been translated into Welsh and Modern Greek, and used in several theological training schools. The author, in the meantime, has been for fourteen years engaged in the practical work of a theological instructor. His increased knowledge and experience as a teacher have been embodied in this new and enlarged edition, which has grown to its present form through several years in connection with his actual class instructions. The new edition contains nearly fifty per cent more matter than the former one. Two chapters have been dropped, and five new ones have been added. Extracts from the principal Confessions, Creeds, and classical theological writers of the great historical churches have been appended to the discussions of the doctrines concerning which the Church is divided. Several chapters have been entirely rewritten, and many others have been materially recast, and enlarged. And the Appendix contains a translation of the Consensus Tigurinus of Calvin, and of the FORMULA CONSENSUS HELVETICA of Heidegger and Turretin, two Confessions of first class historical and doctrinal interest to the student of Reformed theology, but not easily accessible. The work is again offered to the Christian Church, not as a complete treatise of Systematic Theology, for the use of the proficient, but as a simple Text Book, adapted to the needs of students taking their first lessons in this great science, and to the convenience of many earnest workers who wish to refresh their memories by means of a summary review of the ground gone over by them in their earlier studies. princeton, n. j., august 6th, 1878.

Chapter 41

02.01. Christian Theology; Its Several Branches; And Their Relation to Other Departments of...

Chapter 01 Christian Theology; Its Several Branches; And Their Relation to Other Departments of Human Knowledge.

1. What is Religion? And what is Theology in its Christian sense?

Religion, in its most general sense, is the sum of the relations which man sustains to God, and comprises the truths, the experiences, actions, and institutions which correspond to, or grow out of those relations.

Theology, in its most general sense, is the science of religion. The Christian religion is that body of truths, experiences, actions, and institutions which are determined by the revelation supernaturally presented in the Christian Scriptures. Christian Theology is the scientific determination, interpretation. and defense of those Scriptures, together with the history of the manner in which the truths it reveals have been understood, and the duties they impose have been performed, by all Christians In all ages.

2. What is Theological Encyclopoedia? and what Theological Methodology?

Theological Encyclopoedia from the Greek εγκυκλοπαιδεια(the whole circle of general education), presents to the student the entire circle of the special sciences devoted to the discovery, clarity, and defense of the contents of the supernatural revelation contained in the Christian Scriptures, and aims to present these sciences in those organic relations which are determined by their actual genesis and inmost nature.

Theological Methodology is the science of theological method. As each department of human inquiry demands a mode of treatment peculiar to itself; and as even each subdivision of each general department demands its own special modifications of treatment, so theological methodology provides for the scientific determination of the true method, general and special, of pursuing the theological sciences. And this includes two distinct categories:(a) The methods proper to the original investigation and construction of the several sciences, and (b) the methods proper to elementary instruction in the same.

All this should be accompanied with critical and historical information, and direction as to the use of the vast literature with which these sciences are illustrated.

3. To what extent is the scientific arrangement of all the theological sciences possible? And on what account is the attempt desirable?

Such an arrangement can approach perfection only in proportion as these sciences themselves approach their final and absolute form. At present every such attempt must be only more or less an approximation to an ideal unattainable in the present state of knowledge in this life. Every separate attempt also must depend for its comparative success upon the comparative justness of

the general theological principles upon which it is based. It is evident that those who make Reason, and those who make the inspired Church, and those who make the inspired Scriptures the source and standard of all divine knowledge must severally configure the theological sciences to the different foundations on which they are made to stand. The point of view adopted in this book is the evangelical and specifically the Calvinistic or Augustinian one, assuming the following fundamental principles:1st. The inspired Scriptures are the sole, and an infallible standard of all religious knowledge. 2nd. Christ and his work is the center around which all Christian theology is brought into order. 3rd. The salvation brought to light in the gospel is supernatural and of FREE GRACE. 4th. All religious knowledge has a practical end. The theological sciences, instead of being absolute ends in themselves, find their noblest purpose and effect in the advancement of personal holiness, the more efficient service of our fellowmen, and THE GREATER GLORY OF GOD. The advantages of such a grouping of the theological sciences are obvious, and great. The relations of all truths are determined by their nature, whence it follows that their nature is revealed by an exhibition of their relations. Such an exhibition will also tend to widen the mental horizon of the student, to incite him to breadth of culture, and prevent him from unduly exalting or exclusively cultivation any one special branch, and thus from perverting it by regarding it out of its natural limitations and dependencies.

4. What are the fundamental questions which all theological science proposes to answer, and which therefore determine the arrangement of the several departments of that general science?

1st. Is there a God?

2nd. Has God spoken?

3rd. What has God said?

4th. How have men in time past understood his word and practically, in their persons and institutions, realized his intentions?

5. What position in an encyclopedia of theological sciences must be given to other branches of human knowledge?

It is evident that as the Supernatural Revelation God has been pleased to give has come to us in an historical form, that history, and that of the Christian Church, is inseparably connected with all human history more or less directly. Further, it is evident that as all truth is one, all revealed truths and duties are inseparably connected with all departments of human knowledge, and with all the institutions of human society. It hence follows that theological science can at no point be separated from general science, that some knowledge of every department of human knowledge must always be comprehended in every system of Theological Encyclopoedia as auxiliary to the Theological sciences themselves. Some of these auxiliary sciences sustain special relations to certain of the theological sciences, and are very remotely related to others. It is, however, convenient to give them a position by themselves, as in general constituting a discipline preparatory and auxiliary to the science of theology as a whole.

6. State the main divisions of the proposed arrangement of the theological sciences.

I. Sciences Auxiliary to the study of theology.

II. Apologetics—embracing the answers to the two questions—Is there a God? and Has God spoken?

III. Exegetical Theology—embracing the critical determination of the ipsissima verba of the Divine Revelation, and the Interpretation their meaning.

IV. Systematic Theology—embracing the development into an all–embracing and self–consistent system of the contents of that Revelation, and its subsequent elucidation and defense.

V. Practical Theology—embracing the principles and laws revealed in Scripture for the guidance of Christians (a) in the promulgation of this divine revelation thus ascertained and interpreted, and thus (b) in bringing all men into practical obedience to the duties it imposes and (c) into the fruition of the blessings it confers.

VI. Historical Theology—embracing the history of the actual development during all past ages and among all people of the theoretical and practical elements of that revelation (1) in the faith and (2) in the life of the Church.

7. State the chief departments of human knowledge related to study of Theology.

1st. As underlying and conditioning all knowledge, we have Universal History, and as auxiliary to theological science especially the Histories of Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Greece, Rome and of Medieval and Modern Europe.

2nd. Archaeology in its most comprehensive sense, including the interpretation of inscriptions, monuments, coins, and remains of art, and the illustrations gathered thence and from all other available sources, of the geographical distribution and physical conditions and of the political, religious, and social institutions and customs of all peoples, of all ages.

3rd. Ethnology—the science of the divisions of the human family into races and nations, and of their dispersion over the world— which traces their origin and affiliations and their varieties of physical, intellectual, moral, and religious character, and the sources and modifying conditions of these variations.

4th. Comparative Philology, the science which starting from the natural groups of human languages, traces the relations and origins of languages and dialects, and transcending the first dawn of human history, traces the unity of races now separated, and the elements of long extinct civilizations, and the facts of historic changes otherwise left without record.

5th. The Science of Comparative Religion, the critical study and comparison of the history, beliefs, spirit, principles, institutions, and practical character of all the Ethnic religions, tracing the light they throw upon (a) human nature and history, (b) the moral government of God, and (c) the supernatural revelation recorded in Scripture.

6th. Philosophy, the ground and mistress of all the merely human sciences. This will include the history of the origin and development of all the schools of philosophy, ancient, mediaeval, and modern—a critical study and comparison of their principles, methods, and doctrines, and the range and character of their respective influence upon all other sciences and institutions, especially upon those which are political and religious, and more especially upon those which are

definitely Christian.

7th. Psychology, or that department of experimental science which unfolds the laws of action of the human mind under normal conditions, as exhibited (a) in the phenomena of individual consciousness and action, and (b) in the phenomena of social and political life.

8th. Aesthetics, or the science of the laws of the Beautiful in all its forms of Music, Rhetoric, Architecture, Painting, etc., and the principles and history of every department of art.

9th. The Physical Sciences, their methods, general and special; their history, genesis, development, and present tendencies; their relation to Philosophy, especially to Theism and natural religion, to civilization, to the Scriptural records historically and doctrinally.

10th. Statistics, or that department of investigation which aims to present us with a full knowledge of the present state of the human family in the world, in respect to every measurable variety of condition—as to numbers and state, physical, intellectual, religious, social, and political, of civilization, commerce, literature, science, art, etc., etc.; from which elements the immature forms of social science and political economy are being gradually developed.

8. What particulars are included under the head of Apologetics? This department falls under two heads:

(1.) Is there a God.

(2.) Has He spoken; and includes:

1st. The proof of the being of God, that is of an extramundane person transcendent yet immanent, creating, preserving and governing all things according to his eternal plan. This will involve the discussion and refutation of all Antitheistic systems, as Atheism, Pantheism, Naturalistic Deism, Materialism, etc.

2nd. The Development of Natural theology, embracing the relation of God to intelligent and responsible agents as Moral Governor, and the indications of his will and purpose, and consequently of the duties and destinies of mankind, as far as these can be traced by the light of Nature—

3rd. The evidences of Christianity, including—

(1.) The discussion of the proper use of reason in religious questions.

(2.) The demonstration of the a priori possibility of a supernatural revelation.

(3.) The necessity for and the probability of such a revelation, the character of God and the condition of man as revealed by the light of nature, being considered.

(4.) The positive proof of the actual fact that such a revelation has been given (a) through the Old Testament prophets, (b) through the New Testament prophets, and (c) above all in the person and work of Christ. This will involve, of course, , a critical discussion of all the evidence bearing on this subject, external and internal, historical, rational, moral, and spiritual, natural and supernatural, theoretical and practical, and a refutation of all the criticism, historical and rational, which has been brought to bear against the fact of revelation or the integrity of the record. Much that is here

adduced will of course necessarily be also comprehended under the heads of Systematic and of Exegetical Theology.

9. What is included under Exegetical Theology?

If the facts (1) That there is a God, and (2) that he has spoken, be established, it remains to answer the question, “What has God said?” Exegetical Theology is the general title of that department of theological science which aims at the Interpretation of the Scriptures as the word of God, recorded in human language, and transmitted to us through human channels; and in order to this, Interpretation aims to gather and organize all that knowledge which is necessarily introductory thereto. This includes the answer to two main questions (1) What books form the canon, and what were the exact words of which the original autographs of the writers of these several books consisted, and (2) What do those divine words, so ascertained, mean. The answers to all questions preliminary to actual Interpretation, come under the head of Introduction and this is divided (1) into General Introduction, presenting all that information, preliminary to interpretation, which stands related in common to the Bible as a whole, or to each Testament as a whole, and (2) into Special Introduction, which includes all necessary preparation for the interpretation of each book of the Bible in detail.

A. General INTRODUCTION includes—

1st. The Higher Criticism or the canvass of the still existing evidences of all kinds establishing the authenticity and genuineness of each book in the sacred canon.

2nd. The Criticism of the Text, which, from a comparison of the best ancient manuscripts and versions, from internal evidence, and by means of a critical history of the text from its first appearance to the present, seeks to determine the ipsissima verbs of the original autographs of the inspired writers.

3rd. Biblical Philology, which answers the questions:Why were different languages used in the record? and why Hebrew and Greek? What are the special characteristics of the dialects of those languages actually used, and their relation to the families of language to which they belong? And what were the special characteristics of dialect, style, etc., of the sacred writers individually.

4th. Biblical Archaeology, including the physical and political geography of Bible lands during the course of Bible history. and determining the physical, ethnological, social, political, and religious conditions of the people among whom the Scriptures originated, together with an account of their customs and institutions, and of the relation of these to those of their ancestors and of their contemporaries.

5th. Hermeneutics, or the scientific determination of the principles and rules of Biblical Interpretation, including (1) the logical and grammatical and rhetorical principles determining the interpretation of human language in general, (2) the modification of these principles appropriate to the interpretation of the specific forms of human discourse, e. g., history, poetry, prophecy parable, symbol. etc., and (3) those further modifications of these principles appropriate to the interpretation of writings supernaturally inspired.

6th. Apologetics having established the fact that the Christian Scriptures are the vehicle of a supernatural revelation, we must now discuss and determine the nature and extent of Biblical

Inspiration as far as this is determined by the claims and the phenomena of the scriptures themselves.

7th. The History of Interpretation, including the history of ancient and modern versions and schools of interpretation, illustrated by a critical comparison of the most eminent commentaries.

B. SPECIAL INTRODUCTION treats of each book of the Bible by itself, and furnishes all that knowledge concerning its dialect, authorship, occasion, design, and reception that is necessary for its accurate interpretation.

C. Exegesis proper is the actual application of all the knowledge gathered, and of all the rules developed, in the preceding departments of Introduction to the Interpretation of the sacred text, as it stands in its original connections of Testaments, books, paragraphs, etc.

Following the laws of grammar, the usus loquendi of words, the analogy of Scripture, and the guidance of the Holy Ghost. Exegesis seeks to determine the mind of the Spirit as expressed in the inspired sentences as they stand in their order.

There are several special departments classed under the general head of Exegetical Theology, which involve in some degree that arrangement and combination of Scripture testimonies under topics or subjects, which is the distinctive characteristic of Systematic Theology.

These are—

1st. Typology, which embraces a scientific determination of the laws of biblical symbols and types, and their interpretation, especially those of the Mosaic ritual as related to the person and work of Christ.

2nd. Old Testament Christology, the critical exposition of the Messianic idea as it is developed in the Old Testament.

3rd. Biblical Theology, traces the gradual evolution of the several elements of revealed truth from their first suggestion through every successive stage to their fullest manifestation in the sacred text, and which exhibits the peculiar forms and]connections in which these several truths are presented by each inspired writer.

4th. The Development of the principles of Prophetical Interpretation and their application to the construction of an outline of the Prophecies of both Testaments.— “Notes on New Testament Literature,” by Dr. J. A. Alexander.

10. What is included under the head of Systematic Theology? As the name imports, Systematic Theology has for its object the gathering all that the Scriptures teach as to what we are to believe and to do, and the presenting all the elements of this teaching in a symmetrical system. The human mind must seek unity in all its knowledge. God’s truth is one, and all the contents of all revelations natural and supernatural must constitute one self–contained system, each part organically related to every other. The method of construction is inductive. It rests upon the results of Exegesis for its foundation. Passages of Scripture ascertained and interpreted are its data. These when rightly interpreted reveal their own relations and place in the system of which the Person and work of Christ is the center. And as the contents of revelation stand intimately related

to all the other departments of human knowledge, the work of Systematic Theology necessarily involves the demonstration and illustration of the harmony of all revealed truth with all valid science, material and psychological, with all true speculative philosophy, and with all true moral philosophy and practical philanthropy.

It includes—

(1.) The construction of all the contents of revelation into a complete system of faith and duties.

(2.) The history of this process as it has prevailed in the Church during the past.

(3.) Polemics.

(1). The construction of all the contents of revelation into a complete system. This includes the scientific treatment (a) of all the matters of faith revealed, and (b) of all the duties enjoined. In the arrangement of topics the great majority of theologians have followed what Dr. Chalmers calls the synthetical method. Starting with the idea and nature of God revealed in the Scriptures, they trace his eternal purposes and temporal acts in creation, providence, and redemption to the final consummation. The Doctor himself prefers what he calls the analytic method, and starts with the facts of experience and the light of nature, and man's present morally diseased condition, leads upward to redemption and to the character of God as revealed therein.

Following the former of these methods all the elements of the system are usually grouped under the following heads:

1st. Theology proper:including the existence, attributes, triune personality of God, together with his eternal purposes, and temporal acts of creation and providence.

2nd. Anthropology:(doctrine of man) including the creation and nature of man, his original state, fall, and consequent moral ruin. This embraces the Biblical Psychology, and the Scriptural doctrine of sin, its nature, origin, and mode of propagation.

3rd. Soteriology:(doctrine of salvation) which includes the plan, execution, and application and glorious effects of human salvation. This embraces Christology (the doctrine of Christ), the incarnation, the constitution of Christ's person, his life, death, and resurrection, together with the office–work of the Holy Ghost, and the means of grace, the word and sacraments.

4th. Christian Ethics:embracing the principles, rules motives, and aids of human duty revealed in the Bible as determined (a) by his natural relations as a man with his fellows, and (b) his supernatural relations as a redeemed man.

5th. Eschatology (science of last things) comprehending death, the intermediate state of the soul, the second advent, the resurrection of the dead, the general judgment, heaven and hell.

6th. Ecclesiology (science of the Church), including the scientific determination of all that the Scriptures teach as to the Church visible and invisible, in its temporal and in its eternal state; including the Idea of the Church—its true definition, constitution and organization, its officers and their functions. A comparison and criticism of all the modifications of ecclesiastical organization that have ever existed, together with their genesis, history, and practical effects.

2. Doctrine–History, which embraces the history of each of these great doctrines traced in its first appearance and subsequent development, though the controversies it excited and the Confessions in which it is defined.

3. Polemics, or Controversial Theology, including the defense of the true system of doctrine as a whole and of each constituent element of it in detail against the perversions of heretical parties within the pale of the general Church. This embraces—

(1.) The general principles and true method of religious controversies.

(2.) The definition of the true Status Quaestiones in each controversy, and an exposition of the sources of evidence and of the methods, defensive and offensive, by which the truth is to be vindicated.

(3.) The history of controversies.

11. What is included under the head of Practical Theology?

Practical Theology is both a science and an art. As an art it has for its purpose the effective publication of the contents of revelation among all men, and the perpetuation, extension, and edification of the earthly kingdom of God. As a science it has for its province the revealed principles and laws of the art above defined. Hence as Systematic Theology roots itself in a thorough Exegesis at once scientific and spiritual, so does Practical Theology root itself in the great principles developed by Systematic Theology, the department of Ecclesiology being common ground to both departments:the product of the one, and the foundation of the other.

It includes the following main divisions—

1st. The discussion of the Idea and Design of the Church, and of its divinely revealed attributes.

2nd. The determination of the divinely appointed constitution of the Church, and methods of administration, with the discussion and refutation of all the rival forms of church organization that have prevailed, their history, and the controversies which they have encountered.

3rd. The discussion of the nature and extent of the discretion Christ has allowed his followers in adjusting the methods of ecclesiastical organization and administration to changing social and historical conditions.

4th. Church membership, its conditions, and the relation to Christ involved, together with the duties and privileges absolute and relative of the several classes of members. The relation of baptized children to the Church, and the relative duties of Parents and of the Church in relation to them.

5th. The Officers of the Church—extraordinary and temporary; ordinary and perpetual.

(1.) Their call and ordination , their relations to Christ and to the Church.

(2.) Their functions As Teachers, including—

(a.) Catechetics, its necessity, principles, and history.

(b.) Sunday–schools. The duties of parents and of the Church in respect to the religious education of children.

(c.) Sacred Rhetoric. Homiletics and pulpit elocution.

(d.) Christian literature. The newspaper, and periodicals and permanent books.

B. As Leaders of Worship, including—

(a.) Liturgies, their uses, abuses, and history.

(b.) Free forms of prayer (c.) Psalmody, inspired and uninspired, its uses and history.

(d.) Sacred Music, vocal and instrumental uses and history.

C. As Rulers—

(a.) The office, qualification, duties and Scriptural Warrant of Ruling Elders—

(b.) The office, qualification, duties, mode of election, and ordination, and Scriptural Warrant of the New Testament Bishop or Pastor.

(c.) The Session, its constitution and functions. The theory and practical rules and methods of Church discipline.

(d.) The Presbytery and its constitution and functions. The theory and practical rules and precedents regulating the action of Church courts, in the exercise of the constitutional right of Review and Control in the issue and conduct of trials, complaints, appeals, etc., etc.

(e.) The Synod and General Assembly and their constitution and functions. The Principles and policy of Committees, Commissioners, Boards, etc., etc. This leads to the functions of the Church as a whole, and the warrant for and the uses and abuses of Denominational distinctions, and the relations of the different Denominations to one another.

1st. Church Statistics, including our own Church, other Churches, and the world.

2nd. Christian, social, and ecclesiastical economics, including the duties of Christian stewardship. personal consecration, and systematic benevolence. The relation of the Church to the poor and to criminals, the administration of orphan asylums, hospitals, prisons, etc. The relation of the Church to voluntary societies, Young Men’s Christian Associations, etc., etc.

3rd. The education of the ministry, the policy, constitution and administration of theological seminaries.

4th. Domestic Missions. including aggressive evangelization, support of the ministry among the poor, Church extension and Church erection.

5th. The relation of the Church to the state, and the true relation of the state to religion, and the actual condition of the common and statute law with relation to Church property, and the action of Church Courts in the exercise of discipline, etc. The obligations of Christian citizenship. The relation of the Church to civilization, to moral reforms, to the arts, sciences, social refinements, etc., etc.

6th. Foreign Missions in all their departments.

12. What is included under the bead of HISTORICAL THEOLOGY?

According to the logical evolution of the whole contents of the theological sciences, the interpretation of the letter of Scripture, and the construction of the entire system of related truths and duties revealed therein, must precede the History of the actual development of that revelation in the life and faith of the Church, just as the fountain must precede the stream which flows from it. Yet, as a matter of fact, in the actual study of the family of theological sciences, History must precede and lay the foundation for all the rest. History alone gives us the Scriptures in which our revelation is recorded. We are indebted to the same source for our methods of interpretation, and for their results as illustrated in the body of theological literature accumulated in the past; also for our creeds and confessions and records of controversies, and hence for the records preserving the gradual evolution of our system of doctrine. Apart from history, theological sciences cannot be properly pursued.

Historical Theology is divided into Biblical and Ecclesiastical. The first derived chiefly from inspired sources, and continuing down to the close of the New Testament canon. The latter beginning where the former ends, and continuing to the present time.

Biblical History is subdivided into—

1st. Old Testament History including (1) the Patriarchal, (2) Mosaic, and (3) Prophetical eras, together with (4) the history of the chosen people during the interval between the close of the Old and the opening of the New Testament.

2nd. New Testament History, including (l) the life of Christ, (2) The founding of the Christian Church by the Apostles down to the end of the first century. With respect to Ecclesiastical History several preliminary departments of study are essential to its prosecution as a science.

1st. Several of the auxiliary sciences already enumerated must be cited as specifically demanded in this connection.

These are—

(l.) Ancient, Medieval, and Modern Geography.

(2.) Chronology.

(3.) The Antiquities of all the peoples embraced in the area through which the Church has at any period extended.

(4.) Statistics, exhibiting the actual condition of the world at any particular period.

(5.) The entire course of General History.

2nd. The Sources from which Ecclesiastical History is derived should be critically investigated.

(1.) Monumental sources, such as (a) buildings, (b) inscriptions, (c) coins, etc.

(2.) Documental, which are—(a.) Public, such as the Acts of Councils, the briefs, decretals, and bulls of Popes; the archives of governments, and the creeds, confessions, catechisms, and liturgies of the Churches, etc., etc. (b.) Private documents, such as contemporary literature of all kinds, pamphlets, biographies, annals, and later reports and compilations.

3rd. The History of the literature of ecclesiastical history from Eusebius to Neander, Kurtz, and Schaff . . The methods which have been and which should be followed in the arrangement of the material of Church History. The actual Method always has been and probably always will be a combination of the two natural methods—(a) chronological, and (b) topical. The fundamental principle upon which, according to Dr. M'Clintock, the materials of Church History should be arranged, is the distinction between the life and the faith of the Church. The two divisions therefore, are (1) History of the life of the Church, or Church History proper, and (2) History of the thought of the Church, or Doctrine–History.

1st. The History of the Life of the Church deals with persons, communities, and events, and should be treated according to the ordinary methods of historical composition.

2nd. The History of the Thought of the Church comprise—

(1.) Patristics, or the literature of the early Christian Fathers; and Patrology, or a scientific exhibition of their doctrine.

These fathers are grouped under three heads—(a) Apostolic, (b) Ante–Nicene, and (c) Post–Nicene, terminating with Gregory the Great among the Latins, A. D. 604, and with John of Damascus among the Greeks, A. D. 754. This study involves the discussion of (a) the proper use of these Fathers, and their legitimate authority in modern controversies; (b) a full history of their literature, and of the principal editions of their works; and (c) the meaning, value, and doctrine of each individual Father separately—

(2.) Christian Archaeology, which treats of the usage, worship and discipline of the early Church, and the history of Christian worship, art, architecture, poetry, painting, music, etc., etc.

(3.) Doctrine–History, or the critical history of the genesis and development of each element of the doctrinal system of the Church, or of any of its historical branches, with an account of all the heretical forms of doctrine from which the truth has been separated, and the history of all the controversies by of which the elimination has been effected. This will, of course, be accompanied with a critical history of the entire Literature of Doctrine–History, of the principles recognized the methods pursued, and the works produced.

(4.) Symbolics, which involves—(a.) The scientific determination of the necessity for and uses of public Creeds and Confessions. (b.) The history of the occasions, of the actual genesis, and subsequent reception, authority, and influence of each one of the Creeds and Confessions of Christendom. (c.) The study of the doctrinal contents of each Creed, and of each group of Creeds separately, and (d.) Comparative Symbolics, or the comparative study of all the Confessions of the Church, and thence a systematic exhibition of all their respective points of agreement and of contrast.

M'Clintock's "Theological Encyclopaedia"; "Notes on Ecclesiastical History," by Dr. J. A. Alexander, edited by Dr. S. D. Alexander.

02.02. Origin of the Idea of God and Proof of His Existence.

Chapter 2 Origin of the Idea of God and Proof of His Existence.

1. What is the distinction between a NOMINAL and a REAL definition? and give the true definition of the word God. A nominal definition simply explains the meaning of the term used, while a real definition explains the nature of the thing signified by the term. The English word God is by some derived from “good.” Since, however, its various forms in cognate languages could not have had that origin, others derive it from the Persic

Choda— dominus, “possessor.” The Latin Deus, and the Greek Θε■ς have been commonly derived from the Sanskrit div to give “light.” But Curtius, Cremer, and others derive it from θες in θεσσασθαι “to implore.”Θε■ς is “He to whom one prays.” The word God is often used in a pantheistic sense, for the impersonal, unconscious ground of all being, and by many for the unknowable first cause of the existent world. It is for this reason that so many speculators, who actually or virtually deny the existence of the God of Christendom, yet indignantly repudiate the charge of atheism, because they admit the existence of a self–existent substance or first cause to which they give the name God, while they deny to it the possession of the properties generally designated by the term.

But, as a matter of fact, in consequence of the predominance of Christian ideas in the literature of civilized nations for the last eighteen centuries, the term “God” has attained the definite and permanent sense of a self–existent, eternal, and absolutely perfect free personal Spirit, distinct from and sovereign over the world he has created. The man who denies the existence of such a being denies God.

2. How can a “real” definition of God be constructed?

Evidently God can be defined only insofar as he is known to us, and the condition of the possibility of our knowing him is the fact that we were created in his image. Every definition of God must assume this fact, that in an essential sense he and his intelligent creatures are beings of the same genus. He is therefore defined by giving his genus and specific difference. Thus he is as to genus, an intelligent personal Spirit. He is, as to his specific difference, as to that which constitutes him God, infinite, eternal, unchangeable in his being, in his wisdom, in his power in his holiness, and in all perfections consistent with his being.

3. To what extent is the idea of God due to Tradition?

It is evident that the complete idea of God presented in the foregoing definition has been attained only by means of the supernatural revelation recorded in the Christian Scriptures. It is a fact also that the only three Theistic religions which have ever prevailed among men (the Jewish Mohammedan and Christian) are historically connected with the same revelation. It is also, of course, in vain to speculate as to what would be the action of the human mind independent of all inherited habits, and of all traditional opinions. We are entirely without experience or testimony as

to any kind of knowledge attained or judgments formed under such conditions. It is moreover certain that the form in which the theistic conception is realized, and the associations with which it is accompanied, are determined in the case of each community by the theological traditions they have inherited from their fathers.

It is on the other hand, indubitably certain that all men under all known, and therefore under all truly natural conditions, do spontaneously recognize the divine existence as more or less clearly revealed to them in the constitution and conscious experience of their own souls, and in external nature. The theistic conception hence is no more due to authority, as often absurdly charged, than the belief in the subjective reality of spirit or in the objective reality of matter formed under the same educational conditions. The recognition of the self–manifest God is spontaneous, and universal, which proves the evidence to be clear and everywhere present, and convincing to all normally developed men.

4. Is the idea of God INNATE? And is it an INTUITIVE truth? That depends upon the sense in which the respective terms are taken It is evident that there are no “innate” ideas in the sense that any child was ever born with a conception of the divine being, or any other conception already formed in his mind. It is also certain that the human mind when developed under purely natural conditions, in the absence of all super– natural revelation, can never attain to an adequate conception of the divine nature. On the other hand, however, all history proves that the idea of God is innate in the sense that the constitutional faculties of the human soul do, under all natural conditions, secure the spontaneous recognition, more or less clear, of God as the ultimate ground of all being, and as the Lord of conscience, self–manifested in the soul and in the world. It is innate insofar as the evidence is as universally present as the light of day, and the process by which it is apprehended is constitutional.

If the term “intuition” is taken in its strict sense of a direct vision of a truth, seen in its own light to be necessary, by an intellectual act incapable of being resolved into more elementary processes of thought, then the existence of God is not a truth apprehended intuitively by men. The process whereby it is reached, whether spontaneously or by elaborate reasoning, embraces many indubitable intuitions as elements, but no man apprehends God himself by a direct intuition.

Because—

(1.) Although the recognition of the divine existence is necessary in the sense that the great majority of men recognize the truth, and are unable to disbelieve it even when they wish, and no one can do so without doing violence to his nature, yet it is not necessary to thought in the sense that the non–existence of God is unthinkable.

(2.) Because God manifests himself to us not immediately but mediately through his works, and there is always present, at least implicitly, an inference in the act whereby the soul recognizes his presence and action.

(3.) The true idea of God is exceedingly complex, and is reached by a complex process, whether spontaneous or not, involving various elements capable of analysis and description. On the other hand it is true that God manifests himself in his working in our souls and in external nature just as the invisible souls of our fellow men manifest themselves, and we spontaneously recognize him just as we do them. We recognize them because (a) we are generically like them, and (b) their

attributes are significally expressed in their words and actions. And we recognize God because (a) we have been made in his image, which fact we spontaneously recognize (b) from his self–revelations in consciousness, especially in conscience, and from the characteristics of the external world. The principles of theistic inference are very concise and interrelated, almost as if they are one.

5. If the existence of God is spontaneously recognized by all men under normal conditions of consciousness, what is the value of formal arguments to prove that existence? And what are the arguments generally used?

1st. These arguments are of value as analyses and scientific verifications of the mental processes implicitly involved in the spontaneous recognition of the self–manifestations of God.

2nd. They are of use also for the purpose of vindicating the legitimacy of the process against the criticisms of skeptics.

3rd. Also for the purpose of quickening and confirming the spontaneous recognition by drawing attention to the extent and variety of the evidence to which it responds.

4th. The various arguments are convergent rather than consecutive. They do not all establish the same elements of the theistic concept but each establishes independently its separate element, and thus is of use (a) in contributing confirmatory evidence that God is, and (b) complementary evidence as to what God is.

They constitute an organic whole, and are the analysis and illustration of the spontaneous act whereby the mass of men have always recognized God. The relationship pf cause and effect in the universe, theistic design, and goodness all point to God's character. These attributes, while they do not prove God's existence, provide good reason for intelligent men believing in God. The usual arguments will be examined under the following heads:

1st. The Cosmological Argument, or the evidence for God's existence as First Cause.

2nd. The Teleological Argument, or the evidence of God's existence afforded by the presence of order and adaptation in the universe.

3rd. The Moral Argument, or the evidence afforded by the moral consciousness and history of mankind.

4th. The evidence afforded by the phenomena of Scripture and the supernatural history they record.

5th. The a priori Argument, and the testimony afforded by reason to God as the Infinite and Absolute.

6. State the Cosmological Argument.

It may be stated in the form of a syllogism, thus—

Premise.—Every new existence or change in anything previously existing must have had a cause pre–existing and adequate.

Minor Premise.—The universe as a whole and in all its parts is a system of changes.

Conclusion.—Hence the universe must have a cause exterior to itself, and the ultimate or absolute cause must be eternal, uncaused, and unchangeable.

1st. As to the major premise; the causal judgment is intuitive and absolutely universal and necessary. It has been denied theoretically by some speculators, as Hume and Mill, but it is always used by them and all others in all their reasoning as to the origin of the world, as well as of all things it contains The judgment is unavoidable; the opposite is unthinkable. Something exists now, therefore something must have existed from eternity, and that which has existed from eternity is the cause of that which exists now.

It has been claimed that the causal judgment leads to an infinite regressive series of causes and effects. But this is absurd.

(1.) The judgment is not that every thing must have a cause, but that every new thing or change must have been caused. But that which is eternal and immutable needs no cause.

(2.) An infinite series of causes and effects is absurd, for that is only a series of changes, which is precisely that which demands a cause, and all the more imperatively in proportion to its length. A real cause, on the other hand—that in which the causal judgment can alone absolutely rest—must be neither a change nor a series of changes, but something uncaused, eternal and immutable.The same principles of cause and effect utilized here have been a part of logical and scientific deduction for centuries.

2nd. As to the minor premise. The fact that the universe as a whole and in all its parts is a system of changes is emphasized by every principle and lesson of modern science. Every discovery in the fields of geology and astronomy, and all speculation—as the nebular hypothesis and the hypothesis of evolution—embody this principle as their very essence. But John Stuart Mill in his "Essay on Theism," pp. 142, 143, says:"There is in nature a permanent element, and also a changeable:the changes are always the effects of previous changes; the permanent existences, so far as we know, are not effects at all. . . . There is in every object another and permanent element, viz., the specific elementary substance or substances of which it consists, and their inherent properties. These are not known as beginning to exist; within the range of human knowledge they had no beginning, consequently no cause; though they themselves are causes or concauses of every thing that takes place.""Whenever a physical phenomenon is traced to its cause, that cause when analyzed is found to be a certain quantum of force, combined with certain collocations. . . . The force itself is essentially one and the same, and there exists of it in nature a fixed quantity, which (if the theory of the conservation of forces be true) is never increased or diminished. Here then we find in the changes of material nature a permanent element, to all appearance the very one of which we are in quest. This it is apparently to which, if to anything, we must assign the character of First Cause."—"Essay on Theism," pp. 144, 145.

WE ANSWER—

(1.) The existence of "Energy" in any of its conversable forms dissociated from matter is absolutely unthinkable. This is recognized as an unquestionable scientific truth by Stewart and Tait ("Unseen Universe," p. 79).

(2.) It is an obvious fact “that all but an exceedingly small fraction of the light and heat of the sun and stars goes out into space, and does not return to them. In the next place the visible motion of the large bodies of the universe is gradually being stopped by something which may be denominated ethereal friction,” and at last they must fall together, and constitute by successive aggregations one mass. “In fine the degradation of Energy of the visible universe proceeds, pari passu, with the aggregation of mass. The very fact, therefore, that the large masses of the visible universe are of finite size, is sufficient to assure us that the process cannot have been going on forever, or in other words that the visible universe must have had an origin in time—since (a) Energy remains aggregated in finite quantities yet undiffused, and (b) since the matter of the universe still remains in separate masses. Thus the very law of the correlation of Energy to which Mill appeals proves, when really tested, that the visible universe had a beginning and will have an end.” Stewart and Tait (“Unseen Universe,” p. 166)

(3.) His assumption, also, that the matter of the universe is in its ultimate atoms eternal and unchangeable, is unproved and contrary to scientific analogy. Clark Maxwell (in his address as President of the British Association for Advancement of Science, 1870) says:“The exact equality of each mole– cule to all others of the same kind gives it, as Sir John has well said, the essential character of a manufactured article, and precludes the idea of its being eternal and self–existent.”

(4.) As a matter of fact all evolution theories as to the genesis of the universe necessarily postulate a commencement in time, and a primordial fire–mist. But this fire–mist cannot be the First Cause the causal judgment demands, because it is not eternal and immutable. If eternal it would be fully developed. If fully developed it could not develop into the universe. If immutable it could not pass into change. If not immutable it is itself; like the universe which issues from it, a transient condition of matter, like all other change demanding for itself a cause.

7. State the Teleological Argument.

Teleology from τ■λος, end, and λ■γος, discourse, is the science of final causes, or of purposes or design as exhibited in the adjustments of parts to wholes, of means to ends, of organs to uses in nature. It is also familiarly called the Argument from Design, and is ultimately based upon the recognition of the operations of an intelligent cause in nature. It may be profitably stated in two forms based respectively on the more general and the more special manifestations of that intelligence.

FIRST FORM Major Premise.—Universal order and harmony in the conspiring operation of a vast multitude of separate elements can be explained only by the postulate of an intelligent cause.

Minor Premise.—The universe as a whole and in all its parts is a fabric of the most complex and symmetrical order.

Conclusion.—Therefore the eternal and absolute cause of the universe is an intelligent mind.

SECOND FORM Major Premise.—The adjustment of parts and the adaptation of means to effect an end or purpose can be explained only by reference to a designing intelligence and will.

Minor Premise.—The universe is full of such adjustments of parts, and of organisms composed of parts conspiring to effect an end.

Conclusion.—therefore the First Cause of the universe must be an intelligent mind and will.

These arguments if valid amount to proving that God is an eternal self–existing Person. For the assumption of an unconscious intelligence, or of an intelligence producing effects without the exercise of will is absurd. These phrases represent no possible ideas. And intelligence and will together constitute personality. As to the first form of the argument it is evident that the very fact that science is possible is an indubitable proof that the order of nature is intellectual. Science is a product of the human mind, which is absolutely incapable of passing beyond the laws of its own constitution. Intuitions of reason, logical processes of analysis, inductive or deductive inference, imagination, invention, and all the activities of the soul organize the scientific process. To all this external nature is found perfectly to correspond. Even the most subtle solutions of abstract mathematical and mechanical problems have been subsequently found by experiment to have been anticipated in nature. The laws of nature are expressions of numerical and geometrical harmonies and are instinct with reason and beauty. Yet these laws although invariable under invariable conditions, are neither eternal nor inherent in the elementary constitution of the universe. The properties of elemental matter are constant, but the laws which organize them are themselves complicated effects resulting from antecedent adjustments of these elements themselves under the categories of time, place, quantity, and quality. As these adjustments change the laws change. These adjustments, therefore, are the cause of these laws, and the adjustments themselves must be the product either of chance, which is absurd, or of intelligence, which is certain. Again, this order of nature has been accepted as a necessity in all scientific and human processes over time. As to the second form of this Argument.—The principle of design presupposes the general intellectual order of the universe and her laws, and presents in advance the affirmation that the character of the First Cause is further manifested by the everywhere present evidence that these general laws are made to conspire by special adjustments to the accomplishment of ends evidently intended. This principle is illustrated by the mutual adjustments of the various provinces of nature, and especially by the vegetable and animal organisms, and the relations they involve, of organ to organism, of organism to instinct, and of single organisms and classes of organisms to each other and to their physical surroundings. In many cases the intention of these special adjustments is self–evident and undeniable, as in the case of the parts of the eye to the purpose of vision. In other cases it is more obscure and conjectural. In the present condition of science we can understand only in part, but from the beginning the evidence of intelligent purpose has been transparent and overwhelming. A single sentence proves intelligence, although the context is indecipherable. But every advance of science discloses the same evidence over wider areas and in clearer light.

8. State and answer the objections to the theistic inference from the evidences of special design.

1st. Hume (“Dialogues on Natural Religion,” Pt. 7., etc.) argues that our conviction that adaptation implies design is due to experience and cannot go beyond it. That our judgment that natural organisms imply design in their cause is an inference from the analogy of human contrivance, and its effects. He argues further that this analogy is false because—

(1.) The human worker is antecedently known to us as an intelligent contriver, while the author of nature is antecedently unknown and the very object sought to be verified by the theistic inference.

(2.) The processes of nature are all unlike the processes by which man executes his contrivances, and the formation of the world, and the institution of the processes of nature are peculiar effects of the like of which we have no experience.

We answer—

(l.) The argument rests upon a false assumption of fact. The human contriver, the soul of our fellow man, is not antecedently known to us, nor is ever in any way known except by the character of the works by which he manifests himself. And precisely in the same way and to the same extent is the Author of nature known.

(2.) It rests on a false assumption of principle. The analogy of human contrivances is not the ground of our conviction that order and adaptation imply intelligence. It is a universal and necessary judgment of reason that order and adaptation can only spring from an intelligent cause, or from accident, and that the latter supposition is absurd.

2nd. Some men of science, who have become habituated to the consideration of the universe as an absolute unit, all the processes of which are executed by invariable general laws (a mode of thought in which for centuries science was anticipated by Augustinian Theology), object that in inferring intention from the adjustment of parts in special groups or systems, the natural theologian had mistaken a part for a whole and an incidental effect of a general law, resulting from special and temporary conditions, for the real end of the law itself. They hold that if even the First Cause of the universe were intelligent, it were infinitely absurd for men to presume to interpret his purpose from what we see of the special results of the working of laws working from infinite past time, through infinite space, and over an infinite system of conspiring parts.

We answer—

(1.) It is self evident that the relations of the parts of a special whole conspiring to a special end may be fully understood, while the relations of that special whole to the general whole may be entirely unknown although strong light is thrown even on this side by reason and revelation. A single bone of an unknown species of animal gives undeniable evidence of special adaptation, and may even, as scientists justly claim, throw light beyond itself upon the constitution of that otherwise unknown whole to which it belonged.

(2.) We confess that this criticism, although failing as to the argument from design, has force relatively to the mode in which that argument has often been conceived. The older natural theologians did often to too great a degree abstract individual organisms from the great dynamic whole of which they are products as well as parts. Dr. Flint (“Theism,” p. 159) well distinguishes between the intrinsic, the extrinsic, and the ultimate ends of any special adjustment. Thus the intrinsic end of that special adjustment of parts called the eye is vision. Its extrinsic ends are the uses it serves to the animal it belongs to, and all the uses he serves to all he stands immediately or remotely related to. Its ultimate end is the end of the universe itself. Dr. Flint is pointing out the interrelationship of the part and the whole.

It is true indeed that a man cannot discern the ultimate end of a part until he discerns the ultimate end of the whole, and that he cannot discern all the extrinsic ends of any special system until he knows all its relations to all other special systems. Nevertheless, as a man who knows nothing of

the relation of a given plant or animal to the flora or fauna of a continent, may be absolutely certain of the functions of the root or the claw in the economy of the plant or beast, so the manner in which all the parts which conspire to make a special whole are adapted to effect that end may be perfectly understood, while we know nothing as yet of the extrinsic relation of that special whole to that which is exterior to itself.

3rd. It has been claimed in recent times by a certain class of scientists that evidence for the existence of God afforded by the order and adaptation exhibited in the processes of nature has been very much weakened, if not absolutely invalidated by the assumed probability of the alternative hypothesis of Evolution. There are many theories of Evolution, but the term in the general sense denotes the judgment that the state of the universe as a whole and in all its parts any one moment of time, has its cause in its state the immediately preceding moment, and that these changes have been brought about through the agency of powers inherent in nature, and that they may be traced back from moment to moment without any break of causal continuity through all past time.

All possible theories of Evolution, considered in their relation to theology, may be classified thus:

(1.) Those which neither deny nor obscure the evidence which the order and adaptation observed in nature afford to the existence of God, and his immanence in and providential control of his works.

(2.) Those which, while recognizing God as the original source in the remote past, to which the origination and the primary adjustments of the universe are to be referred, yet deny his immanence and constant providential activity in his works

(3.) Those which professedly or virtually obscure or deny the evidence afforded by the order and adaptation of the universe for the existence and activity of God alike as Creator and as Providential Ruler. With the first class of Evolution theories the Natural Theologian has, of course, only the most friendly interest. As to the second class, which admits that a divine intelligence contrived and inaugurated the universe at the absolute beginning, yet deny that any such agent is immanent in the universe controlling its processes, WE REMARK—That the point we have at present to establish is the eternal self–existence of an intelligent First Cause, and not the mode of his relation to the universe. The latter question will be treated in subsequent chapters.

(2.) It is far more philosophical, and more in accordance with a true interpretation of the scientific principle of continuity, to conceive of the First Cause as immanent in the universe, and as organically concurring with all unintelligent second causes in all processes exhibiting power or intelligence. This is recognized by that large majority of scientific men who are either orthodox Theists, or who refer all the phenomena of the physical universe to the dynamic action of the divine will.

(3.) The evidence afforded by man's moral consciousness and history and by revelation, to the immanent and effective agency of God in all his works, is unanswerable. As to the third class of Evolution theories, which do either professedly or virtually obscure or deny the evidence afforded by order or contrivance to an intelligent First Cause of the Universe, as for example the theory of Darwin as to the differentiation of all organisms through accidental variations occurring through unlimited time, WE REMARK—

1st. Every such scheme, when it is proposed as an account of the existing universe, must furnish a probable explanation of all classes of facts. It is notorious that every theory of purely natural Evolution fails utterly to explain the following facts:

(1.) The origination of life. It could not have existed in the fire–mist. It could not have been generated by that which has no life. The old axiom omne vivum ex vivo, all life comes from life, appllies here.

(2.) The origin of sensation.

(3.) Also of intelligence and will.

(4.). Also of conscience.

(5.) The establishment of distinct logically correlated and persistent types of genera and species, maintained by the law of hybridity.

(6.) The origin of man. Prof. Virchow of Berlin, in his recent address at the German Association of Naturalists and Physicians at Munich says, “You are aware that I am now specially engaged in the study of anthropology, but I am bound to declare that every positive advance which we have made in the province of prehistoric anthropology has actually removed us further from the proof of such connection (i. e., the descent of man from any lower type).”

2nd. But even if continuous evolution could be proved as a fact, the significance of the evidence of intelligent order and contrivance would not be in the least affected. It would only establish a method or system of means, but could in no degree alter the nature of the effect, nor the attributes of the real cause disclosed by them

(1.) The laws of abiogenesis, of reproduction, of sexual differentiation and reproduction, of heredity, of variation, such as can evolve sensation, reason, conscience, and will out of atoms and mechanical energy, would all still remain to be accounted for.

(2.) Laws are never causes, but always complicated modes of action resulting from the co–action of innumerable unconscious agents. Instead, therefore, of being explanations they are the very complex effects for which reason demand an intellectual cause.

(3.) All physical laws result from the original properties of matter acting under the mutual condition of certain complicated adjustments. Change the adjustments and the laws change. The laws which execute evolution or rather into which the process of evolution is analyzed, must be referred back to the original adjustments of the material elements of the fire–mist. These adjustments, in which all future order and life is by hypothesis latent, must have been caused by chance or intelligence. Huxley in his “Criticisms on Origin of Species,” p. 330, founds the whole logic of Evolution on chance thus:It has been “ demonstrated that an apparatus thoroughly well–adapted to a particular purpose, may be the result of a method of trial and error worked out by unintelligent agents, as well as of the direct application of the means appropriate to that end by an intelligent agent.”“According to Teleology, each organism is like a rifle bullet fired straight at a mark; according to Darwin organisms are like grape–shot, of which one hits something and the rest fall wide.” The modern scientific explanation of the processes of the universe by physical causes alone, to the exclusion of mind, differs from the old long–exploded chance theory, only by the

accidents (a) of the juggling use of the words “laws of nature,” (b) and the assumption that chance operating through indefinite duration can accomplish the work of intelligence. But as no man can believe that any amount of time will explain the form of flint knives and arrow heads, in the absence of human agents, or that any number of throws could cast a font of type into the order of letters in the plays of Shakespeare, so no man can rationally believe that the complicated and significantly intellectual order of the universe sprang from chance.

(4.) In artificial breeding man selects. In “natural selection” nature selects. Hence, if the results are the most careful adjustments to effect purpose, it follows that that characteristic must be stamped upon the organisms by nature, and hence nature itself must therefore be intelligently directed, either (a.) by an intelligence immanent in her elements, or in her whole as organized, or (b.) by the original adjustment of her machinery by an intelligent Creator.

9. State the Moral Argument, or the Evidence afforded by the Moral Consciousness and History of mankind. The Cosmological argument led us to an eternal self–existent First Cause. The argument from the order and adaptation discovered in the processes of the universe revealed this great First Cause as possessing intelligence and will; that is, as a personal spirit. The moral or anthropological argument furnishes new data for inference, at once confirming the former conclusions as to the fact of the existence of a Personal intelligent First Cause, and at the same time adding to the conception the attributes of holiness, justice, goodness, and truth The argument from design includes the argument from cause, and the argument from righteousness and benevolence includes both the arguments from cause and from design, and adds to them a new element of its own. This group of arguments may he stated thus:

1st. Consciousness is the fundamental ground of all knowledge. It gives us immediately the knowledge of self as existing and as the subject of certain attributes, and the agent in certain forms of activity. These souls and all their attributes must be accounted for. They have not existed from eternity. They could not have been evolved out of material elements because—

(1.) Consciousness testifies to their unity, simplicity, and spirituality.

(2.) The laws of reason and the moral sense cannot be explained as the result of transformed sense impressions modified by association derived by heredity (Mill and Spencer); for, (a) they are universally the same, (b) incapable of analysis, (c) necessary, and (d) sovereign over all impulses. Therefore the human soul must have been created, and its Creator must have attributes superior to his work.

2nd. Man is essentially and universally a religious being. The sense of absolute dependence and moral accountability is inherent in his nature, universal and necessary. Conscience always implies responsibility to a superior in moral authority, and therefore in moral character. It is especially implied in the sense of guilt which accompanies every violation of conscience. God is manifested and recognized in conscience as a holy righteous, just, and intelligent will i. e., a holy personal spirit.

3rd. The adaptations of nature, as far as we can trace their relations to sentient beings, are characteristically beneficent, and evidence a general purpose to promote happiness, and to gratify a sense of beauty. This implies design, and design of a special esthetic and moral character, and proves that the First Cause is benevolent and a lover of beauty.

4th. The entire history of the human race, as far as known discloses a moral order and purpose, which cannot be explained by the intelligence or moral purpose of the human agents concerned, which discovers an all–embracing unity of plan, comprehending all peoples and all centuries. The phenomena of social and national life, of ethnological distribution, of the development and diffusion of civilizations and religions can be explained only by the existence of a wise, righteous, and benevolent ruler and educator of mankind.

10. State and answer the objections to the Moral Argument.

These objections are founded—

1st. On the mechanical invariability of natural laws, and their inexorable disregard of the welfare of sentient creatures.

2nd. The sufferings of irrational animals.

3rd. The prevalence of moral and physical evils among men.

4th. The unequal apportionment of providential favors, and the absence of all proportion between the measure of happiness allotted, and the respective moral characters of the recipients.

These difficulties, more or less trying to the faith of all, are the real occasion in the great majority of instances, of skeptical atheism. John Stewart Mill in his “Essay on Nature” (“Three Essays on Religion”) describes it as the characteristic of “Nature” ruthlessly to inflict suffering and death, and affirms that the cause of nature, if a personal will, must be a monster of cruelty and injustice. In his “Essay on Theism,” Pt. 2., he argues that the attempt to maintain that the author of nature, such as we know it, is at once omniscient and omnipotent and absolutely just and benevolent is abominably immoral. That he can be excused of cruelty and injustice only on the plea of limited knowledge or power or both. He sums up his conclusion from the evidence thus:“A Being of great but limited power, how or by what limited we cannot even conjecture; of great and perhaps unlimited intelligence, but perhaps also more narrowly limited than his power:who desires and pays some regard to the happiness of his creatures, but who seems to have other motives of action which he cares more for, and who can hardly be supposed to have created the universe for that purpose only.” In his “Autobiography,” ch. 2., he says of his father, James Mill, “I have heard him say, that the turning point of his mind on the subject was reading Butler’s Analogy. That work, of which he always continued to speak with respect, kept him, as he said, for some considerable time, a believer in the divine authority of Christianity; by proving to him, that whatever are the difficulties of believing that the Old and. New Testaments proceed from, or record the acts of a perfectly wise and good being, the same and still greater difficulties stand in the way of the belief, that a being of such a character can have been the Maker of the universe. He considered Butler’s argument as conclusive against the only opponents for whom it was intended. Those who admit an omnipotent as well as perfectly just and benevolent Maker and Ruler of such a world as this, can say little against Christianity but what can with at least equal force be retorted against themselves. Finding, therefore, no halting place in Deism, he remained in a state of perplexity, until, doubtless after many struggles, he yielded to the conviction, that concerning the origin of things nothing whatever can be known.”

WE ANSWER—

1st. It is unquestionably true that God has not created the universe for the single purpose, or even for the chief purpose, of promoting the happiness of his creatures. Our reason and observation, and the Christian Scriptures, unite in revealing as far higher and more worthy ends of divine action the manifestation of his own glory, and the promotion by education and discipline of the highest excellence of his intelligent moral creatures. It is evident that the operation of inexorable general laws, and the mystery and sufferings incident to this life, may be the most effective means to promote those ends.

2nd. The direct intention of all the organs with which sensitive creatures are endowed is evidently to promote their well–being; pain and misery are incidental. Even the sudden violent deaths of irrational animals probably promote the largest possible amount of sentient happiness.

3rd. Conscience has taught men in all ages that the sufferings incident to human life are the direct and deserved consequences of human sin, either penalties, or chastisements benevolently designed for our moral improvement.

4th. The origin of sin is a confessed mystery, relieved however by the consideration, that it results from the abuse of man's highest and most valuable endowment, responsible free agency, and by the fact revealed in the Christian Scriptures that even sin will be divinely overruled to the fuller manifestation of the perfections of God, and to the higher excellence and the more perfect happiness of the intelligent creation.

5th. The inequalities of the allotments of providence, and the disproportion between the well–being and the moral characters of men in this life, results from the fact that it is not the scene of rewards and punishments, and that different characters and different destinies require a different educational discipline, and it points to future readjustments revealed in the Bible (Psalms 73:1-28.).

6th. Neither the teleological nor the moral argument involves the assertion that with our present knowledge we are able to discern in the universe the evidences of either infinite or perfect wisdom or goodness. These are both indicated as matters of fact and general characteristics of nature. But our discernment of both is necessarily limited by the imperfections of our knowledge. Even in the judgment of reason alone the infinite probability is that what appears to us abnormal, inconsistent either with perfect wisdom or perfect goodness, will be found, upon the attainment of more adequate information on our part, to illustrate those very perfections which we have been tempted to think obscure.

11. State the Scriptural Evidence.

Since man is a finite and guilty and morally corrupt creature it is unavoidable that the self–manifestations of God in nature should be imperfectly apprehended by him. That supernatural revelation which God has disclosed through an historical process of special interventions in chronological successions, interpreted by a supernaturally endowed order of prophets, and recorded in the Christian Scriptures, supplements the light of nature, explains the mysteries of providence , and furnishes us with the principles of a true theodicy. The God whom nature veils while it reveals him, stands before us unveiled in all the perfection of wisdom, holiness, and love in the person of Christ. He who hath seen Christ hath seen the Father. The truth of Theism is demonstrated in his person, and henceforth will never be held except by those who loyally

acknowledge his Lordship over intellect and conscience and life.

12. State the principle upon which thea priori arguments for the existence of God rest, the value of the principle, and the principal forms in which they have been presented. An a posteriori argument is one which logically ascends from facts of experience to causes, or principles. Thus by means of the preceding arguments we have been led from the facts of consciousness and of external nature to the knowledge of God as an intelligent and righteous personal spirit, the powerful, wise, and benevolent First Cause and Moral Governor. An a priori argument is one which proceeds from the necessary ideas of reason to the consequences necessarily deduced from them, or the truths necessarily involved in them.

It is certain that the intuitions of necessary truth are the same in all men. They are not generalizations from experience, but are presupposed in all experience. They bear the stamp of universality and necessity. They have objective validity, not depending upon the subjective state of personal consciousness, nor depending upon the nature of things, but anterior and superior to all things. What then can be the ground of eternal, necessary, universal, unchangeable truth, unless it be an infinite, eternal, self–existent, unchangeable nature, of whose essence they are?

We have seen that our reasons can rest only in a cause itself uncaused. An uncaused cause must be eternal, self–existent, and unchangeable. We have in our minds ideas and intuitions of infinity and perfection, as well as of eternity, self–existence, and immutability. “These, unless they are wholly delusive—which is what we are unable to conceive—must be predicable of some being. The sole question is, Of what being? It must be of him who has been proved to he the First Cause of all things, the source of all the power, wisdom and goodness displayed in the universe. It cannot be the universe itself; for that has been shown to be but an effect, to have before and behind it a Mind, a Person. It cannot be ourselves, or anything to which our senses can reach, seeing that we and they are finite, contingent, and imperfect. The author of the universe alone—the father of our spirits, and the Giver of every good and perfect gift—can be uncreated, and unconditioned, infinite, and perfect. This completes the idea of God so far as it can be reached or formed by natural reason. And it gives consistency to the idea. The conclusions of the a posteriori arguments fail to satisfy either the mind or the heart until they are connected with and supplemented by, the intuition of the reason—infinity. The conception of any other than an infinite God—a God unlimited in all his perfections—is a self–contradictory conception which the intelligence refuses to entertain.”—Dr. Flint, “Theism,” p. 291.

1. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury (1093–1109), in his “Monologium and Proslogium” states the argument thus:We have the idea of an infinitely perfect being. But real existence is a necessary element of infinite perfection. Therefore an infinitely perfect being exists, otherwise the infinitely perfect as we conceive it would lack an essential element of perfection.

2. Descartes (1596–1650) in his “Meditationes de prima philosophia,” prop. 2, p. 89, states it thus:The idea of an infinite y perfect being which we possess could not have originated in a finite source, and therefore must have been communicated to us by an infinitely perfect being. He also in other connections claims that this idea represents an objective reality, because (1) it is pre–eminently clear, and ideas carry conviction of correspondence to truth in proportion to their clearness, and (2) it is necessary.

3. Dr. Samuel Clarke, in 1705, published his “Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God.” He argues that time and space are infinite and necessarily existent. But they are not substances. Therefore there must exist an eternal infinite substance of which they are properties. THE PRINCIPAL ANTI–THEISTIC THEORIES.

13. What is Atheism?

Atheism, according to its etymology, signifies a denial of the being of God. It was applied by the ancient Greeks to Socrates and other philosophers, to indicate that they failed to conform to the popular religion. In the same sense it was applied to the early Christians. Since the usage of the term Theism has been definitely fixed in all modern languages, atheism necessarily stands for the denial of the existence of a personal Creator and Moral Governor. Notwithstanding that the belief in a personal God is the result of a spontaneous recognition of God as manifesting himself in consciousness and the works of nature, atheism is still possible as an abnormal state of consciousness induced by sophistical speculation or by the indulgence of sinful passions, precisely as subjective idealism is possible. It exists in the following forms:1. Practical, 2. Speculative. Again, Speculative Atheism may be (1) Dogmatic, as when the conclusion is reached either (a) that God does not exist, or (b) that the human faculties are positively incapable of ascertaining or of verifying his existence (e. g., Herbert Spencer, “First Principles,” pt. 1).

(2.) Skeptical, as when the existence is simply doubted, and the conclusiveness of the evidence generally relied upon is denied.

(3.) Virtual, as when (a.) principles are maintained essentially inconsistent with the existence of God, or with the possibility of our knowledge of him:e. g., by materialists, positivists, absolute idealists. (b.) When some of the essential attributes of the divine nature are denied, as by Pantheists, and by J. S. Mill in his “Essays on Religion.” (c.) When explanations of the universe are given which exclude (a1) the agency of an intelligent Creator and Governor, (b1) the moral government of God, and the moral freedom of man, e. g., the theories of Darwin and Spencer, and Necessitarians generally. See Ulrici, “God and Nature” and “Review of Strauss”; Strauss, “Old and New”; Buchanan, “Modern Atheism ”; Tulloch, “Theism”; Flint, “Theism.”

14. What is Dualism?

Dualism, in Philosophy the opposite of Monism, is the doctrine that there are two generically distinct essences, Matter and Spirit in the universe. In this sense the common doctrine of Christendom is dualistic. All the ancient pagan philosophers held the eternal independent existence of matter, and consequently all among them who were also Theists were strictly cosmological dualists. The religion of Zoroaster was a mythological dualism designed to account for the existence of evil. Ormuzd and Ahriman, the personal principles of good and evil, sprang from a supreme abstract divinity, Akerenes. Some of the sects of this religion held dualism in its absolute form, and referred all evil to υλη, self–existent matter. This principle dominated among the various spurious Christian Gnostic sects in the second century, and in the system of Manes in the third century, and its prevalence in the oriental world is manifested in the ascetic tendency of the early Christian Church. See J. F. Clarke, “Ten Religions”; Hardwicke,“ Christ and other Masters”; Neander’s “Church History”;

Pressense, “Early Years of Christianity”; Tennemann, “Manual Hist. Philos.”

15. What is Polytheism?

Polytheism (πολυς and θε■ς) distributes the perfections and functions of the infinite God among many limited gods. It sprang out of the nature–worship represented in the earliest Hindu Veds, so soon and so generally supplanting primitive monotheism. At first, as it long remained in Chaldea and Arabia, it consisted in the worship of elements, especially of the stars and of fire. Subsequently it took special forms from the traditions, the genius, and the relative civilizations of each nationality. Among the rudest savages it sank to Fetichism as in western and central Africa. Among the Greeks it was made the vehicle for the expression of their refined humanitarianism in the apotheosis of heroic men rather than the revelation of incarnate gods. In India, springing from a pantheistic philosophy, it has been carried to the most extravagant extreme, both in respect to the number, and the character of its deities. Whenever polytheism has been connected with speculation it appears as the esoteric counterpart of pantheism. Carlyle, “Hero–worship” Max Muller, “Compar. Myth.,” in Oxford Essays; Prof. Tyler. “Theology of Greek Poets.”

16. What is Deism?

Deism, from deus, although etymologically synonymous with theism, from θεος, has been distinguished from it since the mid of the sixteenth century, and designates a system admitting the existence of a personal Creator, but denying his controlling presence in the world, his immediate moral government, and all supernatural intervention and revelation. The movement began with the English Deists, Lord Herbert of Cherbury (1581–1648), Hobbes (l680), Shaftesbury, Bolingbroke (1678–1751), Thomas Paine (1809), etc. It passed over to France and was represented by Voltaire and the Encyclopaedists. It passed over into Germany and was represented by Lessing and Reimarus (“Wolfenbuttel Fragmentist”), and invading Church and Theology, it was essentially represented by the old school of naturalistic rationalists, who admitted with it a low and inconsequent form of Socinianism, e. g., Eichhorn (1752–1827), Paulus (1761–1851), Wegscheider (1771–1848). 1t has been represented in America by the late Theodore Parker, and the extreme left of the party known as “Liberal Christians.” In Germany mere deistic naturalism gave way to pantheism, as the latter has recently given way to materialistic atheism, e. g., Strauss. See Leland, “View of Deistical Writers”; Van Mildert’s “Boyle Lectures”; Farrar, “Critical Hist. of Freethought”; Dorner, “Hist. Protest. Theology”; Hurst, “ Hist. of Rationalism”; Butler’s “Analogy.”

17. What is Idealism?

“Idealism is the doctrine that in external perceptions the objects immediately known are ideas. It has been held under various forms.”—See Hamilton’s “ Reid,” Note C.

Some of the phases of modern Idealism among the Germans, may be seen in the following passage from Lewes:—“I see a tree. The common psychologists tell me that there are three things implied in this one fact of vision, viz., a tree, an image of that tree, and a mind that apprehends that image. Fichte tells me that it is I alone who exist. The tree and the image of it are one thing, and that is a modification of my mind. This is subjective idealism. Schelling tells me that both the tree and my ego(or self), are existences equally real or ideal; but they are nothing less than manifestations of the absolute, the infinite, or unconditioned. This is objective idealism. But Hegel tells me that all these explanations are false. The only thing really existing (in this one fact of vision) is the idea, the relation. The ego and the tree are but two terms of the relation, and owe

their reality to it. This is absolute idealism. According to this, there is neither mind nor matter, heaven or earth, God or man., The doctrine opposed to Idealism is Realism."—"Vocabulary of the Philosophical Sciences," by C. P. Krauth, D.D., 1878.

18. What is Materialism? As soon as we begin to reflect we become conscious of the presence of two everywhere interlaced, but always distinct classes of phenomena—of thought, feeling, will on the one hand, and of extension, inertia, etc., on the other. Analyze these as we may, we never can resolve the one into the other. The one class we come to know through consciousness, the other through sensation, and we know the one as directly and as certainly as the other; and as we can never resolve either into the other, we refer the one class to a substance called spirit, and the other class to a substance called matter.

Materialists are a set of superficial philosophers in whom the moral consciousness is not vivid, and who have formed the habit of exclusively directing attention to the objects of the senses, and explaining physical phenomena by mechanical conceptions. Hence they fall into the fundamental error of affirming—

(1.) That there is but one substance, or rather that all the phenomena of the universe can be explained in terms of atoms and force.

(2.) That intelligence, feeling, conscience, volition, etc., are only properties of matter, or functions of material organization, or modifications of convertible energy. Intelligence did not precede and effect order and organization, but order and organization developed by laws inherent in matter develop intelligence The German Darwinists style that system the "mechanico–causal" development of the universe:Huxley says life and hence organization results from the "molecular mechanics of the protoplasm."

WE ANSWER—

1st. This is no recondite theory, as some pretend, concerning substance. If the phenomena of consciousness are resolved into modifications of matter and force, i. e., ultimately into some mode of motion, then all ultimate and necessary truth is impossible, duty has no absolute obligation, conscience is a lie, consciousness a delusion, and freedom of will absurd. All truth and duty, all honor and hope, all morality and religion, would be dissolved.

2nd. The theory is one–sided and unwarrantable. In fact our knowledge of the soul and of its intuitions and powers are more direct and clear than the scientist's knowledge of matter. What does he know of the real nature of the atom, of force, of gravity, etc.?

3rd. The explanation of matter by mind, of force and order by intelligence and will, is rational. But the explanation of the phenomena of intelligence, will, and consciousness as modes of matter or force is absurd. The reason can rest in the one and cannot in the other. The soul of man is known to be an absolute cause—matter is known not to be, to be but the vehicle of force, and force to be in a process of dispersion. Intelligence is known to be the cause of order and organization, organization cannot be conceived to be the cause of:intelligence.

Tyndale ("Athenaeum" for August 29, 1868) makes it clear that a materialist cannot blame his ideologies and actions on the physics of his brain. He says, [the Materialist] is entitled to say that his molecular grouping and his molecular motions explain every thing. In reality they explain

nothing.

19. What is Pantheism?

Pantheism (παν θε■ς) is absolute monism, maintaining that the entire phenomenal universe is the ever–changing existence– form of the one single universal substance, which is God. Thus God is all, and all is God. God is το ον, absolute being, of which every finite thing is a differentiated and transient form. This doctrine is, of course, capable of assuming very various forms.

(1.) The one–substance pantheism of Spinoza. He held that God is the one absolute substance of all things, possessing two attributes, thought and extension, from which respectively the physical and intellectual worlds proceed by an eternal, necessary, and unconscious evolution.

(2.) The material pantheism of Strauss, “Old and New Faith.”

(3.) The idealistic pantheism of Schelling, maintaining the absolute identity of subject and object; and of Hegel, maintaining the absolute identity of thought and existence as determinations of the one absolute Spirit.It is obvious that pantheism in all its forms must either deny the moral personality of God, or that of man, or both. Logically it renders both impossible. God comes to self–consciousness only in man; the consciousness of free personal self determination in man is a delusion; moral responsibility is a prejudice; the supernatural is impossible and religion is superstition. Yet such is the flexibility of the system, that in one form it puts on a mystical guise representing God as the all absorbing the world into himself, and in the opposite form it puts on a purely naturalistic guise, representing the world as absorbing God, and the human race in its ever–culminating development the only object of reverence or devotion. The intense individuality of the material science of this century has reacted powerfully on pantheism, substituting materialism for idealism, retiring God, and elevating man. Examples of pantheistic influence can be found throughout the world, however, it seems to be more pervasive in Eastern cultures. The most ancient, persistent, and prevalent pantheism of the world’s history is that of India. As a religion it has molded the character, customs, and mythologies of the people for 4,000 years. As a philosophy it has appeared in three principal forms—the Sanckhya, the Nyaya, and the Vedanta. Pantheistic modes of thought more or less underlay all forms of Greek philosophy, and especially the Neo–Platonic school of Plotinus (205–270), Porphyry (233–305), and Jamblicus (333) It reappeared in John Scotus Erigena (b. 800), and with the Neo–Platonists of the Renaissance—e. g., Giordano Bruno (l600). Modern pantheism began with Benedict Spinoza (1632–1677), and closes with the disciples of Schelling and Hegel.

Besides pure pantheism there has existed an infinite variety of impure forms of virtual pantheism. This is true of all systems that affirm the impersonality of the infinite and absolute, and which resolve all the divine attributes into modes of causality. The same is true of all systems which represent providential preservation as a continual creation, deny the real efficiency of second causes, and make God the only agent in the universe, e. g., Edwards on “Original Sin,” pt. 4, ch . . 3, and Emmons. Under the same general category falls the fanciful doctrine of Emanations, which was the chief feature of Oriental Theosophies, and the Hylozoism of Averroes (1198), which supposes the co–eternity of matter and of an unconscious plastic anima mundi. See Hunt, “Essay on Pantheism,” London, 1866; Saisset, “Modern Pantheism,” Edinburgh, 1863; Cousin, “History of Modern Philosophy”; Ritter’s “Hist. Ancient Philos.”

Buchanan, “Faith in God,” etc.; Dollinger, “Gentile and Jew,” London, 1863; Max Muller, “Hist. Anc. Sancrit Lit.”

02.03. The Sources of Theology.

Chapter 03 The Sources of Theology A general definition of Theology, Chap. 1., Ques. 1.

1. What are the two great departments into which Theology is divided?

1st. Natural Theology, which is the science which proposes to itself these two questions:

(1.) Can the real objective existence of God as a personal extramundane Spirit be established by satisfactory evidence?

(2.) What may be legitimately ascertained concerning the true nature of God in himself and concerning his relations to the universe, and especially to man, by the light of nature alone. A distinction here must be carefully observed between that knowledge of God which can be reached from the evidences afforded in his works by the powers of human reason independently of all suggestions afforded by supernatural revelation, e. g., the theology of Plato and Cicero; and on the other hand, that knowledge of God which the human faculties are now able to deduce from the phenomena of nature under the borrowed, if unacknowledged light of a supernatural revelation, e. g.,., the theology of Modern Rationalists.

2nd. Revealed Theology is that science which, Natural Theology presupposed, comprehends as its province all that has been revealed to us concerning God and his relation to the universe, and especially to mankind, through supernatural channels.

2. What extreme views have been considered to explain the possibility and validity of Natural, and as distinguished from Revealed Theology?

1st. That of Deists or naturalistic Theists, who deny either the possibility or the historical fact of a supernatural revelation and maintain that Natural Theology discovers all that it is either possible or necessary for man now to know about God, or his relation to us. Many German supernaturalistic rationalists, while they admit the historical fact of a supernatural revelation, hold that its only office is to enforce and illustrate the truths already given in Natural Religion, which are sufficient in themselves, and need reinforcement only because they re not sufficiently attended to by men. This is disproved below, Ques. 7–10.

2nd. The opposite extreme has been held by some Christians, that Natural Theology has no real existence; but that we are indebted to supernatural revelation for our first valid information that God exists. This is disproved—

(1.) By the testimony of Scripture, Romans 1:20-24, and Romans 2:14-15, etc.

(2.) By the testimony of experience, e. g., the knowledge of God attained by the more eminent heathen philosophers, however imperfect.

(3.) The validity of the Theistic inference from the phenomena of consciousness and of the external world has been vindicated in Chapt. 2.

(4.) It is self–evident that some knowledge of God is logically presupposed in the recognition of a supernatural revelation as coming from him.

3. State the principal answers given to the question, “What is the Source or Standard of Knowledge in Theology?”

1st. The theory of Schleiermacher and the Transcendental school. He was preacher and professor in Halle and Berlin from 1796 to 1834, and was the author of the “Mediation Theology,” and inaugurated the movement by his “Discourses on Religion, addressed to the Educated among its Despisers,” 1799, and his “Christian Faith on the Principles of the Evangelical Church,” 1821.He considered religion to be a form of feeling, and to be grounded on our constitutional God–consciousness, which consists, on the intellectual side, of an intuition of God, and on the emotional side, of a feeling of absolute dependence. Christianity consists of that specific form of this constitutional religious consciousness which was generated in the bosom of his disciples by the God–man Christ. And as human consciousness in general is generated in every individual by his social relations, so Christian consciousness is generated in communion with that society (the Church) which Christ founded and of which he is the center of life. And as the common intuitions of men are the last appeal in all questions of natural knowledge, so the common Christian consciousness of the Church is the last appeal in all questions of Christian faith, which in its totality is the rule of Faith, and not the Scriptures.

OBJECTION.

(1.) This view is inconsistent with the nature of Christianity, which as a remedial scheme rests upon certain historical facts, which must be known in order to be effective, and which can be authoritatively made known only by means of a supernatural revelation. No form of intuition can reach them.

(2.) It is inconsistent with the uniform conviction of Christians that Christianity is a system of divinely revealed facts and principles.

(3.) It affords no criterion of truth. It must regard all the doctrines of the various Church parties as reconcilable variations of the same fundamental truth.

(4.) It is inconsistent with the claims of Scripture as the work of God, and with its explicit teaching, as to the nature of revelation communicating objective truth, and as to the necessity of the knowledge of the truth so conveyed in order to salvation.

2nd. The Mystic Doctrine of the Inner Light, or the General Inspiration of all Men, or at least all Christians, as held by the Quakers. This view differs from Rationalism because it makes the feelings rather than the understanding the organ of religious truth, and because it regards the “inward light ” as the testimony of God’s Spirit to and within the human spirit. It differs from our doctrine of Inspiration because it is the practical guidance and illumination of the divine Spirit in the hearts of all believing men, and not confined to the official Founders and First Teachers of the Church. It differs from spiritual illumination, which we believe to be experienced by all truly regenerated believers only, because (1) it leads to the knowledge of truth independently of its revelation in Scripture, and (2) it belongs to all men who are willing to attend to and obey it.

OBJECTION.

(1.) This view contradicts Scripture. (a.) Which never promises an illumination which will carry men beyond, or make men independent of its own teaching. (b.) They teach the absolute necessity for salvation of the objective revelation given in the written word (Romans 11:14-18).

(2.) Is disproved by experience, which (a) testifies that the “inner light” affords no criterion to determine the truth of different doctrines, (b) that it has never availed to lead any individual or community to the knowledge of saving truth independently of the objective revelation, and (c) that it has always led to an irreverent depreciation of the word, and in the long run to disorder and confusion.

III. The Theory of an Inspired Church, that is inspired in the persons, or at least the official teaching, of its chief pastors and teachers. This view is refuted Chapter 5.

IV. The common postulate of all Rationalists, that Reason is the source and measure of all our knowledge of God. This view is considered and refuted below, Questions 7–10.

V. The true and Protestant Doctrine. That the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, being given by the Inspiration of God, are his words to us, and an infallible and authoritative Rule of Faith and Practice, and to the exclusion of all others, the one source and standard of Christian Theology.

4. What is the precise sense in which the term “Reason” is used by those who contrast it to Faith as the source of Religious Knowledge? The term “Reason” is used in various senses by different classes of Rationalists. By some it is used as the organ of the higher institutions apprehending necessary and ultimate truth. By others “Reason” stands for the understanding, or logical faculty of observing judging, and drawing inferences in the sphere of experience. Hence it comprehends as its ground and standard the mass of the accredited knowledge and opinion of the day. Practically all men designate by the respectable name of reason their own permanent habit and attitude of mind, with the organized mass of knowledge, opinion, and prejudice with which their minds are full. That is said to stand to reason which is congruous to that habit, or to that mass of accepted opinion. In this controversy, however, we designate by the term , Reason “man’s entire natural faculty of ascertaining the truth, including intuitions, understandings, imagination affections and emotions, acting under natural conditions, and independently of supernatural assistance.”

5. What is Rationalism? A “Naturalist” is one who holds that Nature is a complete self–contained, self–supported sphere in itself; and hence denies either the reality of the supernatural, or that it can be an object of human knowledge; and hence denies the necessity, or possibility, or actual fact, of a supernatural revelation. The term “Rationalist” is more general. It includes the Naturalist of every grade, and also all those who while admitting the fact of a divine revelation, yet maintain that revelation, its doctrines and records, are all to be measured and accredited or rejected and interpreted by human reason as ultimate arbiter. With the Rationalists Reason is the ultimate ground and measure of faith. In its historical sense Rationalism, as a mode of freethinking springing up in the midst of the Christian Church itself; giving rise to an illegitimate use of reason in the interpretation of the Scriptures and their doctrines, has always been active in some form, and in one degree or another, and has been signally manifest in a class of the Mediaeval schoolmen, and in the disciples of Socinus. Its modern and most extreme form originated in Germany in the middle of the last century. The causes to which it is to be attributed were—(a.) The low state of

religion pervading all Protestant countries. (b.) The influence of the formal philosophy and dogmatism of Wolf, the disciple of Leif. (c.) The influence of the English Deists. (d.) The influence of the French infidels collected at the court of Frederick the Great of Prussia. The father of critical rationalism was Semler, Prof. at Halle (b. 1725, and d. 1791). Although personally devout, he arbitrarily examined the canonicity of the books of Scripture neglecting historical evidence, and substituting his own subjective sense of fitness. He introduced the principle of “accommodation ” into Biblical interpretation, holding that besides much positive truth, Christ and his apostles taught many things in “accommodation” to the ideas prevailing among their contemporaries.—Hurst, “History of Rationalism.” This tendency, afterwards greatly aggravated through the influence of Lessing and Reimarus the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist, penetrated the mass of German theological literature, and culminated in the last years of the eighteenth and first years of the nineteenth century. Several theologians of the day, while admitting the fact that Christianity is a supernatural revelation, yet maintained that it is merely a republication of the elements of natural religion, and that Reason is the supreme arbiter as to what books are to be received as canonical, and as to what they mean. Miracles were regarded as unworthy of belief. The narratives of miracles recorded in the Scriptures were referred to the ignorance, superstition, or partiality of the writers, and the miracles themselves were referred to natural causes. Jesus was regarded as a good man, and original Christianity as a sort of philosophical Socinianism. This is what has been historically designated in Germany by the title Rationalism and more specifically as the Rationalismus Vulgaris, the old, or common–sense Rationalism.

After the rise of the philosophies of Fichte, Schelling and Hegel, a new impulse was given to theological speculation, and to Biblical interpretation. This gave rise on the one hand to a reaction towards orthodoxy through the “Mediation theology” of Schleiermacher, and on the other to a new school of Transcendental Rationalism, the basis of which is a pantheistic mode of thought. It necessarily denies the supernatural, and postulates the fundamental principle that miracles are impossible. This school, whose head–quarters was Tubingen, has been most prominently represented by Christian Baur with his Tendency Theory, Strauss with his Mythical theory, and Renan with his Legendary theory, to account for the origin of the New Testament writings, while denying their historical basis of fact. This tendency, in various degrees of force, is manifested in the state of theological opinion in England and America, principally in the School of Coleridge, Maurice, Stanley, Jowett and Williams, and the Broad Church party generally; in Scotland in Tulloch in America by the late Theodore Parker, the school of liberal Christians, and in the general relaxation of faith discernible on every side.

“German Rationalism,” Hagenbach, Clarke Edinburg Library; “History of German Protestantism,” Kahnis, Clarke Ed. Lib.; “Critical History of Free Thought,” A. S. Farrar, New York, D. Appleton & Co.; “Germany, its Universities, Theology, and Religion,” Philip Schaff, D.D.; “History of Rationalism,” President Hurst, C. Scribner, New York.

6. Into what two classes may all the argumentative grounds of opposition to historical Christianity be grouped?

1st. A priori grounds. These rest upon a false view of the being and nature of God, and of his relation to the world. Thus the Positivist, who confines man’s knowledge to Phenomena, and their laws of co–existence and sequence; the Deist, who denies the immanence of God in his works

and denies or renders remote and obscure his relation to us as Moral Governor and spiritual Father; and the Pantheist, who denies his personality; and the scientific naturalist, who sees in nature only the operation of invariable self–executing physical laws—must all alike deny the possibility and credibility of miracles, must resolve inspiration into genius, and in some way or other explain away the Scriptures, as historical records of fact. This class of questions has been discussed above, Chapter 2.

2nd. Historical and Critical grounds. These all rest on the assumed defect in the historical evidence for the genuineness and authenticity of the several books of the canon, and in the alleged discrepancies, and historical and scientific inaccuracies, found in scripture. This class of questions must be met in the departments of Biblical Introduction, and Exegesis.

7. State the grounds upon which it is evident that Reason is not the ultimate source and measure of religions ideas.

These are in general three:

(1.) A priori. Reason, considering man's present condition of ignorance, moral degradation, and guilt, has no qualities which render it competent to attain either (a) certainty or (b) sufficient information for man's practical guidance, as to God's existence, or character, or relation to us, or purposes with regard to us.

(2.) from universal experience:unassisted reason has never availed for these ends, but when unduly relied upon has always led men, in spite of a neglected revelation, to skepticism and confusion.

(3.) As a matter of fact an infallible record of a supernatural revelation has been given, which conveys, when interpreted with the illuminating assistance of the Holy Spirit, information, the knowledge of which is essential to salvation, which reason could by no means have anticipated. To establish this argument the following points must be separately established in their order:

1st. A supernatural revelation is necessary for man in his present condition.

2nd. A supernatural revelation is possible alike a parte Dei(part of God), and a parte hominis, (part of man).

3rd. From what Natural Theology reveals to us of the Attributes of God, of his relations to men, and of our moral condition, a supernatural revelation is antecedently probable.

4th. It is an historical fact that Christianity is just such a supernatural revelation.

5th. It is also an historical fact that the present Canon of the Old and New Testaments consists only of and contain all the extant authentic and genuine records of that revelation.

6th. That the books constituting this canon were supernaturally inspired, so as to be constituted the word of God, and an infallible and authoritative rule of faith and practice for men.

8. Prove that a supernatural revelation is necessary for men in their present condition.

1st. Reason itself teaches—(1) that as a matter of fact man's moral nature is disordered, and (2) his relations to God disturbed by guilt and alienation. Reason is capable of discovering the fact of

sin, but makes no suggestions as to its remedy. We can determine a priori God's determination to punish sin, because that as a matter of justice rests on his unchangeable and necessary nature, but can so determine nothing with respect to his disposition to provide, or to allow a remedy, because that, as a matter of grace, rests on his simple volition.

2nd. A spontaneous religious yearning, natural and universal, for a divine self–revelation and intervention on the part of God. and manifest in all human history, proves its necessity.

3rd. Reason has never in the case of any historical community availed to lead men to certainty, to satisfy their wants or to rule their lives.

4th. Rationalism is strong only for attack and destruction. It has never availed in any considerable degree in the way of positive construction. No two prominent Rationalists agree as to what the positive and certain results of the teaching of reason are.

9. Prove that a supernatural revelation is possible botha parte Dei , anda parse hominis. As to its being possible on God's side, if Theism be true, if God be an infinite extramundane person, who yet controls the operation of the laws he has ordained as his own methods and has subordinated the physical system to the higher interests of his moral government, then obviously to limit him as to the manner, character, or extent of his self–manifestations to his creatures is transcendently absurd. All the philosophical presumptions, which render a supernatural revelation on the part of God impossible, are based on Deistic, Materialistic or Pantheistic principles. We have exhibited the argument for Theism in Chapter 2. As to its being possible on man's side, it has been argued by modern transcendental rationalists that the communication of new truth by means of a "book revelation" is impossible. That words are conventional signs which have power to excite in the mind only those ideas which having been previously apprehended, have been conventionally associated with those words.

WE ANSWER—

1st. We admit that simple ultimate ideas which admit of no analysis, must in the first instance be apprehended by an appropriate organ in an act of spontaneous intuition. No man can attain the idea of color except through the act of his own eyes, nor the idea of right except by an intuitive act of his own moral sense. But

2nd, the Christian revelation involves no new simple ultimate ideas incapable of analysis. They presuppose and involve the matter of all such natural intuitions, and they excite the rational and moral intuitions to a more active and normal exercise by association with new aspects of our divine relations, but for the most part they narrate objective and concrete facts, they explain the application of intuitive principles to our actual historical condition and relations; they state the purposes, requirements, and promises of God. But,

3rd, even new simple ideas may be excited in the mind by means of a supernatural inward spiritual illumination action on the minds of the subject of religious experience. The work of the Holy Spirit accompanying the written word completes the revelation. An experienced Christian under the teaching of the Holy Spirit through the word, has as clear and certain a knowledge of the matter involved in his new experience, as he has of the matter of his perceptions through his bodily senses.

10. Show from the data of Natural Theology that in the present state of human nature a supernatural revelation is antecedently probable. As shown in Chapt. 2., Natural Theology ascertains for us an infinite, eternal, wise, and absolutely righteous and benevolent personal God. It ascertains also that man created in the divine image is morally corrupt and judicially condemned. It reveals to us man needing divine help, yearning and hoping for it, and therefore not incapable of it, as are the finally lost demons. Therefore all the perfections of God, and all the miseries of men, lead to the rational hope that at some time and in some way God may be graciously disposed to intervene supernaturally for man's help, and reveal his character and purposes more fully for man's guidance.

11. How may it be proved that it is an historical fact that Christianity is such a supernatural revelation? The reader must here be referred to the many and excellent treatises on the Evidences of Christianity.

Paley's, Chalmers', Erskine's, and Alexander's works on the Evidences; A. S. Farrar's "Critical History of Free Thought"; Hopkins's "Evidences of Christianity"; Barnes's "Evidences of Christianity in the Nineteenth Century"; G. Wardlaw's "Leading Evidences of Christianity"; Hetherington's "Apologetics of the Christian Faith"; Leathes's "Grounds of Christian Hope"; Row's "Supernatural in the New Testament"; Rogers's "Superhuman Origin of the Bible"; Christlieb's "Modern Doubt and Christian Belief"; Rawlinson's "Historical Evidence of the Truth of the Scripture Records"; Wace's "Christianity and Morality "; Titcomb's "Cautions for Doubters"; Pearson's "Prize Essay on Infidelity"; F. W. Farrar's "Witness of History to Christ."

12. How can it be proved that the accepted Canon of the Old and New Testament consists only of and contains all the authentic and genuine records of the Christian Revelation?

Here also the reader must be referred to the best treatises on the Canon of holy Scriptures. B. F. Westcott, on "The Canon" and on "Introduction to the Study of the Gospels"; Tischendorf, "When were our Gospels composed?" E. Cone Bissell "Historic Origin of the Bible"; Prof. George P. Fisher, "The Supernatural Origin of Christianity," and "The Beginnings of Christianity."

13. What is the Nature and Extent of the Inspiration of the Christian Scriptures?

See below, Chapter 4.

14. What is the legitimate office of Reason in the sphere of Religion?

1st. Reason is the primary revelation God has made to man, necessarily presupposed in every subsequent revelation of whatever kind.

2nd. Hence Reason, including the moral and emotional nature, and experience, must be the organ by means of which alone all subsequent revelations can be apprehended and received. A revelation addressed to the irrational would be as inconsequent as light to the blind. This is the usus organicus of reason. 3rd. Hence no subsequent revelation can contradict reason acting legitimately within its own sphere. For then (1) God would contradict himself and (2) faith would be impossible. To believe is to assent to a thing as true, but to see that it contradicts reason, is to see that it is not true. Hence the Reason has the office in judging the Evidences or in interpreting the Records of a supernatural revelation, of exercising the judicium contradictionis. Reason has therefore to determine two questions:

1st. Does God speak?

2nd. What does God say? This, however, requires (a) the cooperation of all the faculties of knowing, moral as well as purely intellectual, (b) a modest and teachable spirit, (c) perfect candor and loyalty to truth, (d) willingness to put all known truth to practice, (e) the illumination and assistance of the promised Spirit of truth. This is the old distinction between what is contrary to reason, and what is above it. It is evident that it is the height of absurdity for reason to object to an otherwise accredited revelation that its teaching is incomprehensible, or that it involves elements apparently irreconcilable with other truths. Because—

(1.) This presumes that human reason is the highest form of intelligence, which is absurd.

(2.) In no other department do men limit their faith by their ability to understand. What do men of science understand as to the ultimate nature of atoms, of inertia, of gravity, of force, of life? They are every moment forced to assume the truth of the impossible, and acknowledge the inexplicability of the certain.

All speculative infidelity springs out of the insane pride of the human mind, the insatiate rage for explanation, and, above all, for the resolution of all knowledge to apparent logical unity. Common sense, and the habit of reducing opinions to actual practice, leads to health of mind and body, and to religious faith.

15. What is Philosophy and what is its relation to Theology?

Philosophy, in its wide sense, embraces all human knowledge acquired through the use of man's natural faculties, and consists of that knowledge interpreted and systematized by the reason. Science is more specific, relating to some special department of knowledge thoroughly reduced to system. In later days the word Science is becoming more and more definitely appropriated to the knowledge of the physical phenomena of the universe. In this sense Science has for its task the determination of phenomena in their classifications of likeness and unlikeness, and their laws or order of co–existence and succession, and does not inquire into substance, or cause, or purpose, etc. Philosophy is presupposed, therefore, in science as the first and most general knowledge. It inquires into the soul and the laws of thought into intuition and ultimate truth, into substance and real being, into absolute cause, the ultimate nature of force and will, into conscience and duty. As to its relations to Theology it will be observed—

1st. The first principles of a true philosophy are presupposed in all theology, natural and revealed.

2nd. The Holy scriptures, although not designed primarily to teach philosophy, yet necessarily presuppose and involve the fundamental principles of a true philosophy. Not the inferences of these principles drawn out into a system, but the principles themselves, as to substance and cause, as to conscience and right, etc.

3rd. The philosophy prevalent in every age has always and will necessarily react upon the interpretation of Scripture and the formation of theological systems. This has been true as to the early Platonism, and the Neo–Platonism of the second age; as to the Aristotelian philosophy of the middle ages; as to the systems of Descartes and Leibnitz; of Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel on the continent, and the systems of Locke, Reid, Coleridge, etc., in Britain.

4th. The devout believer, however, who is assured that the Bible is the very word of God, can never allow his philosophy, derived from human sources, to dominate his interpretation of the Bible, but will seek with a docile spirit and with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, to bring his own philosophy into perfect harmony with that which is implicitly contained in the word. He will by all means seek to realize a philosophy which proves itself to be the genuine and natural handmaid of the religion which the word reveals.

All human thought, and all human life, is one. If therefore God speaks for any purpose, his word must be supreme, and insofar as it has any bearing on any department of human opinion or action, it must therein be received as the most certain informant and the highest Law. The various departments of Christian Theology have been enumerated in Chapter 1.

02.04. The Inspiration of the Bible.

Chapter 4 The Inspiration of the Bible.

Necessary Presuppositions.

1. What are the necessary presuppositions, as to principles, and matters of fact, which must be admitted before the possibility of inspiration, or the inspiration of any particular book can be affirmed?

1st. The existence of a personal God, possessing the attributes of power, intelligence, and moral excellence in absolute perfection.

2nd. That in his relation to the universe he is at once immanent and transcendent. Above all, and freely acting upon all from without. Within all, and acting through the whole and every part from within in the exercise of all his perfections, and according to the laws and modes of action he has established for his creatures, sustaining and governing them, and all their actions.

3rd. His moral government over mankind and other intelligent creatures, whereby he governs them by truth and motives addressed to their reason and will, rewards and punishes them according to their moral characters and actions, and benevolently educates them for their high destiny in his communion and service.

4th. The fact that mankind instead of advancing along a line of natural development from a lower to a higher moral condition, have fallen from their original state and relation, and are now lost in a condition involving corruption and guilt, and incapable of recovery without supernatural intervention.

5th. The historical integrity of the Christian Scriptures, their veracity as history, and the genuineness and authenticity of the several books.

6th. The truth of Christianity in the sense in which it is set forth in the sacred record.

All of these necessary presuppositions, the truth of which is involved in the doctrine that the Scriptures are inspired, fall under one of two classes—

(1.) Those which rest upon intuition and the moral spiritual evidences of divine truth, such as the being and attributes of God, and his relations to world and to mankind, such as the testimony of conscience and the moral consciousness of men as sinners justly condemned, and impotent.

(2.) Those which rest upon matters of fact, depending upon historical and critical evidence as to the true origin and contents of the sacred books.

If any of these principles or facts is doubted, the evidence substantiating them should be sought in their appropriate sources, e. g., the department of Apologetics—the Theistic argument and Natural Theology, the evidences of Christianity, the Historic Origin of the Scriptures, the Canon, and

Criticism and Exegesis of the Sacred Text.

STATEMENT OF THE CHURCH DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION.

2. In what sense and to what extent has the Church universally held the Bible to be inspired? That the sacred writers were so influenced by the Holy spirit that their writings are, as a whole and in every part, God's word to us—an authoritative revelation to us from God, endorsed by him, and sent to us as a rule of faith and practice, the original autographs of which are absolutely infallible when interpreted in the sense intended, and hence are clothed with absolute divine authority.

3. What is meant by "plenary inspiration"? A divine influence full and sufficient to secure its end. The end in this case secured is the perfect infallibility of the Scriptures in every part, as a record of fact and doctrine both in thought and verbal expression. So that although they come to us through the instrumentality of the minds, hearts, imaginations, consciences, and wills of men, they are nevertheless in the strictest sense the word of God.

4. What is meant by the phrase "verbal inspiration," and how can it be proved that the words of the Bible were inspired?

It is meant that the divine influence, of whatever kind it may have been, which accompanied the sacred writers in what they wrote, extends to their expression of their thoughts in language, as well as to the thoughts themselves. The effect being that in the original autograph copies the language expresses the thought God intended to convey with infallible accuracy, so that the words as well as the thoughts are God's revelation to us. That this influence did extend to the words appears—

1st, from the very design of inspiration, which is, not to secure the infallible correctness of the opinions of the inspired men themselves (Paul and Peter differed, Galatians 2:11, and sometimes the prophet knew not what he wrote), but to secure an infallible record of the truth. But a record consists of language.

2nd. Men think in words, and the more definitely they think the more are their thoughts immediately associated with an exactly appropriate verbal expression. Infallibility of thought cannot be secured or preserved independently of an infallible verbal rendering.

3rd. The Scriptures affirm this fact, 1 Corinthians 2:13; 1 Thessalonians 2:13.

4th. The New Testament writers, while quoting from the Old Testament for purposes of argument, often base their argument upon the very words used, thus ascribing authority to the word as well as the thought.—Matthew 22:32, and Exodus 3:6; Exodus 3:16; Matthew 22:45, and Psalms 110:1-7; Galatians 3:16, and Genesis 17:7.

5. By what means does the Church hold that God has effected the result above defined? The Church doctrine recognizes the fact that every part of Scripture is at once a product of God's and of man's agency. The human writers have produced each his part in the free and natural exercise of his personal faculties under his historical conditions. God has also so acted concurrently in and through them that the whole organism of Scripture and every part thereof is his word to us, infallibly true in the sense intended and absolutely authoritative God's agency includes the three following elements:

1st. His PROVIDENTIAL agency in producing the Scriptures. The whole course of redemption, of which revelation and inspiration are special functions, was a special providence directing the evolution of a specially providential history. Here the natural and the supernatural continually interpenetrate. But as is of necessity the case, the natural was always the rule and the supernatural the exception; yet as little subject to accident, and as much the subject of rational design as the natural itself. Thus God providentially produced the very man for the precise occasion, with the faculties, qualities, education, and gracious experience needed for the production of the intended writing, Moses, David, Isaiah, Paul, or John, genius and character, nature and grace, peasant, philosopher, or prince, the man, and with him each subtle personal accident, was providentially prepared at the proper moment as the necessary instrumental precondition of the work to be done.

2nd. REVELATION of truth not otherwise attainable. Whenever the writer was not possessed, or could not naturally become possessed, of the knowledge God intended to communicate, it was supernaturally revealed to him by vision or language. This revelation was supernatural, objective to the recipient, and assured to him to be truth of divine origin by appropriate evidence. This direct revelation applies to a large element of the sacred Scriptures, such as prophecies of future events, the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, the promises and threatenings of God's word, etc., but it applies by no means to all the contents of Scripture.

3rd. INSPIRATION. The writers were the subjects of a plenary divine influence called inspiration, which acted upon and through their natural faculties in all they wrote directing them in the choice of subject and the whole course of thought and verbal expression, so as while not interfering with the natural exercise of their faculties, they freely and spontaneously, produced the very writing which God designed, and which thus possesses the attributes of infallibility and authority as above defined. This inspiration differs, therefore, from revelation—

(1.) In that it was a constant experience of the sacred writers in all they wrote and it affects the equal infallibility of all the elements of the writings they produced, while, as before said, revelation was supernaturally vouchsafed only when it was needed.

(2.) In that revelation communicated objectively to the mind of the writer truth otherwise unknown. While inspiration was a divine influence flowing into the sacred writer subjectively, communicating nothing, but guiding their faculties in their natural exercise to the producing an infallible record of the matters of history, doctrine, prophecy, etc., which God designed to send through them to his Church.

It differs from spiritual illumination, in that spiritual illumination 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.

Inspiration is a special influence of the Holy Spirit peculiar to the prophets and apostles, and attending them only in the exercise of their functions as accredited teachers. Most of them were the subjects both of inspiration and spiritual illumination. Some, as Balaam, being unregenerate were inspired, though destitute of spiritual illumination. THE PROOF OF THE CHURCH DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION.

6. From what sources of evidence is the question as to the nature and extent of the Inspiration of the Scriptures to be determined?

1st. From the statements of the Scriptures themselves.

2nd. From the phenomena of Scripture when critically examined. THE STATEMENTS OF THE SCRIPTURES AS TO THE MATTER OF THEIR OWN INSPIRATION.

7. How can the propriety of proving the Inspiration of the Scriptures from their own assertions be vindicated?

We do not reason in a circle when we rest the truth of the inspiration of the Scriptures on their own assertions. We come to this question already believing in their credibility as histories, and in that of their writers as witnesses of facts, and in the truth of Christianity and in the divinity of Christ. Whatever Christ affirms of the Old Testament, and whatever he promises to the Apostles, and whatever they assert as to the divine influence acting in and through themselves, or as to the infallibility and authority of their writings, must be true. Especially as all their claims were endorsed by God working with them by signs and wonders and gifts of the Holy Ghost. It is evident that if their claims to inspiration and to the infallibility and authority of their writings are denied, they are consequently charged with fanatical presumption and gross misrepresentation, and the validity of their testimony on all points is denied. When plenary inspiration is denied all Christian faith is undermined.

8. How may the inspiration of the apostles be fairly inferred from the fact that they wrought miracles? A miracle is a divine sign (σημειον) accrediting the person to whom the power is delegated as a divinely commissioned agent, Matthew 16:1; Matthew 16:4; Acts 14:3; Hebrews 2:4. This divine testimony not only encourages, but absolutely renders belief obligatory. Where the sign is, God commands us to believe. But he could not unconditionally command us to believe any other than unmixed truth infallibly conveyed.

9. How may it be shown that the gift of Inspiration was promised to the apostles?

Matthew 10:19; Luke 12:12; John 14:26; John 15:26-27; John 16:13; Matthew 28:19-20; John 13:20.

10. In what several ways did they claim to have possession of the Spirit?

They claimed—

1st. To have the Spirit in fulfillment of the promise of Christ. Acts 2:33; Acts 4:8; Acts 13:2-4; Acts 15:28; Acts 21:11; 1 Thessalonians 4:8.

2nd. To speak as the prophets of God.—1 Corinthians 4:1; 1 Corinthians 9:17; 2 Corinthians 5:19; 1 Thessalonians 4:8.

3rd. To speak with plenary authority.—1 Corinthians 2:13; 1 Thessalonians 2:13; 1 John 4:6; Galatians 1:8-9; 2 Corinthians 13:2-4. They class their writings on a level with the Old Testament Scriptures.—2 Peter 3:16;1 Thessalonians 5:27; Colossians 4:16; Revelation 2:7.—Dr. Hodge.

11. How was their claim confirmed?

1st. By their holy, simple, temperate, yet heroic lives.

2nd. By the holiness of the doctrine they taught, and its spiritual power, as attested by its effect upon communities and individuals.

3rd. By the miracles they wrought.—Hebrews 2:4; Acts 14:3; Mark 16:20.

4th. All these testimonies are accredited to us not only by their own writings, but also by the uniform testimony of the early Christians, their contemporaries, and their immediate successors.

12. Show that the writers of the Old Testament claim to be inspired.

1st. Moses claimed that he wrote a part at least of the Pentateuch by divine command.—Deuteronomy 31:19-22; Deuteronomy 34:10; Numbers 16:28-29. David claimed it.—2 Samuel 23:2.

2nd. As a characteristic fact, the Old Testament writers speak not in their own name, but preface their messages with, “Thus saith the Lord,““The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it,” etc.—Jeremiah 9:12; Jeremiah 13:13; Jeremiah 30:4; Isaiah 8:1-22 :l; 33:10; Micah 4:4; Amos 3:1; Deuteronomy 18:21-22; 1 Kings 21:28; 1 Chronicles 17:3.—Dr. Hodge.

13. How was their claim confirmed?

1st. Their claim was confirmed to their contemporaries by the miracles they wrought by the fulfillment of many of their predictions (Numbers 16:28-29), by the holiness of their lives. the moral and spiritual perfection of their doctrine, and the practical adaptation of the religious system they revealed to the urgent wants of men.

2nd. Their claim is confirmed to us principally—

(1.) By the remarkable fulfillment, in far subsequent ages, of many of their prophecies.

(2.) By the evident relation of the symbolical religion which they promulgated to the facts and doctrines of Christianity, proving a divine preadjustment of the type to the antitype.

(3.) By the endorsement of Christ and his apostles.

14. What are the formulas by which quotations from the Old Testament are introduced into the New, and how do these forms of expression prove the inspiration of the ancient Scriptures?

“The Holy Ghost saith,”Hebrews 3:7. “The Holy Ghost this signifying,”Hebrews 9:8. “God saith,”Acts 2:17, and Isaiah 44:3; 1 Corinthians 9:9-10, and Deuteronomy 25:4. “The Scriptures saith.,”Romans 4:3; Galatians 4:30. “It is written,”Luke 18:31; Luke 21:22; John 2:17; John 20:31. “The Lord by the mouth of his servant David says,”Acts 4:25, and Psalms 2:1-2. “The Lord limiteth in David a certain day, saying,”Hebrews 4:7; Psalms 95:7. “David in spirit says,”Matthew 22:43, and Psalms 110:1.

Thus these Old Testament writings are what God saith, what God saith by David, etc., and are quoted as the authoritative basis for conclusive argumentation; therefore they must have been inspired.

15. How may the Inspiration of the Old Testament writers be proved by the express declarations of the New Testament?

Luke 1:70; Hebrews 1:1; 2 Timothy 3:16;1 Peter 1:10-12; 2 Peter 1:21.

16. What is the argument on this subject drawn from the manner in which Christ and his apostles argue from the Old Testament as of final authority?

Christ constantly quotes the Old Testament, Matthew 21:13; Matthew 22:43. He declares that it cannot be falsified, John 7:23; John 10:35; that the whole law must be fulfilled, Matthew 5:18; and all things also foretold concerning himself “in Moses, the prophets, and the Psalms,”Luke 24:44. The apostles habitually quote the Old Testament in the same manner, “That it might be fulfilled which was written,” is with them a characteristic formula, Matthew 1:22; Matthew 2:15; Matthew 2:17; Matthew 2:23; John 12:38; John 15:25; etc. They all appeal to the words of Scripture as of final authority. This certainly proves infallibility. THE PHENOMENA OF SCRIPTURE CONSIDERED AS EVIDENCE OF THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF ITS INSPIRATION.

17. What evidence do the Phenomena of the Scriptures afford as to nature and extent of the human causes conspiring to produce them?

Every part of Scripture alike bears evidence of a human origin. the writers of all the books were men, and the process of composition through which they originated was characteristically human. The personal characteristics of thought and feeling of these writers have acted spontaneously in their literary activity, and have given character to their writings in a manner precisely similar to the effect of character upon writing in the case of other men. They wrote from human impulses, on special occasions, with definite design. Each views his subject from an individual standpoint. They gather their material from all sources—personal experience and observation, ancient documents, and contemporary testimony. They arrange their material with reference to their special purpose, and draw inferences from principles and facts according to the more or less logical habits of their own minds. Their emotions and imaginations are spontaneously exercised, and follow as co–factors with their reasoning into their compositions. The limitations of their personal knowledge and general mental condition, and the defects of their habits of thought and style, are as obvious in their writings as any other personal characteristics. They use the language and idiom proper to their nation and class. They adopt the usus loquendi of terms current among their people, without committing themselves to the philosophical ideas in which the usage originated. Their mental habits and methods were those of their nation and generation. They were for the most part Orientals, and hence their writings abound with metaphor and symbol; and although always reliable in statement as far as required for their purpose they never aimed at the definiteness of enumeration, or chronological or circumstantial narration, which characterizes the statistics of modern western nations. Like all purely literary men of every age, they describe the order and the facts of nature according to their appearances, and not as related to their abstract law or cause.

Some of these facts have, by many careless thinkers, been supposed to be inconsistent with the asserted fact of divine guidance. But it is evident, upon reflection, that if God is to reveal himself at all, it must be under all the limits of human modes of thought and speech. And if he inspires human agents to communicate his revelation in writing, he must use them in a manner consistent with their nature as rational and spontaneous agents. And it is evident that all the distinctions between

the different degrees of perfection in human knowledge, and elegance in human dialect and style, are nothing when viewed in the light of the common relations of man to God. He obviously could as well reveal himself through a peasant as through a philosopher; and all the better when the personal characteristics of the peasant were providentially and graciously preadjusted to the special end designed.

18. What evidence do the Phenomena of the Scriptures afford as to the nature and extent of the divine agency exercised in their production?

1st. Every part of Scripture affords moral and spiritual evidence of its divine origin. This is, of course, more conspicuous in some portions than in others. There are transcendent truths revealed, a perfect morality, an unveiling of the absolute perfections of the Godhead, a foresight of future events, a heart searching and rein–trying knowledge of the secrets of the human soul, a light informing the reason and an authority binding the conscience, a practical grasp of all the springs of human experience and life, all of which can only have originated in a divine source. These are characteristics of a large portion of the Scriptures, and of the Scriptures alone in all literature, and together with the accompanying witness of the Holy Ghost, these are practically the evidences upon which the faith of a majority of believers rests.

2nd. But another characteristic of the Scriptures, taken in connection with the foregoing, proves incontestably their divine origin as a whole and in every part. The sacred Scriptures are an organism, that is a whole composed of many parts, the parts all differing in matter, form, and structure from each other, like the several members of the human body, yet each adjusted to each other and to the whole, through the most intricate and delicate correlations mediating a common end. Scripture is the record and interpretation of redemption. Redemption is a work which God has prepared and wrought out by many actions in succession through an historical process occupying centuries. A supernatural providence has flowed forward evolving a system of divine interventions, accompanied and interpreted by a supernaturally informed and guided order of prophets. Each writer has his own special and temporary occasion, theme, and audience. And yet each contributed to build up the common organism, as the providential history has advanced, each special writing beyond its temporary purpose taking permanent place as a member of the whole, the gospel fulfilling the law, antitype has answered to type and fulfillment to prophecy, history has been interpreted by doctrine, and doctrine has given law to duty and to life. The more minutely the contents of each book are studied in the light of its special purpose, the more wonderfully various and exact will its articulations in the general system and ordered structure of the whole be discovered to be. This is the highest conceivable evidence of design, which in the present case is the proof of a divine supernatural influence comprehending the whole, and reaching to every part, through sixteen centuries, sixty–six distinct writings, and about forty cooperating human agents. Thus the divine agency in the genesis of every part of Scripture is as clearly and certainly determined as it is in the older genesis of the heavens and the earth.

19. What is the objection to this doctrine drawn from the free manner in which the New Testament writers quote those of the Old Testament, and the answer to that objection? In a majority of instances the New Testament writers quote those of the Old Testament with perfect verbal accuracy. Sometimes they quote the Septuagint version, when it conforms to the Hebrew; at others they substitute a new version; and at other times again they adhere to the Septuagint, when

it differs from the Hebrew. In a number of instances, which however are comparatively few, their quotations from the Old Testament are made very freely, and in apparent accommodation of the literal sense.

Rationalistic interpreters have argued from this last class of quotations that it is impossible that both the Old Testament writer quoted from, and the New Testament writer quoting, could have been the subjects of plenary inspiration, because, say they, if the ipsissima verba were infallible in the first instance, an infallible writer would have transferred them unchanged. But surely if a human author may quote himself freely, changing the expression, and giving a new turn to his thought in order to adapt it the more perspicuously to his present purpose, the Holy Spirit may take the same liberty with his own. The same Spirit that rendered the Old Testament writers infallible in writing only pure truth, in the very form that suited his purpose then, has rendered the New Testament writers infallible in so using the old materials, that while they elicit a new sense, they teach only the truth, the very truth moreover contemplated in the mind of God from the beginning, and they teach it with divine authority.—See Fairbairn's "Herm. Manual," Part 3. Each instance of such quotation should be examined in detail, as Dr. Fairbairn has done.

20. What objection to the doctrine of Plenary Inspiration is drawn from the alleged fact that "Discrepancies" exist in the Scriptural Text? and how is this objection to be answered?

It is objected that the sacred text contains numerous statements which are inconsistent with other statements made in some part of Scripture itself, or with some certainly ascertained facts of history or of science.

It is obvious that such a state of facts, even if it could be proved to exist, would not, in opposition to the abundant positive evidence above adduced, avail to disprove the claim that the Scriptures are to some extent and in some degree the product of divine inspiration. The force of the objection would depend essentially upon the number and character of the instances of discrepancy actually proved to exist, and would bear not upon the fact of Inspiration, but upon its nature and degree and extent. The fact of the actual existence of any such "discrepancies," it is evident, can be determined only by the careful examination of each alleged case separately. This examination belongs to the departments of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis. The following considerations, however, are evidently well–grounded, and sufficient to allay all apprehension on the subject.

1st. The Church has never held the verbal infallibility of our translations, nor the perfect accuracy of the copies of the original Hebrew and Greek Scriptures now possessed by us. These copies confessedly contain many "discrepancies" resulting from frequent transcription. It is, nevertheless, the unanimous testimony of Christian scholars, that while these variations embarrass the interpretation of many details, they neither involve the loss nor abate the evidence of a single essential fact or doctrine of Christianity. And it is moreover reassuring to know that believing criticism, by the discovery and collation of more ancient and accurate copies, is constantly advancing the Church to the possession of a more perfect text of the original Scriptures than she has enjoyed since the apostolic age.

2nd. The Church has asserted absolute infallibility only of the original autograph copies of the Scriptures as they came from the hands of their inspired writers. And even of these she has not asserted infinite knowledge, but only absolute infallibility in stating the matters designed to be

asserted. A “discrepancy,” therefore, in the sense in which the new critics affirm and the Church denies its existence, is a form of statement existing in the original text of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures evidently designed to assert as true that which is in plain irreconcilable contradiction to other statements existing in some other portions of the same original text of Scripture, or to some other certainly ascertained element of human knowledge. A “discrepancy” fulfilling in every particular this definition must be proved to exist, or the Church’s doctrine of plenary verbal inspiration remains unaffected.

3rd. It is beyond question, that, in the light of all that the Scriptures themselves assert or disclose as to the nature and the extent of the divine influence controlling their genesis, and as to their authority over man’s conscience and life as the voice of God, the existence of any such “discrepancies” as above defined is a violent improbability. Those who assert the existence of one or more of them must bring them out, and prove to the community of competent judges, that all the elements of the above definition meet in each alleged instance, not merely probably, but beyond the possibility of doubt. The burden of proof rests exclusively on them.

4th. But observe that this is for them a very difficult task to perform, one in any instance indeed hardly possible. For to make good their point against the vast presumptions opposed to it, they must prove over and over again in the case of each alleged discrepancy each of the following points:

(1.) That the alleged discrepant statement certainly occurred in the veritable autograph copy of the inspired writing containing it.

(2.) That their interpretation of the statement, which occasions the discrepancy, is the only possible one, the one it was certainly intended to bear. The difficulty of this will be apprehended when we estimate the inherent obscurity of ancient narratives, unchronological, and fragmentary, with a background and surroundings of almost unrelieved darkness. This condition of things which so often puzzles the interpreter, and prevents the apologist from proving the harmony of the narrative, with equal force baffles all the ingenious efforts of the rationalistic critic to demonstrate the “discrepancy.” Yet this he must do, or the presumption will remain that it does not exist.

(3.) He must also prove that the facts of science or of history, or the Scriptural statements, with which the statement in question is asserted to be inconsistent, are real fact or real parts of the autograph text of canonical Scripture, and that the sense in which they are found to be inconsistent with the statement in question is the only sense they can rationally bear.

(4.) When the reality of the opposing facts or statements is determined, and their true interpretation is ascertained, then it must, in conclusion, be shown not only that they appear inconsistent, nor merely that their reconciliation is impossible in our present state of knowledge, but that they are in themselves essentially incapable of being reconciled.

5th. Finally it is sufficient for the present purpose, to point to the fact that no single case of “discrepancy,” as above defined, has been so proved to exist as to secure the recognition of the community of believing scholars. Difficulties in interpretation and apparently irreconcilable statements exist, but no “discrepancy” has been proved. Advancing knowledge removes some difficulties and discovers others. It is in the highest degree probable that perfect knowledge would remove all.

21. Explain the meaning of such passages as 1 Corinthians 7:6 and 1 Corinthians 15:12 and 1 Corinthians 15:40, Romans 3:5; Romans 6:19, and Galatians 3:15, and show their perfect consistency with the fact of the plenary inspiration of the whole Bible.

“I speak as a man,” is a phrase occurring frequently, and its sense is determined by the context. In Romans 3:5, it signifies that Paul was, for argument’s sake, using the language common to men; it was the Jews’ opinion, not his own. In Romans 6:19, it signifies “in a manner adapted to human comprehension,” and in Galatians 3:15, it signifies, “I use an illustration drawn from human affairs,” etc.

“I speak this by permission, not of commandment.”—1 Corinthians 7:6, refers to 1 Corinthians 7:2. Marriage was always permitted, but under certain circumstances inexpedient.

“And unto the married I command, yet not I but the Lord.”“But to the rest speak:I, not the Lord.”—1 Corinthians 7:10; 1 Corinthians 7:12. Reference is here made to what the “Lord,” that is Christ, taught in person while on earth. The distinction is made between what Christ taught while on earth, and what Paul teaches. As Paul puts his word here on an equal basis of authority with Christ’s word, it of course implies that Paul claims an inspiration which makes his word equal to that of Christ in infallibility and authority.

“And I think also that I have the Spirit of God.”—1 Corinthians 7:40. “I think (δοκω) I have, is only, agreeably to Greek usage, an urbane way of saying, I have(cf. Galatians 2:6, 1 Corinthians 12:22). Paul was in no doubt of his being an organ of the Holy Ghost.” Hodge, “Comm. on First Corinthians.”

DEFECTIVE STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE.

22. State what is meant by theological writers by the inspiration “of superintendence,”“of elevation,”“of direction,” and “of suggestion.”

Certain writers on this subject, confounding the distinction between inspiration and revelation, and using the former term to express the whole divine influence of which the sacred writers were the subjects, first, in knowing the truth, second, in writing it, necessarily distinguish between different degrees of inspiration in order to accommodate their theory to the facts of the case. Because, first, some of the contents of Scripture evidently might be known without supernatural aid, while much more as evidently could not; second, the different writers exercised their natural faculties, and carried their individual peculiarities of thought, feeling, and manner into their writings. By the “inspiration of superintendence,” these writers meant precisely what we have above given as the definition of inspiration. By the “inspiration of elevation,” they meant that divine influence which exalted their natural faculties to a degree of energy otherwise unattainable. By the “inspiration of direction,” they meant that divine influence which guided the writers in the selection and disposition of their material. By the “inspiration of suggestion,” they meant that divine influence which directly suggested to their minds new and otherwise unattainable truth.

23. What objections may be fairly made to these distinctions?

1st. These distinctions spring from a prior failure to distinguish between revelation the frequent, and inspiration the constant, phenomenon presented by Scripture; the one furnishing the material when not otherwise attainable, the other guiding the writer at every point, (1) in securing the

infallible truth of all he writes; and (2) in the selection and distribution of his material.

2nd. It is injurious to distinguish between different degrees of inspiration, as if the several portions of the Scriptures were in different degrees God's word, while in truth the whole is equally and absolutely so.

FALSE DOCTRINES OF INSPIRATION.

24. What Principles necessarily lead to the denial of any super– Inspiration?

All philosophical principles or tendencies of thought which exclude the distinction between the natural and the supernatural necessarily lead to the denial of Inspiration in the sense affirmed by the Church. These are, for example, all Pantheistic, Materialistic, and Naturalistic principles, and of course Rationalistic principles in all their forms.

25. In what several forms has the doctrine of a Partial Inspiration of the Scriptures been held?

1st. It has been maintained that certain books were the subjects of plenary inspiration, while others were produced with only a natural providential and gracious assistance of God. S. T. Coleridge admitted the plenary inspiration of "the law and the prophets, no jot or tittle of which can pass unfulfilled," while he denied it of the rest of the canon.

2nd. Many have admitted that the moral and spiritual elements of the Scriptures, and their doctrines as far as these relate to the nature and purposes of God not otherwise ascertainable, are products of inspiration, but deny it of the historical and biographical elements, and of all its allusions to scientific facts or laws.

3rd. Others admit that the inspiration of the writers controlled their thoughts, but deny that it extended to its verbal expression. In one, or in all of these senses, different men have held that the Scriptures are only "partially" inspired. All such deny that they "ARE the word of God," as affirmed by the Scriptures themselves and by all the historical Churches, and admit merely that they "contain the word of God."

26. State the doctrine of Gracious Inspiration.

Coleridge, in his "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit," Letter 7., holds that the Scriptures, except the Law and the Prophets, were produced by their writers assisted by "the highest degree of that grace and communion with the Spirit which the Church under all circumstances, and every regenerate member of the Church of Christ, is permitted to hope and instructed to pray for." This is the doctrine of Maurice ("Theological Essays," p. 339) and virtually that of Morell ("Philosophy of Religion," p. 186) and of the Quakers. These admit an objective supernatural revelation, and that this is contained in the Scriptures, which are highly useful, and in such a sense an authoritative standard of faith and practice; that no pretended revelation which is inconsistent with Scripture can be true, and that they are a judge in all controversies between Christians. Nevertheless they hold that the Scriptures are only "a secondary rule, subordinate to the Spirit from whom they have all their excellency," which Spirit illumines every man in the world, and reveals to him either with, or without the Scriptures, if they are unknown, all the knowledge of God and of his will which are necessary for his salvation and guidance, on condition of his rendering a constant obedience to that light as thus graciously communicated to him and to all men. "Barclay's Apology, Theses

Theological," Propositions 1., 2., and 3.

AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS.

ROMAN CATHOLIC.—"Decrees of Council of Trent," Sess. 4. "Which gospel . . . our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, first promulgated with his own mouth, and then commanded to be preached by his apostles to every creature, . . . and seeing clearly that this truth and discipline are contained in the written books, and the unwritten tradition, which received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or from the apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand:the Synod following the example of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament—seeing God is the author of both—as also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated, either by Christ's own word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession."

"Dogmatic Decrees of the Vatican Council," 1870, Sess. 3., Ch. 2. "Further this supernatural revelation, according to the universal belief of the Church, declared by the sacred Synod of Trent, is contained in the written books and unwritten traditions which have come down to us, having been received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or from the apostles themselves, by the dictation of the Holy Spirit, have been transmitted as it were from hand to hand. And these books of the Old and New Testament are to be received as sacred and canonical, in their integrity, with all their parts as they are enumerated in the decree of the said Council, and are contained in the ancient Edition of the Vulgate. These the Church holds to be sacred and canonical, not because having been carefully composed by mere human industry, they were afterwards approved by her authority, nor merely because they contain revelation with no admixture of error, but because, having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their author, and have been delivered as such to the Church herself."

LUTHERAN.—"Formula Concordia Epitome." 1. "We believe, confess, and teach that the only rule and norm, according to which all dogmas and all doctors ought to be esteemed and judged, is no other whatever than the prophetic and apostolic writings of the Old and New Testament, as it is written, Psalms 119:105, and Galatians 1:8."

REFORMED.—"Second Helvetic Confession," Ch. 1. Concerning Holy Scripture, "We believe and confess, that the canonical Scriptures of the holy prophets and apostles of each Testament are the true word of God, and that they possess sufficient authority from themselves alone and not from man. For God himself spoke to the fathers, to the prophets and to the apostles, and continues to speak to us through the Holy Scriptures."

"The Belgic Confession," Art. 3. "We confess that this word of God was not sent nor delivered by the will of man, but that holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, as the apostle Peter saith. And that afterwards God, from a special care which he has for us and our salvation, commanded his servants, the prophets and apostles, to commit his revealed word to writing, and he himself wrote with his own finger the two tables of the law. Therefore we call such writings holy and divine Scriptures."

“Westminster Confession of Faith,” Chap. 1. “Therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times and in divers manners, to reveal himself and to declare his will unto his Church; and afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the Church against the Corruption of the flesh and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing.”“The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God (who is truth itself) the Author thereof; and therefore it is to be received because it is the word of God.”

02.05. The Rule of Faith and Practice

Chapter 5 The Rule of Faith and Practice. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, Having Been Given by Inspiration of God, are the All–sufficient and Only Rule of Faith and Practice, and Judge of Controversies.

(This chapter is compiled from Dr. Hodge's unpublished "Lectures on the Church.") 1. What is meant by saying that the Scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice?

Whatever God teaches or commands is of sovereign authority. Whatever conveys to us an infallible knowledge of his teachings and commands is an infallible rule. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the only organs through which, during the present dispensation, God conveys to us a knowledge of his will about what we are to believe concerning himself, and what duties he requires of us.

2. What does the Romish Church declare to be the infallible rule of faith and practice? The Romish theory is that the complete rule of faith and practice consists of Scripture and tradition, or the oral teaching of Christ and his apostles, handed down through the Church. Tradition they hold to be necessary, 1st, to teach additional truth not contained in the Scriptures; and,

2nd, to interpret Scripture. The Church being the divinely constituted depository and judge of both Scripture and tradition.—" Decrees of Council of Trent," Session IV, and "Dens Theo.," Tom. 2., N. 80 and 81.

3. By what arguments do they seek to establish the authority of tradition? By what criterion do they distinguish true traditions from false, and on what grounds do they base the authority of the traditions they receive?

1st. Their arguments in behalf of tradition are—

(1.) Scripture authorizes it, 2 Thessalonians 2:15; 2 Thessalonians 3:6.

(2.) The early fathers asserted its authority and founded their faith largely upon it.

(3.) The oral teaching of Christ and his apostles, when clearly ascertained, is intrinsically of equal authority with their writings. The scriptures themselves are handed down to us by the evidence of tradition, and the stream cannot rise higher than its source.

(4.) The necessity of the case. (a.) Scripture is obscure, needs tradition as its interpreter. (b.)Scripture is incomplete as a rule of faith and practice; since there are many doctrines and institutions, universally recognized, which are founded only upon tradition as a supplement to Scripture.

(5.) Analogy. every state recognizes both written and unwritten, common and statute law.

2nd. The criterion by which they distinguish between true and false traditions is Catholic consent. The Anglican ritualists confine the application of the rule to the first three or four centuries. the Romanists recognize that as an authoritative consent which is constitutionally expressed by the bishops in general council, or by the Pope ex–cathedra, in any age of the church whatever.

3rd. They defend the traditions which they hold to be true.

(1.) On the ground of historical testimony, tracing them up to the apostles as their source.

(2.) The authority of the Church expressed by Catholic consent.

4. By what arguments may the invalidity of all ecclesiastical tradition, as a part of our rule of faith and practice, be shown?

1st. The Scriptures do not, as claimed, ascribe authority to oral tradition. Tradition, as intended by Paul in the passage cited (2 Thessalonians 2:15; 2 Thessalonians 3:6), signifies all his instructions, oral and written, communicated to those very people themselves, not handed down. On the other hand, Christ rebuked this doctrine of the Romanists in their predecessors, the Pharisees, Matthew 15:3; Matthew 15:6; Mark 7:7.

2nd. It is improbable a priori that God would supplement Scripture with tradition as part of our rule of faith.

(1.) Because Scripture, as will be shown below (questions 7–14), is certain, definite, complete, and perspicuous.

(2.) Because tradition, from its very nature, is indeterminate, and liable to become adulterated with every form of error. Besides, as will be shown below (question 20), the authority of Scripture does not rest ultimately upon tradition.

3rd. The whole ground upon which Romanists base the authority of their traditions (viz., history and church authority) is invalid.

(1.) History utterly fails them. For more than three hundred years after the apostles they have very little, and that contradictory, evidence for any one of their traditions.

They are thus forced to the absurd assumption that what was taught in the fourth century was therefore taught in the third, and therefore in the first.

(2.) The church is not infallible, as will be shown below (question 18).

4th. Their practice is inconsistent with their own principles. Many of the earliest and best attested traditions they do not receive. Many of their pretended traditions are recent inventions unknown to the ancients.

5th. Many of their traditions, such as relate to the priesthood, the sacrifice of the mass, etc., are plainly in direct opposition to Scripture. Yet the infallible church affirms the infallibility of Scripture. A house divided against itself cannot stand.

5. What is necessary to constitute a sole and infallible rule of faith?

Plenary inspiration, completeness, perspicuity or clarity, and accessibility.

6. What arguments do the Scriptures themselves afford in favor of the doctrine that they are the only infallible rule of faith?

1st. The Scriptures always speak in the name of God, and command faith and obedience.

2nd. Christ and his apostles always refer to the written Scriptures, then existing, as authority, and to no other rule of faith whatsoever.—Luke 16:29; Luke 10:26; John 5:39; Romans 4:3;2 Timothy 3:15.

3rd. The Bereans are commended for bringing all questions, even apostolic teaching, to this test.—Acts 17:11; see also Isaiah 8:16.

4th. Christ rebukes the Pharisees for adding to and perverting the Scriptures.—Matthew 15:7-9; Mark 7:5-8; see also Revelation 22:18-19, and Deuteronomy 4:2; Deuteronomy 12:32; Joshua 1:7.

7. In what sense is the completeness of Scripture as a rule of faith asserted?

It is not meant that the Scriptures contain every revelation which God has ever made to man, but that their contents are the only supernatural revelation that God does now make to man, and that this revelation is abundantly sufficient for man's guidance in all questions of faith, practice, and modes of worship, and excludes the necessity and the right of any human inventions.

8. How may this completeness be proved, from the design of scripture? The Scriptures profess to lead us to God. Whatever is necessary to that end they must teach us. If any supplementary rule, as tradition, is necessary to that end, they must refer us to it.

"Incompleteness here would be falsehood." But while one sacred writer constantly refers us to the writings of another, not one of them ever intimates to us either the necessity or the existence of any other rule.—John 20:31; 2 Timothy 3:15-17.

9. By what other arguments may this principle be proved? As the Scriptures profess to be a rule complete for its end, so they have always been practically found to be such by the true spiritual people of God in all ages. They teach a complete and harmonious system of doctrine. They furnish all necessary principles for the government of the private lives of Christians, in every relation, for the public worship of God, and for the administration of the affairs of his kingdom; and they repel all pretended –traditions and priestly innovations.

10. In what sense do Protestants affirm and Romanists deny the perspicuity of Scripture?

Protestants do not affirm that the doctrines revealed in the Scriptures are level to man's powers of understanding. Many of them are confessedly beyond all understanding. Nor do they affirm that every part of Scripture can be certainly and perspicuously expounded, many of the prophesies being perfectly obscure until explained by the event. But they do affirm that every essential article of faith and rule of practice is clearly revealed in Scripture, or may certainly be deduced therefrom. This much the least instructed Christian may learn at once; while, on the other hand, it is true, that with the advance of historical and critical knowledge, and by means of controversies, the Christian church is constantly making progress in the accurate interpretation of Scripture, and in the comprehension in its integrity of the system therein taught.

Protestants affirm and Romanists deny that private and unlearned Christians may safely be allowed to interpret Scripture for themselves.

11. How can the perspicuity of scripture be proved from the fact that it is a law and a message?

We saw (question 8) that Scripture is either complete or false, from its own professed design. We now prove its perspicuity upon the same principle. It professes to be (1) a law to be obeyed; (2) a revelation of truth to be believed, to be received by us in both aspects upon the penalty of eternal death. To suppose it not to be perspicuous, relatively to its design of commanding and teaching is to charge God with clearing with us in a spirit at once disingenuous and cruel.

12. In what passages is their perspicuity asserted?

Psalms 19:7-8; Psalms 119:105; Psalms 119:130; 2 Corinthians 3:14; 2 Peter 1:18-19; Habakkuk 2:2; 2 Timothy 3:15; 2 Timothy 3:17.

13. By what other arguments may this point be established?

1st. The Scriptures are addressed immediately, either to all men indiscriminately, or else to the whole body of believers as such.—Deuteronomy 6:4-9; Luke 1:3; Romans 1:7; 1 Corinthians 1:2; 2 Corinthians 1:1; 2 Corinthians 4:2; Galatians 1:2; Ephesians 1:1; Php 1:1; Colossians 1:2; James 1:1; 1 Peter 1:1; 2 Peter 1:1; 1 John 2:12; 1 John 2:14; Jude 1:1; Revelation 1:3-4; Revelation 2:7. The only exceptions are the epistles to Timothy and Titus.

2nd. All Christians indiscriminately are commanded to search the Scriptures.—2 Timothy 3:15; 2 Timothy 3:17; Acts 17:11; John 5:39.

3rd. Universal experience. We have the same evidence of the light–giving power of Scripture that we have of the same property in the sun. The argument to the contrary, is an insult to the understanding of the whole world of Bible readers.

4th. The essential unity in faith and practice, in spite of all circumstantial differences, of all Christian communities of every age and nation, who draw their religion directly from the open Scriptures.

14. What was the third quality required to constitute the scriptures the sufficient rule of faith and practice?

Accessibility. It is self–evident that this is the pre–eminent characteristic of the Scriptures, in contrast to tradition, which is in the custody of a corporation of priests, and to every other pretended rule whatsoever. The agency of the church in this matter is simply to give all currency to the word of God.

15. What is meant by saying that the Scriptures are the judge as well as the rule in questions of faith?

“A rule is a standard of judgment; a judge is the expounder and applier of that rule to the decision of particular cases.” The Protestant doctrine is—

1st. That the Scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

2nd.

(1.) negatively. That there is no body of men who are either qualified, or authorized, to interpret the Scriptures, or apply their principles to the decision of particular questions, in a sense binding upon the faith of their fellow Christians.

(2.) Positively. That Scripture is the only infallible voice in the church, and is to be interpreted, in its own light, and with the gracious help of the Holy Ghost, who is promised to every Christian (1 John 2:20-27), by each individual for himself; with the assistance, though not by the authority, of his fellow Christians. Creeds and confessions, as to form, bind only those who voluntarily profess them, and as to matter, they bind only so far as they affirm truly what the Bible teaches, and because the Bible does so teach.

16. What is the Romish doctrine regarding the authority of the church as the infallible interpreter of the rule of faith and the authoritative judge of all controversies? The Romish doctrine is that the church is absolutely infallible in all matters of Christian faith and practice, and the divinely authorized depository and interpreter of the rule of faith. Her office is not to convey new revelations from God to man, yet her inspiration renders her infallible in disseminating and interpreting the original revelation communicated through the apostles. The church, therefore, authoritatively determines—

1st. What is Scripture.

2nd. What is genuine tradition

3rd. What is the true sense of Scripture and 'tradition', and what is the true application of that perfect rule to every particular question of belief or practice. This authority vests in the pope, when acting in his official capacity, and in the bishops as a body, as when assembled in general council, or when giving universal consent to a decree of pope or council.—"Decrees of Council of Trent," Session 4.; "Deus Theo.," N. 80, 81, 84, 93, 94, 95, 96. "Bellarmine," Lib. 3., de eccles., cap. 14., and Lib. 2., de council., cap. 2.

17. By what arguments do they seek to establish this authority?

1st. The promises of Christ, given, as they claim, to the apostles, and to their official successor, securing their infallibility, and consequent authority.—Matthew 16:18; Matthew 18:18-20; Luke 24:47-49; John 16:13; John 20:23.

2nd. The commission given to the church as the teacher of the world.—Matthew 28:19-20; Luke 10:16, etc.

3rd. The church is declared to be "the pillar and ground of the truth," and it is affirmed that "the gates of hell shall never prevail against her."

4th. To the church is granted power to bind and loose, and he that will not hear the church is to be treated as a heathen. Matthew 16:19; Matthew 18:15-18.

5th. The church is commanded to discriminate between truth and error, and must consequently be qualified and authorized to do so—2 Thessalonians 3:6; Romans 16:17; 2 John 1:10.

6th. From the necessity of the case, men need and crave an ever–living, visible, and cotemporaneous infallible Interpreter and Judge.

7th. From universal analogy every community among men has the living judge as well as the written law, and the one would be of no value without the other.

8th. This power is necessary to secure unity and universality, which all acknowledge to be essential attributes of the true church.

18. By what arguments may this claim of the Romish church be shown to be utterly baseless?

1st. A claim vesting in mortal men a power so momentous can be established only by the most clear and certain evidence, and the failure to produce such converts the claim into a treason at once against God and the human race.

2nd. Her evidence fails, because the promises of Christ to preserve his church from extinction and from error do none of them go the length of pledging infallibility. The utmost promised is, that the true people of God shall never perish entirely from the earth, or be left to apostatize from the essentials of the faith.

3rd. Her evidence fails, because these promises of Christ were addressed not to the officers of the church as such, but to the body of true believers. Compare John 20:23 with Luke 24:33; Luke 24:47-49, and 1 John 2:20; 1 John 2:27.

4th. Her evidence fails, because the church to which the precious promises of the Scriptures are pledged is not an external, visible society, the authority of which is vested in the hands of a perpetual line of apostles. For—

(1.) the word church εκκλησια is a collective term, embracing the effectually called κλητοι or regenerated.—Romans 1:7; Romans 8:28; 1 Corinthians 1:2; Jude 1:1 :; Revelation 17:14; also Romans 9:24; 1 Corinthians 7:18-24; Galatians 1:15; 2 Timothy 1:9; Hebrews 9:15; 1 Peter 2:9; 1 Peter 5:10; Ephesians 1:18; 2 Peter 1:10.

(2.) The attributes ascribed to the church prove it to consist alone of the true, spiritual people of God as such.—Ephesians 5:27; 1 Peter 2:5; John 10:27; Colossians 1:18; Colossians 1:24.

(3.) The epistles are addressed to the church, and in their salutations explain that phrase as equivalent to “the called,”“the saints,”“all true worshippers of God;” witness the salutations of 1st and 2nd Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians 1:1-29 st and 2nd Peter and Jude. The same attributes are ascribed to the members of the true church as such throughout the body of the Epistles.— 1 Corinthians 1:30; 1 Corinthians 3:16; 1 Corinthians 6:11; 1 Corinthians 6:19; Ephesians 2:3-8; Ephesians 2:19-22; 1 Thessalonians 5:4-5; 2 Thessalonians 2:13; Colossians 1:21; Colossians 2:10; 1 Peter 2:9.

5th. The inspired apostles have had no successors.

(1.) There is no evidence that they had such in the New Testament.

(2.) While provision was made for the regular perpetuation of the offices of presbyter and deacon (1 Timothy 3:1-13), there are no directions given for the perpetuation of the apostolate.

(3.) There is perfect silence concerning the continued existence of any apostles in the church in the writings of the early centuries. Both the name and the thing ceased.

(4.) No one ever claiming to be one of their successors have possessed the “signs of an apostle.”—2 Corinthians 12:12; 1 Corinthians 9:1; Galatians 1:1; Galatians 1:12; Acts 1:21-22.

6th. This claim, as it rests upon the authority of the Pope, is utterly unscriptural, because the Pope is not known to Scripture. As it rests upon the authority of the whole body of the bishops, expressed in their general consent, it is unscriptural for the reasons above shown, and it is, moreover, impracticable, since their universal judgment never has been and never can be impartially collected and pronounced.

7th. There can be no infallibility where there is not self– consistency. But as a matter of fact the Papal church has not been self–consistent in her teaching.

(1.) She has taught different doctrines in different sections and ages.

(2.) She affirms the infallibility of the holy Scriptures, and at the same time teaches a system plainly and radically inconsistent with their manifest sense; witness the doctrines of the priesthood, the mass, penance, of works, and of Mary worship. Therefore the Church of Rome hides the Scriptures from the people.

8th. If this Romish system be true then genuine spiritual religion ought to flourish in her communion, and all the rest of the world ought to be a moral desert. The facts are notoriously the reverse. If; therefore, we admit that the Romish system is true, we subvert one of the principal evidences of Christianity itself; viz., the self–evidencing light and practical power of true religion, and the witness of the Holy Ghost.

19. By what direct arguments may the doctrine that the Scriptures are the final judge of controversies be established? That all Christians are to study the Scriptures for themselves, and that in all questions as to God’s revealed will the appeal is to the Scriptures alone, is proved by the following facts:

1st. Scripture is perspicuous, see above, questions 11–13.

2nd. Scripture is addressed to all Christians as such, see above, question 13.

3rd. All Christians are commanded to search the scriptures, and by them to judge all doctrines and all professed teachers.—John 5:39; Acts 17:11; Galatians 1:8; 2 Corinthians 4:2; 1 Thessalonians 5:21; 1 John 4:1-2.

4th. The promise of the Holy Spirit, the author and interpreter of Scripture, is to all Christians as such. Compare John 20:23 with Luke 24:47-49; 1 John 2:20; 1 John 2:27; Romans 8:9; 1 Corinthians 3:16-17.

5th. Religion is essentially a personal matter. Each Christian must know and believe the truth explicitly for himself; on the direct ground of its own moral and spiritual evidence, and not on the mere ground of blind authority. Otherwise faith could not be a moral act, nor could it “purify the heart.” Faith derives its sanctifying power from the truth which it immediately apprehends on its own experimental evidence.—John 17:17; John 17:19; James 1:18; 1 Peter 1:22.

20. What is the objection which the Romanists make to this doctrine, on the ground that the church is our only authority for believing that the scriptures are the word of God? Their objection is, that as we receive the scriptures as the word of God only on the authoritative testimony of the church, our faith in the Scriptures is only another form of our faith in the church, and the authority of the church, being the foundation of that of Scripture, must of course be held paramount. This is absurd, for two reasons—

1st. The assumed fact is false. The evidence upon which we receive Scripture as the word of God is not the authority of the church, but—

(1.) God did speak by the apostles and prophets, as is evident (a) from the nature of their doctrine, (b) from their miracles, (c) their prophecies, (d) our personal experience and observation of the power of the truth.

(2.) These very writings which we possess were written by the apostles, etc., as is evident, (a) from internal evidence, (b) from historical testimony rendered by all competent cotemporaneous witnesses in the church or out of it.

2nd. Even if the fact assumed was true, viz., that we know the Scriptures to be from God, on the authority of the church's testimony alone, the conclusion they seek to deduce from it would be absurd. The witness who proves the identity or primogenitor of a prince does not thereby acquire a right to govern the kingdom, or even to interpret the will of the prince.

21. How is the argument for the necessity of a visible judge, derived from the diversities of sects and doctrines among Protestants, to be answered?

1st. We do not pretend that the private judgment of Protestants is infallible, but only that when exercised in a humble, believing spirit, it always leads to a competent knowledge of essential truth.

2nd. The term Protestant is simply negative, and is assumed by many infidels who protest as much against the Scriptures as they do against Rome. But Bible Protestants, among all their circumstantial differences, are, to a wonderful degree, agreed upon the essentials of faith and practice. Witness their hymns and devotional literature.

3rd. The diversity that does actually exist arises from failure in applying faithfully the Protestant principles for which we contend. Men do not simply and without prejudice take their creed from the Bible.

4th. The Catholic church, in her last and most authoritative utterance through the Council of Trent, has proved herself a most indefinite Judge. Her doctrinal decisions need an infallible interpreter infinitely more than the Scriptures.

22. How may it be shown that the Romanist theory, as well as the Protestant, necessarily throws upon the people the obligation of private judgment? Is there a God? Has he revealed himself? Has he established a church? Is that church an infallible teacher? Is private judgment a blind leader? Which of all pretended churches is the true one? Every one of these questions evidently must be settled in the Private judgment of the inquirer, before he can, rationally or irrationally, give up his private judgment to the direction of the self–asserting church. Thus of necessity Romanists appeal to the Scriptures to prove that the Scriptures cannot be understood, and address arguments to the

private judgment of men to prove that private judgment is incompetent; thus basing an argument upon that which it is the object of the argument to prove is baseless.

23. How may it be proved that the people are far more competent to discover what the Bible teaches than to decide, by the marks insisted upon by the Romanists, which is the true church? The Romanists, of necessity, set forth certain marks by which the true church is to be discriminated from all counterfeits. These are (1.) Unity (through subjection to one visible head, the Pope);

(2.) Holiness;

(3.) Catholicity;

(4.) Apostolicity, (involving an uninterrupted succession from the apostles of canonically ordained bishops.)—"Cat. of Council of Trent," Part 1., Cap. 10. Now, the comprehension and intelligent application of these marks involve a great amount of learning and intelligent capacity upon the part of the inquirer. He might as easily prove himself to be descended from Noah by an unbroken series of legitimate marriages, as establish the right of Rome to the last mark. Yet he cannot rationally give up the right of studying the Bible for himself until that point is made clear.

Surely the Scriptures, with their self–evidencing spiritual power, make less exhaustive demands upon the resources of private judgment.

ROMAN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AS TO THE PRIVATE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE, AND AS TO TRADITION, AND AS TO THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE.

1st. AS TO THE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE.—"Decrees of council of Trent," Sess. 4.—"Moreover the same sacred and holy Synod ordains and declares, that the said old and Vulgate edition, which, by the lengthened usage of so many ages, has been approved of in the Church, be in public lectures, disputations, sermons, and expositions held as authentic; and that no one is to dare or presume to reject it under any pretext whatever."

"Furthermore, in order to restrain petulant spirits, it decrees that no one, relying on his own skill shall in matters of faith and of morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine, wresting the sacred Scripture to his own senses, presume to interpret the said sacred scripture contrary to that sense which holy mother church—whose it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy scriptures—hath held and doth hold, or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers; even though such interpretations were never (intended) to be at any time published."

"Dogmatic Decrees of the Vatican council," ch. 2.—"And as the things which the holy Synod of Trent decreed for the good of souls concerning the interpretation of Divine Scripture, in order to curb rebellious spirits, have been wrongly explained by some, we, renewing the said decree, declare this to be their sense, that, in matters of faith and morals, appertaining to the building up of Christian doctrine, that is to be held as the true sense of Holy Scripture which our holy mother Church hath held and holds, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense of the Holy Scripture; and therefore that it is permitted to no one to interpret the sacred scripture contrary to this sense, nor, likewise contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. "

2nd. AS TO TRADITION.—“Prof. Fidei Tridentinoe”—(A. D. 1564) 2. and 3. “I most steadfastly admit and embrace apostolic and ecclesiastic traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church. I also admit the Holy scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother Church has held and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures, neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according, to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.”

“Council of Trent,” Sess. 4.—“And seeing clearly that this truth and discipline are contained in the written books, and the unwritten traditions which, received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ himself or from the apostles themselves the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us transmitted as it were from hand to hand.”

3rd. AS TO THE ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY OF THE POPE.—“Dogmatic Decisions of the Vatican Council,” chap. 3.—“Hence we teach and declare that by the appointment of our Lord . . . the power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff is immediate, to which all, of whatever rite and dignity, both pastors and faithful, both individually and collectively, are bound, by their duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, to submit not only in matters which belong to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world. . . . We further teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the faithful, and that in all causes, the decision of which belongs to the Church, recourse may be had to his tribunal, and that none may reopen the judgment of the Apostolic See, than whose authority there is no greater, nor can any lawfully review his judgment. Wherefore they err from the right course who assert that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of the Roman Pontiff to an ecumenical council, as to an authority higher than that of the Roman Pontiff.”

4th. CONCERNING THE ABSOLUTE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE AS THE TEACHER OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH.—“Dogmatic Decrees of the Vatican Council,” Chap. 4.—“Therefore faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian people, the sacred Council approving, we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed:That the Roman Pontiff when he speaks ex cathedra, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to he held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of the infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that his Church should be endowed for defining doctrine according to faith and morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the church. But if any one—which may God avert—presume to contradict this our definition:let him be anathema.”

Cardinal Manning in his “Vatican Council” says, “In this definition there are six points to be noted:”

“1st. It defines the meaning of the well–known phrase loquens ex cathedra; that is, speaking from the Seat, or place, or with the authority of the supreme teacher of all Christians, and binding the assent of the universal Church.”

“2nd. The subject matter of the infallible teaching, namely, the doctrine of faith and morals.”

“3rd. The efficient cause of infallibility, that is, the divine assistance promised to Peter, and in Peter to his successors.”

“4th. The act to which this divine assistance is attached, the defining of doctrines of faith and morals.”

“5th. The extension of this infallible authority to the limits of the doctrinal office of the Church.”

“6th. The dogmatic value of the definitions ex cathedra, namely that they are in themselves irreformable, because in themselves infallible, and not because the Church, or any part or member of the Church, should assent to them.”

“Dogmatic Decrees of Vatican Council” Ch. 4.—“For the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter, that by his revelation they might make known new doctrine; but that by his assistance they might inviolably keep and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered through the Apostles.”

02.06. A Comparison of Systems

Chapter 6 A Comparison of Systems. In this chapter will be presented a brief sketch of the main contrasting positions of the three rival systems of Pelagianism, Semipelagianism, and Augustinianism, or as they are denominated in their more completely developed forms, Socinianism, Arminianism, and Calvinism—together with an outline of the history of their rise and dissemination.

1. What, in general, was the state of theological thought during the first three centuries?

During the first three hundred years which elapsed after the death of the apostle John the speculative minds of the church were principally engaged in defending the truth of Christianity against unbelievers—in combating the Gnostic heresies generated by the leaven of Oriental philosophy—and in settling definitely the questions which were evolved in the controversies concerning the Persons of the Trinity. It does not appear that any definite and consistent statements were made in that age, as to the origin, nature, and consequences of human sin; nor as to the nature and effects of divine grace; nor of the nature of the redemptive work of Christ, or of the method of its application by the Holy Spirit, or of its appropriation by faith. As a general fact it may be stated, that, as a result of the great influence of Origen, the Fathers of the Greek Church pretty unanimously settled down upon a loose Semipelagianism, denying the guilt of original sin, and maintaining the ability of the sinner to predispose himself for, and to cooperate with divine grace. And this has continued the character of the Greek Anthropology to the present day. The same attributes characterized the speculations of the earliest writers of the Western Church also, but during the third and fourth centuries there appeared a marked tendency among the Latin Fathers to those more correct views afterwards triumphantly vindicated by the great Augustine. This tendency may be traced most clearly in the writings of Tertullian of Carthage, who died circum. 220, and Hilary of Poitiers (368) and Ambrose of Milan (397).

2. By what means has the Church made advances in the clear discrimination of divine truth? And in what ages, and among what branches of the Church, have the great doctrines of the trinity and Person of Christ, of sin and grace, and of redemption and the application thereof been severally defined? The Church has always advanced toward clearer conceptions and more accurate definitions of divine truth through a process of active controversy. And it has pleased Providence that the several great departments of the system revealed in the inspired Scriptures should have been most thoroughly discussed, and clearly defined in different ages, and in the bosom of different nations.

Thus the profound questions involved in the departments of Theology proper and of Christology were investigated by men chiefly of Greek origin, and they were authoritatively defined in Synods held in the Eastern half of the General Church during the fourth and immediately following centuries. As concerns THEOLOGY the consubstantial divinity of Christ was defined in the Council of Nice, 325, and the Personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost in the first Council of Constantinople, 381; the Filioque clause being added by the Latins at the Council of Toledo, 589.

As concerns Christology. The Council of Ephesus, 431, asserted the personal unity of the Theanthropos. The Council of Chalcedon, 451, asserted that the two natures remain distinct. The sixth Council of Constantinople, 680, asserted that the Lord possessed a human as well as a divine will. These decisions have been accepted by the whole Church, Greek and Roman, Lutheran and Reformed. The questions concerning sin and grace embraced under the general head of anthropology were in the first instance most thoroughly investigated by men of Latin origin, and definite conclusions were first reached in the controversy of Augustine with Pelagius in the first half of the Fifth century.

Questions concerning redemption, and the method of its application, embraced under the grand division of soteriology, were never thoroughly investigated until the time of the Reformation and subsequently by the great theologians of Germany and Switzerland.

Many questions falling under the grand division of Ecclesiology even yet await their complete solution in the future.

3. What are the three great systems of theology which have always continued to prevail in the church?

Since the revelation given in the Scriptures embraces a complete system of truth, every single department must sustain many obvious relations, logical and otherwise, to every other as the several parts of one whole. The imperfect development, and the defective or exaggerated conception of any one doctrine, must inevitably lead to confusion and error throughout the entire system. For example, Pelagian views as to man's estate by nature always tend to coalesce with Socinian views as to the Person and work of Christ. And Semipelagian views as to sin and grace are also irresistibly attracted by, and in turn attract Arminian views as to the divine attributes, the nature of the Atonement, and the work of the Spirit.

There are, in fact, as we might have anticipated, but two complete self–consistent systems of Christian theology possible.

1st. On the right hand, Augustinianism completed in Calvinism.

2nd. On the left hand, Pelagianism completed in Socinianism. And 3rd. Arminianism comes between these as the system of compromises and is developed Semipelagianism. In the common usage of terms Socinianism is principally applied as the designation of those elements of the false system which relate to the Trinity of the Person of Christ; the terms Pelagianism and Semipelagianism are applied to the more extreme or the more moderate departures from the truth under the head of anthropology; and the term Arminianism is used to designate the less extreme errors concerned with the Department of soteriology.

4. When, where, and by whom were the fundamental principles of the two great antagonistic schools of theology first clearly discriminated? The contrasted positions of the Augustinian and Pelagian systems were first taught out and defined through the controversies maintained by the eminent men whose name they bear, during the first third of the fifth century.

Augustine was bishop of Hippo in Northern Africa from A. D. 395 to A. D. 430. Pelagius, whose family name was Morgan, was a British monk. He was assisted in his controversies by his disciples Coelestius and Julian of Eclanum in Italy. The positions maintained by Pelagius were

generally condemned by the representatives of the whole Church, and have ever since been held by all denominations, except professed Socinians, to be fatal heresy. They were condemned by the two councils held at Carthage A. D. 407 and A. D. 416, by the Council held at Milevum in Numidia A. D. 416; by the popes Innocent and Zosimus, and by the Ecumenical Council held at Ephesus A. D. 431. This speedy and universal repudiation of Pelagianism proves that while the views of the early Fathers upon this class of questions were very imperfect, nevertheless the system taught by Augustine must have been in all essentials the same with the faith of the Church as a whole from the beginning.

5. State in contrast the main distinguishing positions of the Augustinian and Pelagian systems.

“1st. As to ORIGINAL SIN. ”1

“Augustinianism. By the sin of Adam, in whom all men together sinned, sin and all the other positive punishments of Adam’s sin came into the world. By it human nature has been both physically and morally corrupted. Every man brings into the world with him a nature already so corrupt, that it can do nothing but sin. The propagation of this quality of his nature is by concupiscence.

Pelagianism. By his transgression, Adam injured only himself, not his posterity. In respect to his moral nature, every man is born in precisely the same condition in which Adam was created. There is therefore no original sin.”

“2nd. As to FREE WILL.”

“Augustinianism. By Adam’s transgression the Freedom of the human Will has been entirely lost. In his present corrupt state man can will and do only evil.

Pelagianism. Man’s will is free. Every man has the power to will and to do good as well as the opposite. Hence it depends upon himself whether he be good or evil.”

“3rd. As to GRACE.”

“Augustinianism. If nevertheless man in his present state, wills and does good, it is merely the work of grace. It is an inward, secret, and wonderful operation of God upon man. It s a preceding as well as an accompanying work. By preceding grace, man attains faith, by which he comes to an insight of good, and by which power is given him to will the good. He needs cooperating grace for the performance of every individual good act. As man can do nothing without grace, so he can do nothing against it. It is irresistible. And as man by nature has no merit at all, no respect at all can be had to man’s moral disposition, in imparting grace, but God acts according to his own free will.

Pelagianism. Although by free will, which is a gift of God, man has the capacity of willing and doing good without God’s special aid, yet for the easier performance of it, God revealed the law; for the easier performance, the instruction and example of Christ aid him; and for the easier performance, even the supernatural operations of grace are imparted to him. Grace, in the most limited sense (gracious influence) is given to those” only who deserve it by the faithful employment of their own powers. But man can resist it.

“4th. As to PREDESTINATION AND REDEMPTION.”

“Augustinianism. From eternity, God made a free and unconditional decree to save a few2 from the mass that was corrupted and subjected to damnation. To those whom he predestinated to this salvation, he gives the requisite means for the purpose. But on the rest, who do not belong to this small number of the elect, the merited ruin falls. Christ came into the world and died for the elect only.

Pelagianism. God’s decree of election and reprobation is founded on prescience. Those of whom God foresaw that they would keep his commands, he predestinated to salvation; the others to damnation. Christ’s redemption is general. But those only need his atoning death who have actually sinned. All, however, by his instruction and example, may be led to higher perfection and virtue.”

6. What was the origin of the Middle or Semipelagian system? In the meantime, while the Pelagian controversy was at its height, John Cassian, of Syrian extraction and educated in the Eastern Church, having removed to Marseilles, in France, for the purpose of advancing the interests of monkery in that region, began to give publicity to a scheme of doctrine occupying a middle position between the systems of Augustine and Pelagius. This system, whose advocates were called Massilians from the residence of their chief, and afterward Semipelagians by the Schoolmen, is in its essential principles one with that system which is now denominated Arminianism, a statement of which will be given in a subsequent part of this chapter. Faustus, bishop of Priez, in France, from A. D. 427 to A. D. 480, was one of the most distinguished and successful advocates of this doctrine, which was permanently accepted by the Eastern Church, and for a time was widely disseminated throughout the Western also, until it was condemned by the synods of Orange and Valence, A. D. 529.

7. What is the relation of Augustinianism to Calvinism and of Semipelagianism to Arminianism?

After this time Augustinianism became the recognized orthodoxy of the Western Church, and the name of no other uninspired man exerts such universal influence among Papists and Protestants alike. If any human name ought to be used to designate a system of divinely revealed truth, the phrase

Augustinianism as opposed to Pelagianism properly designates all those elements of faith which the whole world of Evangelical Christians hold in common. On the other hand Augustinianism as opposed to Semipelagianism properly designates that system commonly called Calvinism—while Cassianism would be the proper historical designation of that Middle or Semipelagian Scheme now commonly styled Arminianism.

8. How were parties divided with respect to these great systems among the Schoolmen, and how are they in the modern papal Church?

After the lapse of the dark ages, during which all active speculation slumbered, the great Thomas Aquinas, an Italian by birth, A. D. 1224, and a monk of the order of St. Dominic, Doctor Angelicus, advocated with consummate ability the Augustinian system of theology in that cumbrous and artificial manner which characterized the Schoolmen. John Duns Scotus, a native of Britain, A. D. 1265, a monk of the order of St. Francis, Doctor Subtilis, was in that age the ablest advocate of the system then styled Semipelagian. The controversies then revived were perpetuated for many ages, the Dominicans and the Thomists in general advocating unconditional election and

efficacious grace, and the Franciscans and the Scotists in general advocating conditional election and the inalienable power of the human will to cooperate with or to resist divine grace. The same disputes under various party names continue to agitate the Romish Church since the Reformation, although the genius of her ritualistic system, and the predominance of the Jesuits in her councils, have secured within her bounds the almost universal prevalence of Semipelagianism. The general Council, commenced at Trent, A. D. 1546, attempted to form a non–committal Creed that would satisfy the adherents of both systems. Accordingly the Dominicans and Franciscans have both claimed that their respective views were sanctioned by that Synod. The truth is that while the general and indefinite statements of doctrine to be found among its canons are often Augustinian in form, the more detailed and accurate explanations which follow these are uniformly Semipelagian.—Principal Cunningham's "Historical Theology" vol. 1, pp. 483–495. The order of the Jesuits, founded by Ignatius Loyola, A. D. 1541, has always been identified with Semipelagian Theology. Lewis Molina, a Spanish Jesuit, A. D. 1588, the inventor of the distinction denoted by the term "Scientia Media," attained to such distinction as its advocate, that its adherents in the Papal Church have been for ages styled Molinists. In 1638 Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres in the Netherlands died leaving behind him his great work, Augustinus, wherein he clearly unfolded and established by copious extracts the true theological system of Augustine. This book occasioned very widespread contentions, was ferociously opposed by the Jesuits, and condemned by the Bulls of popes Innocent X. and Alexander VII., A. D. 1653 and 1656—which last were followed in 1713 by the more celebrated Bull "imigenitus" of Clement XI., condemning the New Testament Commentary of Quesnel. The Augustinians in that Church were subsequently called Jansenists, and had their principal seat in Holland and Belgium and at Port Royal near Paris. They have numbered among them some very illustrious names, as Tillemont, Arnauld, Nicole Pascal, and Quesnel. These controversies between the Dominicans and Molinists, the Jansenists and Jesuits, have continued even to our own time, although at present Semipelagianism shares with Jesuitism in its almost unlimited sway in the Papal Church, which has definitely triumphed in the Vatican council, 1870.

9. What is the position of the Lutheran church with relation to these great systems?

Luther, a monk of the order of Augustine, and an earnest disciple of that father, taught a system of faith agreeing in spirit and in all essential points with that afterwards more systematically developed by Calvin. The only important point in which he differed from the common consensus of the Calvinistic Churches related to the literal physical presence of the entire person of Christ in, with, and under the elements in the Eucharist. With these opinions of Luther Melanchthon appears to have agreed at the time he published the first edition of his "Loci Communes." His opinions, however, as to the freedom of man and the sovereignty of divine grace were subsequently gradually modified. After the death of Luther, at the Leipsic Conference in 1548, he explicitly declared his agreement with the synergists, who maintain that in the regenerating act the human will cooperates with divine grace. Melanchthon, on the other hand, held a view of the relation of the sign to the grace signified thereby in the Sacraments, much more nearly conforming to opinions of the disciples of ingli and Calvin than generally prevailed in his own Church. His position on both these points gave great offense to the Old Lutherans, and occasioned protracted and bitter controversies. finally, the Old or Strict Lutheran party prevailed over their antagonists, and their views received a complete scientific statement in the "Formula Concordiae" published 1580.

Although this remarkable document never attained a position by the side of the Augsburg Confession and Apology as the universally recognized Confession of the Lutheran Churches, it may justly be taken as the best available witness as to what strictly Lutheran theology when developed into a complete system really is. The Characteristics of Lutheran theology as contrasted with that of the Reformed Churches may be briefly stated under the following heads:

1st. As to THEOLOGY PROPER AND CHRISTOLOGY the only points in which it differs from Calvinism are the following:

(1.) As to the divine attributes of sovereign foreordination, they hold that as far as it is concerned with the actions of moral agents it is limited to those actions which see morally good, while it sustains no determining relation to those which are bad. God foreknows all events of whatever kind; he foreordains all the actions of necessary agents, and the good actions of free agents—but nothing else.

(2.) As to CHRISTOLOGY, they hold that in virtue of the hypostatical union the human element of Christ's person partakes with the divine in at least some of its peculiar attributes. Thus his human soul shares in the omniscience and omnipotence of his divinity, and his body in its omnipresence, and together they have the power of giving life to the truly believing recipient of the sacrament.

2nd. As to ANTHROPOLOGY, they hold views identical with those held by the staunchest advocates of the Reformed theology—for instance the antecedent and immediate imputation of Adam's public sin; the total moral depravity of all his descendants from birth and by nature, and their absolute inability to do aright in their own strength anything which pertains to their relation to God.

3rd. As to the Great central elements of SOTERIOLOGY, they agree with the Reformed with great exactness as to the nature and necessity of the expiatory work of Christ; as to forensic justification through the imputation to the believer of both the active and passive obedience of Christ; as to the nature and office of justifying faith; as to the sole agency of divine grace in the regeneration of the sinner, with which, in the first instance, the dead soul is unable to cooperate; as to God's eternal and sovereign election of believers in Christ, not because of anything foreseen in them, but because of his own gracious will—and consequently as to the fact that the salvation of every soul really saved is to be attributed purely and solely to the grace of God, and not in any degree to the cooperating will or merit of the man himself. At the same time they teach, with obvious logical inconsistency, that the grace of the gospel is in divine intention absolutely universal. Christ died equally and in the same sense for all men. He gives grace alike to all men. Those who are lost are lost because they resist the grace. Those who are saved owe their salvation simply to the grace they have in common with the lost—to the very same grace—not to a greater degree of grace nor to a less degree of sin—not to their own improvement of grace, but simply to the grace itself. According to them God sovereignly elects all those who are saved, but he does not sovereignly pass over those who are lost. He gives the same grace to all men, and the difference is determined persistent resistance of those who are lost. The grand distinction of Lutheranism however relates to their doctrine of the EUCHARIST. They hold to the real physical presence of the Lord in the Eucharist, in, with, and under the elements, and that the grace signified and conveyed by the sacraments is necessary to salvation, and conveyed ordinarily by no other means. Hence the theology and church life of the strict Lutherans center in the sacraments. They

differ from the high sacramental party in the Episcopal church chiefly in the fact that they ignore the dogma of apostolic succession, and the traditions of the early church.

10. Into what two great parties has the Protestant world always been divided? The whole Protestant world from the time of the Reformation has been divided into two great families of churches classified severally as LUTHERAN, or those whose character was derived from Luther and Melanchthon; and as reformed or those who have received the characteristic impress of Calvin. The LUTHERAN family of churches comprises all of those Protestants of Germany, of Hungary, and the Baltic provinces of Russia, who adhere to the Augsburg confession, together with the national churches of Denmark and of Norway and Sweden, and the large denomination of the name in America. These are estimated as amounting to a population of about twenty–five million pure Lutherans, while the Evangelical Church of Prussia, which was formed of a political union of the adherents of the two confessions, embraces probably eleven–and–a–half million. Their Symbolical Books are the Augsburg Confession and Apology, the Articles of Smalcald, Luther's Larger and Smaller Catechism, and, as received by the Stricter party, the Formula Concordiae. The CALVINISTIC or REFORMED churches embrace, in the strict usage of the term, all those Protestant Churches which derive their Theology from Geneva; and among these, because of obvious qualifying conditions, the Episcopal Churches of England, Ireland, and America form a subdivision by themselves; and the Wesleyan Methodists, who are usually classed among the Reformed because they were historically developed from that stock, are even yet more distinctly than the parent church of England removed from the normal type of the general class. In a general sense, however, this class comprises all those churches of Germany which subscribe to the Heidelburg Catechism, the churches of Switzerland, France, Holland, England, and Scotland, the Independents and Baptists of England and America, and the various branches of the Presbyterian Church in England, Ireland, and America. These embrace about eight million German Reformed in the Reformed church of Hungary; twelve million and a half Episcopalians; Presbyterians six million; Methodists, three million and a half; Baptists, four million and a half; and independents' one million and a half;—in all about thirty–eight millions. The principal confessions of the Reformed Church are the Gallic, Belgic, 2d Helvetic, and Scotch Confessions; the Heidelburg Catechism; the Thirty–nine Articles of the Church of England; the Canons of the Synod of Dort, and the Confession and Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly.

11. State the Origin of the Unitarian Heresy. In the early church the Ebionites, a Jewish–Gnostic Christian sect, were the only representatives of those in modern times called Socinians. A party among them were called Elkesaites. Their ideas, with special modifications, are found expressed in the Clementine "Homilies," written about A. D. 150 in Oriental Syria. The most distinguished humanitarians in the early church were the two Theodotuses of Rome, both laymen, Artemon (t180) and Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch (260–270), deposed by a Council held 269. Most of these admitted the supernatural birth of Christ, but maintained that he was a mere man, honored by a special divine influence. They admitted an apotheosis or relative deification of Christ consequent upon his earthly achievements. (Dr. E. De Pressense, "Early Years of Christianity" Part 3, bk. 1, chs. 3 and 5).

Cerinthus, who lived during the last of the first and the first of the second century, held that Jesus was a mere man born of Mary and Joseph, that the Christ or Logos came down upon him in the shape of a dove at his baptism when he was raised to the dignity of the son of God, and wrought

miracles, etc. The Logos left the man Jesus to suffer alone at his crucifixion. The resurrection also was denied.

They were succeeded by the Arians in the fourth century. During the Middle Ages there remained no party within the church that openly denied the supreme divinity of our Lord. In modern times Unitarianism revived at the period the Reformation through the agency of Laelius Socinus of Italy. It was carried by him into Switzerland and existed there as a doctrine professed by a few conspicuous heretics from 1525 to 1560. The most prominent of its professors were the Socini, Servetus, and Ochino. It existed as an organized church at Racow in Poland, where the exiled heretics found a refuge from 1539 to 1658, when the Socinians were driven out of Poland by the Jesuits, and passing into Holland became absorbed in the Remonstrant or Armenian Churches. In 1609 Schmetz drew up from materials afforded by the teaching of Faustus Socinus, the nephew of Laelius, and of J. Crellius, the Racovian Catechism, which is the standard of Socinianism (see Ree's translation, 1818.) After their dispersion Andrew Y. Wissowatius and others collected the most important writings of their leading theologians under the title "Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum." Socinianism was developed by these writers with consummate ability, and crystallized into its most perfect form, as a logical system. It is purely Unitarian in its theology— Humanitarian in its Christology, Pelagian in its Anthropology— and its Soteriology was developed in perfect logical and ethical consistency with those elements. A statement of its characteristic positions will be found below.

It reappeared again as a doctrine held by a few isolated men in England in the seventeenth century. During the eighteenth century a number of degenerate Presbyterian (churches in England lapsed into Socinianism, and towards the end of the same century a larger number of Congregational Churches in Eastern Massachusetts followed their example and these together constitute the foundation of the modern Unitarian Denomination.

" Its last form is a modification of the old Socinianism formed under the pressure of evangelical religion on the one hand, and of rationalistic criticism on the other. Priestley, Channing, and J. Martineau are the examples of the successive phases of Modern Unitarianism. Priestley, of the old Socinian– building itself upon a sensational philosophy; Channing, of an attempt to gain a large development of the spiritual element; Martineau, of the elevation of view induced by the philosophy of Cousin, and the introduction of the idea of historical progress in religious ideas."–"Farrar's Crit. Hist. of Free Thought," Bampton Lecture, 1862.

12. At what date and under what circumstances did modern Arminianism arise?

James Arminius, professor of theology in the university of Leyden from 1602 until his death in 1609, although a minister of the Calvinistic Church of Holland, at first secretly, and afterwards more openly, advocated that scheme of theological opinion which has ever subsequently been designated by his name. These views were rapidly diffused, and at the same time strongly opposed by the principal men in the church. His disciples, consequently, about a year after his death formed themselves into an organized party. and in that capacity presented a Remonstrance to the States of Holland and West Friesland, praying to be allowed to hold their places in the church without being subjected by the ecclesiastical courts to vexatious examinations as to their orthodoxy. From the fact that the utterance of this Remonstrance was their first combined act as a party, they were afterwards known in history as Remonstrants.

Soon after this the Remonstrants, for the sake of defining their position, presented to the authorities five Articles expressing their belief on the subject of Predestination and Grace. This is the origin of the famous “five Points” in the controversy between Calvinism and Arminianism. Very soon however the controversy took a much wider range, and the Armenians were forced by logical consistency to teach radically erroneous views with respect to the nature of; sin, original sin, imputation, the nature of the Atonement, and Justification by faith. some of their later writers carried the rationalistic spirit inherent in their system to its legitimate results in a hardly qualified Plagiarism, and some were even suspected of Socinianism. As all other means had failed to silence the innovators, the States General called together a General Synod at Dort in Holland, which held its sessions in the year 1618–1619. It consisted of pastors, elders, and theological professors from the churches of Holland, and deputies from the churches of England Scotland, Hesse, Bremen, the Palatinate and Switzerland:the promised attendance of delegates from the French churches being prevented by an interdict of their king. The foreign delegates present were nineteen Presbyterians from Reformed churches on the Continent, and one from Scotland, and four Episcopalians from the church of England headed by the bishop of Llandaff. This Synod unanimously condemned the doctrines of the Armenians, and in their Articles confirmed the common Calvinistic faith of the Reformed churches. The most distinguished Remonstrant Theologians who succeeded Arminius were Episcopius, Curcellaeus, Limborch, Le Clerc, Wetstein, and the illustrious jurisconsult Grotius. The denomination of Methodists in Great Britain and America is the only large Protestant body in the world it an avowedly Armenian Creed. Their Arminianism, however as presented by their standard writer, Richard Watson, an incomparably more competent theologian than Wesley, is far less removed from the Calvinism of the Westminster Assembly than the system of the later Remonstrants, and should always be designated by the qualified phrase “ Evangelical Arminianism.” In the hands of Watson the Anthropology and Soteriology of Arminianism are in a general sense nearly assimilated to the corresponding provinces of Lutheranism, and of the Calvinism of Baxter, and of the French School of the seventeenth century.

13. Give an outline of the main positions of the Socinian System.

THEOLOGY AND CHRISTOLOGY.

1st. Divine Unity.

(a.) This unity inconsistent with any personal distinctions in the Godhead.

(b.) Christ is a mere man.

(c.) The Holy Ghost is an impersonal divine influence.

2d. Divine Attributes.

(a.) There is no principle of vindicatory justice in God. Nothing to prevent his acceptance of sinners on the simple ground of repentance.

(b.) Future contingent events are essentially unknowable. The foreknowledge of God does not extend to such events.

ANTHROPOLOGY.

(a.) Man was created without positive moral character. The “ image of God , ” in which man was said to be created did not include holiness.

(b.) Adam in eating the forbidden fruit committed actual sin, and thereby incurred the divine displeasure, but he retained nevertheless the same moral nature and tendencies with which he was created, and he transmitted these intact to his posterity.

(c.) The guilt of Adam’s sin is not imputed.

(d.) Man is now as able by nature to discharge all his obligations as he ever was. The circumstances under which man’s character is now formed are more unfavorable than in Adam’s case, and therefore man is weak. But God is infinitely merciful; and obligation is graded by ability. Man was created naturally mortal and would have died had he sinned or not.

SOTERIOLOGY. The great object of Christ’s mission was to teach and to give assurance with respect to those truths concerning which the conclusions of mere human reason are problematical. This he does both by doctrine and example.

1st. Christ did not execute the office of priest upon earth; but only in heaven, and there in a very indefinite sense.

2nd. The main office of Christ was prophetical. He taught a new law. Gave an example of a holy life. Taught the personality of God. And illustrated the doctrine of a future life by his own resurrection.

3rd. His death was necessary only as a condition unavoidably prerequisite to his resurrection. It was also designed to make a moral impression upon sinners, disposing them to repentance on account of sin, and assuring them of the clemency of God. No propitiation of divine justice was necessary, nor would it be possible by means of vicarious suffering.

ESCHATOLOGY.

1st. In the intermediate period between death and the resurrection the soul remains unconscious.

2nd. “ For it is evident from the authorities cited, that they (the older Socinians), equally with others’ constantly maintain that there will be a resurrection both of the just and of the unjust, and that the latter shall be consigned to everlasting punishment, but the former admitted to everlasting life.”–B. Wissowatius.

“The doctrine of the proper eternity of hell torments is rejected by most Unitarians of the present day (1818) as in their opinion wholly irreconcilable with the divine goodness, and unwarranted by the Scriptures. In reference to the future fate of the wicked, some hold that after the resurrection they will be annihilated or consigned to ‘everlasting destruction’ in the literal sense of the words:but most have received the doctrine of universal restoration, which maintains that all men, however depraved their characters may have been in this life, will, by a corrective discipline, suited in the measure of its severity to the nature of each particular case, be brought ultimately to goodness and consequently to happiness.” (—Rees’s “Racovian Catechism,” pp. 367, 368.)

ECCLESIOLOGY.

1st. The church is simply a voluntary society. Its object mutual improvement. Its common bond similarity of sentiments and pursuits. Its rule is human reason.

2nd. The Sacraments are simply commemorative and teaching ordinances.

14. Give an outline of the main features of the Ar minian System.

DIVINE ATTRIBUTES.

1st. They admit that vindicatory justice is a divine attribute, but hold that it is relaxable, rather optional than essential, rather belonging to administrative policy than to necessary principle.

2nd. They admit that God foreknows all events without exception. They invented the distinction expressed by the term Scientia Media to explain God's certain foreknowledge of future events, the futurition of which remain undetermined by his will or any other antecedent cause.

3rd. They deny that God's foreordination extends to the volitions of tree agents and hold that the eternal election of men to salvation is not absolute, but conditioned upon foreseen faith and obedience.

ANTHROPOLOGY.

1st. Moral character can not be created but is determined only by previous self–decision.

2nd. Both liberty and responsibility necessarily involve possession of power to the contrary.

3rd. They usually deny the imputation of the guilt of Adam's first sin.

4th. The strict Armenians deny total depravity, and admit only the moral enfeeblement of nature. Arminius and Wesley were more orthodox but less self–consistent.

5th. They deny that man has ability to originate holy action or to carry it on in his own unassisted strength—but affirm that every man has power to co–operate with, or to resist "common grace" That which alone distinguishes the saint from the sinner is his own use or abuse of grace.

6th. They regard gracious influence as rather moral and suasory than as a direct and effectual exertion of the new creative energy of God.

7th. They maintain the liability of the saint at every stage of his earthly career to fall from grace.

SOTERIOLOGY.

1st. They admit that Christ made a vicarious offering of himself in place of sinful men, and yet deny that he suffered either the literal penalty of the law, or a full equivalent for it, and maintain that his sufferings were graciously accepted as a substitute for the penalty.

2nd. They hold that not only with respect to its sufficiency and adaptation, but also in the intention of the Father in giving the Son, and of the Son in dying, Christ died in the same sense for all men alike.

3rd. That the acceptance of Christ's satisfaction in the place of the infliction of the penalty on sinners in person involves a relaxation of the divine law.

4th. That Christ's satisfaction enables God in consistency with his character, and the interests of his general government, to offer salvation on easier terms. The gospel hence is a new law, demanding faith and evangelical obedience instead of the original demand of perfect obedience.

5th. Hence Christ's work does not actually save any, but makes the salvation of all men possible——removes legal obstacles out of the way,does not secure faith but makes salvation available on the condition of faith.

6th. sufficient influences of the Holy Spirit, and sufficient opportunities and means of grace are granted to all men.

7th. It is possible for and obligatory upon all men in this life to attain to evangelical perfection–which is explained as a being perfectly sincere–a being animated by perfect love —and doing all that is required of us under the gospel dispensation.

8th. With respect to the heathen some have held that in some way or other the gospel is virtually, if not in form, preached to all men. Others have held that in the future world there are three conditions corresponding to the three great classes of men as they stand related to the gospel in this world – the Status Credentium; the Status Incredulorum; the Status ignorantium.

15. Give a brief outline of the main features of the Calvinistic System.

THEOLOGY.

1st. God is an absolute sovereign, infinitely wise, righteous, benevolent, and powerful, determining from eternity the certain futurition of all events of every class according to the counsel of his own will.

2nd. Vindicatory Justice is an essential and immutable perfection of the divine nature demanding the full punishment of all sin, the exercise of which cannot be relaxed or denied by the divine will.

CHRISTOLOGY. The Mediator is one single, eternal, divine person, at once very God, and very man. In the unity of the Theanthropic person the two natures remain pure and unmixed, and retain each its separate and incommunicable attributes distinct. The personality is that of the eternal and unchangeable Logos. The human nature is impersonal. All mediatorial actions involve the concurrent exercise of the energies of both natures according to their several properties in the unity of the single person.

ANTHROPOLOGY.

1st. God created man by an immediate fiat of omnipotence and in a condition of physical, intellectual, and moral faultlessness, with a positively formed moral character.

2nd. The guilt of Adam's public sin is by a judicial act of God immediately charged to the account of each of his descendants from the moment he begins to exist antecedently to any act of his own.

3rd. Hence men come into existence in a condition of condemnation deprived of those influences of the Holy Spirit upon which their moral and spiritual life depends.

4th. Hence they come into moral agency deprived of that original righteousness which belonged to human nature as created in Adam, and with an antecedent prevailing tendency in their nature to

sin which tendency in them is of the nature of sin, and worthy of punishment.

5th. Man's nature since the fall retains its constitutional faculties of reason, conscience, and free–will, and hence man continues a responsible moral agent, but he is nevertheless spiritually dead, and totally averse to spiritual good, and absolutely unable to change his own heart, or adequately to discharge any of those duties which spring out of his relation to God.

SOTERIOLOGY.

1st. The salvation of man is absolutely of grace. God was free in consistency with the infinite perfections of his nature to save none, few, many, or all, according to his sovereign good pleasure.

2nd. Christ acted as Mediator in pursuance of an eternal covenant formed between the Father and the Son, according to which he was put in the law–place of his own elect people as their personal substitute, and as such by his obedience and suffering he discharged all the obligations growing out of their federal relations to law–by his sufferings vicariously enduring their penal debt by his obedience vicariously discharging those covenant demands, upon which their eternal well–being was suspended—thus fulfilling the requirements of the law, satisfying the justice of God, and securing the eternal salvation of those for whom he died.

3rd. Hence, by his death he purchased the saving influences of the Holy Spirit for all for whom he died. And the infallibly applies the redemption purchased by Christ to all for whom he intended it, in the precise time and under the precise conditions predetermined in the eternal Covenant of Grace–and he does this by the immediate and intrinsically efficacious exercise of his power, operating directly within them, and in the exercises of their renewed nature bringing them to act faith and repentance and all gracious obedience.

4th. Justification is a Judicial act of God, whereby imputing to us the perfect righteousness of Christ, including his active and passive obedience, he proceeds to regard and treat us accordingly, pronouncing all the penal claims of law. to be satisfied, and us to be graciously entitled to all the immunities and rewards conditioned in the original Adamic covenant upon perfect obedience.

5th. Although absolute moral perfection is unattainable in this life, and assurance is not of the essence of faith, it is nevertheless possible and obligatory upon each believer to seek after and attain to a full assurance of his own personal salvation, and leaving the things that are behind to strive after perfection in all things.

6th. Although if left to himself every believer would fall in an instant, and although most believers do experience temporary seasons of backsliding, yet God by the exercise of his grace in their hearts, in pursuance of the provisions of the eternal Covenant of Grace and of the purpose of Christ in dying, infallibly prevents even the weakest believer from final apostasy.

1 "Historical Presentation of Augustinianism and Pelagianism," by G. F. Wiggers, D.D., Translated by Rev. Ralph Emerson, pp. 268–270.

2 The doctrine of Augustine does not by any means involve the conclusion that the elect are " few " or " a small number."

02.07. Creeds and Confessions

Chapter 7 Creeds and Confessions. As Creeds and Confessions, their uses and their history, form a distinct subject of study by themselves, they will together in this chapter, while references will be found under the several chapters of this work to the particular Creed in which the particular doctrine is most clearly or authoritatively defined. On this entire subject consult the admirable historical and critical work of Dr. Philip Schaff of Union Theological Seminary, New York—the "CREEDS OF CHRISTENDOM." In the first volume he presents a history of the authorship and occasion of each Creed or Confession and a critical estimate of its contents and value. In volumes second and third he gives the text of all the principal creeds in two languages.

1. Why are Creeds and Confessions necessary, and how have they been produced? The Scriptures of the Old and New Testament having been given by inspiration of God, are for man in his present state the only and the all–sufficient rule of faith and practice. This divine word, therefore, is the only standard of doctrine which has any intrinsic authority binding the consciences of men. All other standards are of value or authority only as they teach what the Scriptures teach. But it is the inalienable duty and necessity of men to arrive at the meaning of the Scriptures in the use of their natural faculties, and by the ordinary instruments of interpretation. Since all truth is self–consistent in all its parts, and since the human reason always instinctively strives to reduce all the elements of knowledge with which it grapples to logical unity and consistency, it follows that men must more or less formally construct a system of faith out of the materials presented in the Scriptures. Every student of the Bible necessarily does this in the very process of understanding and digesting its teaching, and all such students make it manifest that they have found, in one way or another, a system of faith as complete as for him has been possible, by the very language he uses in prayer, praise, and ordinary religious discourse. If men refuse the assistance afforded by the statements of doctrine slowly elaborated and defined by the church, they must severally make out their own creed by their own unaided wisdom. The real question between the church and the impugners of human creeds, is not, as the latter often pretend, between the word of God and the creed of man, but between the tried and proved faith of the collective body of God's people, and the private judgment and the unassisted wisdom of the individual objector. As it would have been anticipated, it is a matter of fact that the church has advanced very gradually in this work of accurately interpreting Scripture, and defining the great doctrines which compose the system of truths it reveals. The attention of the church has been especially directed to the study of one doctrine in one age, and of another doctrine in a subsequent age. And as she has gradually advanced in the clear discrimination of gospel truth, she has at different periods set down an accurate statement of the results of her new attainments in a creed, or Confession of Faith, for the purpose of preservation and of popular instruction, of discriminating and defending the truth from the perversion of heretics and the attacks of infidels, and of affording a common bond of faith and rule of teaching and discipline. The ancient creeds of the universal Church were formed by the first four ecumenical or general councils, except the so–called Apostle's Creed, gradually formed from the baptismal confessions in use in the different churches of the West, and the so–called

Athanasian Creed, which is of private and unknown authorship. The great authoritative Confession of the Papal Church was produced by the ecumenical council held at Trent, 1545. The mass of the principal Protestant Confessions were the production of single individuals or of small circles of individuals, e. g., the Augsburg Confession and Apology, the 2d Helvetic Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, the Old Scotch Confession, the Thirty–nine Articles of the Church of England etc. Two, however, of the most valuable and generally received Protestant Confessions were produced by large and venerable Assemblies of learned divines, namely:the Canons of the international Synod of Dort, and the Confession and Catechisms of the national Assembly of Westminster.

2. What are their legitimate uses?

They have been found in all ages of the church useful for the following purposes.

(1.) To mark, preserve and disseminate the attainments made in the knowledge of Christian truth by any branch of the church in any grand crisis of its development.

(2.) To discriminate the truth from the glosses of false teachers, and accurately to define it in its integrity and due proportions.

(3.) To act as the bond of ecclesiastical fellowship among those so nearly agreed as to be able to labor together in harmony.

(4.) To be used as instruments in the great work of popular instruction.

3. What is the ground and extent of their authority, or power to bind the conscience? The matter of all these Creeds and Confessions binds the consciences of men only so far as it is purely scriptural, and because it is so. The form in which that matter is stated, on the other hand, binds only those who have voluntarily subscribed the Confession and because of that subscription. In all churches a distinction is made between the terms upon which private members are admitted to membership and the terms upon which office–bearers are admitted to their sacred trusts of teaching and ruling. A church has no right to make anything a condition of membership which Christ has not made a condition of salvation. The church is Christ's fold. The Sacraments are the seals of his covenant. All have a gilt to claim admittance who make a credible profession of the true religion, that is, who are presumptively the people of Christ. This credible profession of course involves a competent knowledge of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, a declaration of personal faith in Christ and of devotion to his service, and a temper of mind and a habit of life consistent therewith. On the other hand, no man can be inducted into any office in any church who does not profess to believe in the truth and wisdom of the constitution and laws it will be his duty to conserve and administer. Otherwise all harmony of sentiment and all efficient co–operation in action would be impossible. The Standards of the creeds and confession are binding for officers of presbyterian congregations. The vows taken by elder and deacons are solemnly administered and agreed to before both God and man.

4. What were the Creeds of the ancient Church which remain the common inheritance of all branches of the modern Church?

I. THE APOSTLE'S CREED, so called. This Creed gradually grew out of the comparison and assimilation of the Baptismal Creeds of the principal Churches in the West or Latin half of the

ancient Church. The most complete and popular forms of these baptismal creeds were those of Rome, Aquileja, Milan, Ravenna, Carthage, and Hippo, “of which the Roman form, enriching itself by additions from others, gradually gained the more general acceptance. While the several articles considered separately are all of Nicene or Anti–nicene origin, the creed as a whole in its present form cannot be traced beyond the sixth century.”—Schaff’s “ Creeds of Christendom,” vol. 1. p. 20.

It was subjoined by the Westminster divines to their Catechism, together with the Lord’s Prayer and Ten Commandments Not as though it was composed by the apostles’ or ought to be esteemed canonical Scripture, but because it is a brief sum of Christian agreeable to the word of God and anciently received in the Churches of Christ. It was retained by the framers of the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States as part of our Catechism. It is a part of the Catechism of the Methodist Episcopal Church also. It is used in the baptismal Confession of the Roman, English, Reformed, Lutheran, Methodist Episcopal, and Protestant Episcopal Churches.

It 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 (Hades); the third day he rose again from the deed, 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.

II. THE NICENE CREED, in which the true Trinitarian faith of the church is accurately defined in opposition to Arian and Semiarian errors. It exists in three forms, and evidently was molded upon pre–existing forms similar to those from which the Apostles’ Creed grew.

1st. The original form in which it was composed and enacted by the (Ecumenical Council of Nice, A. D. 325.

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, begotten of the Father, the only begotten, that is, of the essence of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance (ομοουσιον) with by whom all things were made, both in heaven and on earth; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down and was incarnate, and was made man; he suffered, and the third day he rose again, ascended into heaven; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost. But those who say:‘There was a time when he was not’ and ‘He was not before he was made’ and ‘He was made out of nothing,’ or ‘He is of another substance or essence’ or ‘The Son of God is created or changeable or alterable’—they are condemned by the holy catholic and apostolic Church.

2nd. The Nicaeno–Constantinopolitan Creed. This consists oft the Nicene Creed, above given slightly changed in the first article, and with the clauses defining the Person and work of the Holy Ghost added, and the Anathema omitted. This new form of the Creed has been generally attributed to the Council of Constantinople, convened by the Emperor Theodosius, A. D. 381, to condemn the doctrine of the Macedonians, who denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost. These

changes in the Nicene Creed were unquestionably made about that date, and the several " clauses " added existed previously in formularies proposed by individual theologians. But there is no evidence that the changes were made by the Council of Constantinople. They were, however, recognized by the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451.

It is in this latter form that the Creed of Nice is now used in the Greek Church.

3rd. The third or Latin form of this creed in which it is used in the Roman, Episcopal, and Lutheran Churches' differs from the second form above mentioned only in (a.) restoring the clause ("Deus de Deo ") " God of God," to the first clause; it belonged to the original Creed of Nice, but had been dropped cut of the Greek Nicaeno–Constantinopolitan form. (b.) The famous "Filioque ," term was added to the clause affirming the procession of the Spirit from the Father. This was added by the provincial Council of Toledo, Spain, A. D. 589, and gradually accepted by the whole Western Church, and thence by all Protestants, without any ecumenical ratification. That phrase is rejected by the Greek Church. The text of this Creed as received with reverence by all Catholics and Protestants is as follows (Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom" pp. 25—29):

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 incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; He was crucified, also for us, under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried and the third day he rose 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 (this phrase "filioque" was added to the creed of Constantinople by the council of the western church held at Toledo, A. D. 589), who, with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spoke by the prophets. And I believe 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.

III. THE ATHANASIAN CREED, so called, also styled, from its opening words:the symbol Quicunque vult is vulgarly ascribed to the great Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria from about A. D. 328 to A. D. 373, and the leader of the orthodox party in the church in opposition to the arch heretic, Arius. But modern scholars unanimously assign to it a later origin, and trace it to Northern Africa and the school of Augustine. Bigham refers it to Virgilius Tapsensis at the end of the fifth century. Schaff says its complete form does not appear before the eighth century. This Creed is received in the Greek, Roman, and English Churches, but it has been left out of the Prayer Book of the Episcopal Church of America. It presents a most admirably stated exposition of the faith of all Christians, and it is objected to only because of the "damnatory clauses", which ought never to be attached to any human composition, especially one making such nice distinctions upon so profound a subject.

It is as follows:

1. Whosoever wishes to be saved, it is above all necessary for him to hold the Catholic faith.

2. Which, unless each one shall preserve perfect and inviolate, he shall certainly perish forever.

3. But the Catholic faith is this that we worship one God in trinity and in unity.

4. Neither confounding the persons, nor separating the substance.

5. For the person of the Father is one, of the Son another, and of the Holy Ghost another.

6. But of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Ghost there is one divinity, equal glory and co–eternal majesty.

7. What the Father is, the same is the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

8. The Father is uncreated, the Son uncreated, the Holy Ghost uncreated.

9. The Father is immense, the Son immense, the Holy Ghost immense.

10. The Father is eternal, the Son eternal, the Holy Ghost eternal.

11. And yet there are not three eternals, but one eternal.

12. So there are not three (beings) uncreated, nor three immense, but one uncreated, and one immense.

13. In like manner the Father is omnipotent, the Son is omnipotent, the Holy Ghost is omnipotent.

14. And yet there are not three omnipotents, but one omnipotent.

15. Thus the Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghost is God.

16. And yet there are Not three Gods, but one God.

17. Thus 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. Because as we are thus compelled by Christian verity to confess each person severally to be God and Lord; so we are prohibited by the Catholic religion from saying that there are three Gods or Lords.

20. The Father was made from none, nor created, nor begotten.

21. The Son is from the Father alone, neither made, nor created, but begotten.

22. The Holy Ghost is from the Father and the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten but proceeding.

23. Therefore there is one Father, not three fathers, one Son, not three sons, one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts.

24. And in this trinity no one is first or last, no one is greater or less.

25. But all the three co–eternal persons are co–equal among themselves, so that through all, as is above said, both unity in trinity, and trinity in unity is to be worshipped.

26. Therefore, he who wishes to be saved must think thus concerning the trinity.

27. But it is necessary to eternal salvation that he should also faithfully believe the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

28. It is, therefore, true faith that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ is both God and man.

29. He is God, generated from eternity from the substance of the Father, man born in time from the substance of his mother.

30. Perfect God, perfect man, subsisting of a rational soul and human flesh.

31. Equal to the Father in respect to his divinity, less than the Father in respect to his humanity.

32. Who, although he is God and man, is not two but one Christ.

33. But one, not from the conversion of his divinity into flesh, but from the assumption of his humanity into God.

34. One not at all from confusion of substance, but from unity of person.

35. For as a rational soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ.

36. Who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, the third day rose from the dead.

37. Ascended to heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God the Father omnipotent, whence he shall come to judge the living and the dead.

38. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall render an account for their own works.

39. and they who have done well shall go into life eternal; they who have done evil into eternal fire.

40. This is the Catholic faith, which, unless a man shall faithfully and firmly believe, he cannot be saved.

IV. THE CREED OF Chalcedon, The Emperor Marcianus called the fourth ecumenical council to meet at Chalcedon in Bithynia, on the Bosphorus, opposite Constantinople, to put down the Eutychian and Nestorian heresies. The Council consisted of 630 bishops and sat from Oct. 8 to Oct. 31, A. D. 451. The principal part of the “Definition of Faith” agreed upon by this Council is as follows:

We, then, following the holy Fathers, all with one consent, teach men to confess, one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ; the same perfect in Godhead and also perfect in Manhood; truly God, and truly Man, of a reasonable soul and body; consubstantial with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the Manhood; in all things like unto us without sin, begotten before all ages of the Father to the Godhead, and in these latter days, for us and for our salvation, born of Mary the Virgin Mother of God according to the Manhood. He is one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only–begotten, existing in two natures without mixture (ασυγχυτως), without change (ατρεπτως), without division (αδιαιρετως), without separation (αχωριστως); the diversity of the two natures not being at all destroyed by their union, but the peculiar properties of each nature being preserved, and concurring to one person and one

subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son, and Only begotten, God, the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ; as the prophets from the beginning have declared concerning Him, and as the Lord Jesus Christ Himself hath taught us, and as the CREED, of the holy fathers has delivered to us. This completed the development of the orthodox Church doctrine of the Trinity of Persons in the one God and of the duality of natures in the one Christ. It remains a universally respected statement of the common faith of the Church.

5. What are the doctrinal Standards of the Church of Rome?

Besides the above mentioned Creeds, all of which are of recognized authority in the Romish Church, their great Standards of Faith are—

1st. The “Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent,”which they regard as the twentieth ecumenical council, and was called by Pope Pius IV. to oppose the progress of the Reformation (A. D. 1545—1563). The decrees contain the positive statements of Papal doctrine. The canons explain the decrees, distribute the matter under brief heads, and condemn the opposing doctrine on each point. Although studiously ambiguous, the system of doctrine taught is evidently though not consistently Semipelagian.

2nd. The “Roman Catechism,” which explains and enforces the canons of the Council of Trent, was prepared by order of Pius IV., and promulgated by the authority of Pope Pius V., A. D. 1566.

3rd. The “Creed of Pope Pius IV.,” also called “Professio Fidei Tridentinoe,” or “Forma Professionis Fidei Catholicoe,” contains a summary of the doctrines taught in the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, and was promulgated in a bull by Pope Pius IV., A. D. 1564. It is subscribed to by all grades of Papal teachers and ecclesiastics, and by all converts from Protestantism.

It is as follows:

I, A. B., believe and profess with a firm faith all and every one of the things which are contained in the symbol of faith which is used in the holy Roman Church; namely, 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 the Father before all worlds; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, consubstantial 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, was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, suffered and was buried, and rose again the third day according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of the Father, and will come again with glory to judge the living and the dead of whose kingdom there will be no end; and in the Holy Ghost The Lord and Life–giver, who proceeds from the Father and the Son, who, together with the Father and the Son, is adored and glorified, who spake by the holy prophets; and one holy catholic and apostolic Church. I confess one baptism for the remission of sins, and I expect the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

I most firmly admit and embrace the apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other constitutions and observances of the same Church. I also admit the sacred Scriptures according to the sense which the holy mother Church has held and does hold to whom it belongs to judge of the

true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures, nor will I ever take or interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers. I profess, also, 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 all are not necessary for every one–namely baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony, and that they confer grace; and of these baptism, confirmation, and order cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. I do also receive and admit the ceremonies of the Catholic Church, received and approved in the solemn administration of all the above–said sacraments. I receive and embrace all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent concerning sin and justification. I profess likewise that in the mass is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I confess, also, that under either kind alone, Christ whole and entire, and a true sacrament is received. I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrage of the faithful. Likewise that the saints reigning together with Christ are to be honored and invoked, that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be venerated. I most firmly assert that the images of Christ, and of the mother of God ever Virgin and also of the other saints, are to be had and retained and that due honor and veneration are to be given to them. I also affirm that the power of indulgences and left by Christ in the Church and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people. I acknowledge the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, the mother and mistress of all churches, and I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman bishop, the successor of St. Peter, prince of the apostles, and near of Jesus Christ. I also profess, and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent and by the [Ecumenical Vatican Council delivered, defined, and declared, particularly concerning the primacy and infallible rule of the Roman Pontiff."3 And likewise I also condemn, reject and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever condemned rejected and anathematized by the Church. This true Catholic faith, out of which none can be saved, which I now freely profess and truly hold, I., A. B., promise, vow and swear most constantly to hold, and profess the same whole and entire with God's assistance, to the end of my life, and to procure as far as lies in my power, that the same shall he held, taught and preached by all who are under me, or who are entrusted to my care in virtue of my office so help me God, and these holy gospels of God —Amen.

4th. The Holy ecumenical Vatican Council assembled at the call of Pius IX., in the Basilica of The Vatican, Dec. 8, 1869, and continued its sessions until October 20, 1870, after which it was indefinitely postponed. The Decrees of this Council embrace two sections.

I. " The Dogmatic Constitution on the Catholic Faith."This embraces four chapters. Chap. 1 treats of God as Creator; chap. 2, of revelation; chap. 3, of faith; chap. 4, of faith and reason. These are followed by eighteen canons, in which the errors of modern rationalism and infidelity are condemned

II. “First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ.” This also embraces four chapters. Chap. 1 is entitled “ Of the Institution of the Apostolic Primacy in Blessed Peter;” chap. 2, “ Of the Perpetuity of the Primacy of Blessed Peter in the Roman Pontiffs;” chap.3, “ On the. Power and Nature of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff;” chap. 4, “ Concerning the Infallible Teaching of the Roman Pontiff. ”The new features are contained in the last two chapters, which teach “Papal Absolutism and Papal Infallibility.” These definitions are presented to a sufficient extent under Chapter 5. of these “Outlines.” In consequence of this principle of Papal Infallibility it necessarily follows, that the whole succession of Papal Bulls, and especially those directed against the Jansenists and the Decree of Pius IX. “On the Immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary,” Dec. 8, 1854; and his Syllabus of Errors, Dec. 8, 1864, are all infallible and irreformable and parts of the amazing Standards of Faith professed by the Roman Church.

6. What Are the Doctrinal Standards of the Greek Church? The ancient church divided, from causes primarily political and ecclesiastical, secondarily doctrinal and ritual, into two great sections – the Eastern or Greek Church, and the Western or Latin church. This division began to culminate in the seventh, and was consummated in the eleventh century. The Greek Church embraces about eighty millions of people, the majority of the Christians inhabitants of the Turkish Empire, and the national churches of Greece and Russia. All the Protestant Churches have originated from the Western or Latin division of the church.

She arrogates to herself, pre–eminently, the title of “Orthodox” because the original ecumenical Creeds defining the doctrines of the Trinity and the Person of Christ were produced in the Eastern division of the ancient church and in the Greek language, and hence are in a special sense her inheritance, and because from the fact that her theology is absolutely unprogressive, she contents herself with the literal repetition of the old formulas.

She adheres to the ancient Creeds and doctrinal decisions of the first seven ecumenical councils, and possesses a few modern Confessions and Catechisms. The most important of these are– The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Greek church composed by Peter Mogilas, Metropolitan of Kieff in Russia, A. D. 1643, and approved by all the Eastern Patriarchs.

2nd. The “Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem,” or the Confession of Dositheus, 1672.

3rd. The Russian Catechisms which have the sanction of the Holy Synod, especially the Longer Catechism of Philaret, Metropolitan of Moscow, 1820—1867, unanimously approved by all the Eastern Patriarchs. and since 1839 generally used in the schools and Churches of Russia. The Decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem teach substantially though less definitely the same doctrine as those of the Council of Trent as to the Scriptures and Tradition, good works and faith, justification, the sacraments, the sacrifice of the mass, the worship of saints, and purgatory. The Catechism of Philaret “ approaches more nearly to the evangelical principle of the supremacy of the Bible in matters of Christian faith and life than any other deliverance of the Eastern Church.”—Schaff’s “Creeds of Christendom,” Vol. 1., pp. 45 and 71.

7. What are the Doctrinal Standards of The Lutheran Church?

Besides the great General Creeds, which they receive in common with all Christians, their Symbolical Books are:The Augsburg Concession, the joint authors of which were Luther and Melanchthon. Having been signed by the Protestant princes and leaders, it was presented to the

emperor and imperial diet in Augsburg, A. D, 1530. It is the oldest Protestant Confession, the ultimate basis of Lutheran theology, and the only universally accepted standard of the Lutheran Churches. It consists of two grand divisions. The first embracing twenty–one articles, presents a positive statement of Christian doctrines as the Lutherans understand them; and the second, embracing seven articles, condemns the principal characteristic errors of the Papacy. It is evangelical in the Augustinian sense, although not as precise in statement as the more perfect Calvinistic Confessions, and it, of course, contains the germs of the peculiar Lutheran views as to the necessity of the Sacraments, and the relation of the sacramental signs to the grace they signify. Yet these peculiarities are so far from being explicitly stated, that Calvin found it consistent with his views of divine truth to subscribe this great Confession, during his residence in Strasburg. In 1540, ten years after it had been adopted as the public symbol of Protestant Germany, Melanchthon produced an editorial in Latin which he altered in several particulars, and which was hence distinguished as the Variata, the original and only authentic form of the Confession being distinguished as the Invariata. The principal changes introduced in this edition incline towards Synergistic or Armenian views of divine grace on the one hand, and on the other to simple views as to the sacraments more nearly corresponding with those prevailing among the Reformed Churches. – See Shedd's " Hist. of Christ. Doctrine" Book 7., chap. 2. See also the accurate and learnedly illustrated edition of the Augsburg Confession by Rev. Charles Krauth, D.D.

2nd. The Apology[Defense] of the Augsburg Confession, prepared by Melanchthon, A. D. 1530, and subscribed by the Protestant theologians, A. D. 1537, at Smalcald.

3rd. The Larger and Smaller Catechisms prepared by Luther, A. D. 1529, "the first for the use of preachers and teachers, the last as a guide for youth."

4th. The Articles of Smalcald, drawn up by Luther, A.D. 1536, and inscribed by the evangelical theologians in February, A. D. 1537, at the place whose name they bear.

5th. The Formula Concordice(Form of Concord), prepared in A. D. 1577 by Jacob Andreae and Martin Chemnitz and others for the purpose of settling certain controversies which had sprung up in the Lutheran Church, especially (a) concerning the relative action of divine grace and the human will in regeneration, (b) concerning the nature of the Lord's presence in the Eucharist. This Confession contains a more scientific and thoroughly developed statement of the Lutheran doctrine than can be found in any other of their public symbols. Its authority is, however acknowledged only by the high Lutheran party, that is, by that party in the church which consistently carries the peculiarities of Lutheran theology out to the most complete logical development. All these Lutheran Symbols may be found in Latin accurately edited in "Libri Symbolici," by Dr. C. A. Hase, Leipsic, 1836, and in Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom."

8. What are the principal Confessions of the Reformed or Calvinistic Churches? The Confessions of the Reformed Churches are very considerable in number, and weary somewhat in character, although they substantially agree in the system of doctrines they teach.

1st. "The oldest Confession of that branch of Protestantism which was not satisfied with the Lutheran tendency and symbol is the Confessio Tetrapolitana, – so–called, because the theologians of four cities of upper Germany, Strasburg, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau, drew it up, and presented it to the emperor at the same diet of Augsburg, in 1530, at which the first

Lutheran symbol was presented. The principal theologian concerned in its construction was Martin Bucer, of Strasburg. It consists of twenty–two articles, and agrees generally with the Augsburg Confession. The points of difference pertain to the doctrine of the sacraments. Upon this subject it is inglian. These four cities, however, in 1532 adopted the Augsburg Confession, so that the Confessio Tetrapolitana ceased to be the formally adopted symbol of any branch of the church." Shedd's "Hist. of Christ. Doctrine," Book 7., chap. 2.

2nd. The Reformed Confessions of the highest authority among the Churches are the following:

(1.) The Second Helvetic confession prepared by Bullinger, A. D. 1564, and published 1566, superseded the First Helvetic Confession of A. D. 1536. It was adopted by all the Reformed Churches in Switzerland with the exception of Basle (which was content with the old Confession) and by the Reformed Churches in Poland, Hungary, Scotland and France, and it has always been esteemed as of the highest authority by all the Reformed Churches.

(2.) The Heidelberg Catechism, prepared by Ursinus and Olevianus, A. D. 1562. It was established by civil authority as the doctrinal standard as well as the instrument of religious instruction for the churches of the Palatinate, a German state at that time including both banks of the Rhine. It was endorsed by the Synod of Dort, and is a doctrinal standard of the Reformed Churches of Germany and Holland, and of the (German and Dutch) Reformed Churches in America. It was used for the instruction of children in Scotland, before the adoption of the Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly, and its use was sanctioned by an unanimous vote of the first General Assembly of the reunited Presbyterian Church in the United States A. I). 1870.—See Minutes.

(3.) The Thirty–nine Articles of the Church of England. In 1552, Cranmer, with the advice of other bishops, drew up the Forty–two Articles of Religion, and which were published by royal authority in 1553. These were revised and reduced to the number of thirty–nine by Archbishop Parker and other bishops, and ratified by both houses of Convocation, and published by royal authority in 1563. They constitute the doctrinal standard of the Protestant Episcopal Churches of England, Ireland, Scotland, the Colonies, and the United States of America. The question whether these Articles are Calvinistic or not has been very unwarrantably made a matter of debate. See Lawrence's " Bampton Lecture , for 1804 on the Armenian side" and Toplady's "Doctrinal Calvinism of the Church of England," Dr. Goode's "Doctrine of Church of England as to Effects of Infant Baptisms," and Dr. William Cunningham's," Reformers and their Theology" on the Calvinistic side. The seventeenth Article on Predestination is perfectly decisive of the question, and is as follows:

Predestination to life is the everlasting purpose of God whereby (before the foundations of the world were laid) he hath constantly decreed by his counsel, secret to us, to deliver from curse and damnation those whom he hath chosen in Christ out of mankind, and to bring them by Christ to everlasting salvation, as vessels made to honor. Wherefore they which he endued with so excellent a benefit of God, he called according to God's purpose by his Spirit working in due season:they through grace, obey the calling; they he justified freely; they he made sons of God by adoption; they he made like the image of his only begotten Son, Jesus Christ; they walk religiously in good works, and at length by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity. As the godly consideration of predestination and our election in Christ is full of sweet, pleasant, and

unspeakable comfort to godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the works of the flesh and their earthly members, and drawing up their mind to high and heavenly things, as well because it doth greatly establish and confirm their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their love toward God. So, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchedness of most unclean living, no less perilous than desperation.

Furthermore, we must receive God's promises in such wise as they be generally set forth to us in Holy Scripture; and, in our doings, that will of God is to be followed which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God.

These Articles purged of their Calvinism and reduced in number to twenty–five including a new political Article (the twenty–third) adopting as an article of faith the political system of the United States Government, constitute the doctrinal Standard of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America.

(4.) The canons of the Synod of Dort. This famous Synod was convened in Dort, Holland, by the authority of the States General, for the purpose of settling the questions brought into controversy by the disciples of Arminius. Its sessions continued from Nov. 13, A. D. 1618, to May 9, (b.) D. 1619. It consisted of pastors, elders, and theological professors from the churches of Holland, and deputies from the churches of England Scotland, Hesse, Bremen, the Palatinate, and Switzerland. The Canons of this Synod were received by all the Reformed Churches as a true, accurate, and eminently authoritative exhibition of the Calvinistic system of theology. They constitute in connection with the Heidelberg Catechism the doctrinal Confession of the Reformed Church of Holland and of its daughter the [Dutch] Reformed Church in America.

(5.) The Confession and Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly. This Assembly of Divines was convened by an act of the Long Parliament passed June 12, 1643. The original call embraced ten lords and twenty commoners as lay members, and one hundred and twenty–one divines—twenty ministers being afterward. added—all shades of opinion as to Church Government being represented. The body continued its sessions from 1st of July, 1643, to 22d of February, 1649. The Confession and Catechisms they produced were immediately adopted by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. The Congregational Convention, also, called by Cromwell to meet at Savoy, in London, A.D. 1658, declared their approval of the doctrinal part of the Confession and Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly, and conformed their own deliverance, the Savoy Declaration, very nearly to it. Indeed " the difference between these two Confessions is so very small, that the modern Independents have in a manner laid aside the use of it (Savoy Declaration) in their families, and agreed with the Presbyterians in the use of the Assembly's Catechisms."—Neal, "Puritans," 2., 178. This Confession together with the Larger and Smaller Catechisms is the doctrinal standard of all the Presbyterian bodies in the world of English and Scotch derivation. It is also of all Creeds the one most highly approved by all bodies of Congregationalists in England and America.

All of the Assemblies convened in new England for the purpose of settling the doctrinal basis of their churches have either endorsed or explicitly adopted this Confession and these Catechisms

as accurate expositions of their own faith. This was done by the Synod which met at Cambridge, Massachusetts, June, 1647, and again August, 1648, and prepared the Cambridge Platform. And it was done again by the Synod which sat in Boston, September, 1679, and May, 1680, and produced the Boston Confessions. And again by the Synod which met at Saybrook, Connecticut, 1708, and produced the Saybrook Platform.

3rd. There remain several other Reformed Confessions, which, although they are not the doctrinal standards of large denominations of Christians, are nevertheless of high classical interest and authority because of their authors, and the circumstances under which they originated.

(1.) The “Consensus Tigurinus,” or the “Consensus of Zurich,” or “The mutual consent with respect to the doctrine of the sacrament of the ministers of the Church of Zurich and John Calvin, minister of the church of Geneva.” It consisted of twenty–six Articles, and deals exclusively with the questions relating to the Lord’s Supper, and it was drawn by Calvin, A. D. 1549, for the purpose of bringing about a mutual consent among all parties in the Reformed Church on the subject of which it treats. It was subscribed by the Churches of Zurich, Geneva, St. Gall, Schaffhausen, the Grisons, Neuchatel, and Basle and was received it favor by all parts of the Reformed church, and remains an eminent monument of the true mind of the Reformed Church upon this so much debated question; and especially it is of value as setting forth with eminent clearness and unquestionable authority the real opinion of Calvin on the subject, deliberately stated after he had ceased from the vain attempt to secure the unity of Protestantism by a compromise with the Lutheran views as to the Lord’s presence in the Eucharist. An accurate translation of this important document will be found in the Appendix.

(2.) The “Consensus Genevensis ” was drawn up by Calvin, A D. 1552, in the name of the Pastors of Geneva, and is a complete statement of Calvin’s views on the subject of Predestination. It was designed to unite all the Swiss churches in their views of this great doctrine. It remains a pre–eminent monument of the fundamental principles of true Calvinism.

(3.) The “Formula Consensus Helvetica,” composed at Zurich, A. D. 1675, by John Henry Heidegger of Zurich, assisted by Francis Turretin of Geneva and Luke Gernler of Basle. Its title is “Form of agreement of the Helvetic Reformed Churches respecting the doctrine of universal grace, the doctrines connected therewith, and some other points.” It was designed to unite the Swiss Churches in condemning and excluding that modified form of Calvinism, which in that century emanated from the Theological School of Saumur, represented by Amyraldus, Placaeus, etc. This is the most scientific and thorough of all the Reformed Confessions. Its eminent authorship4 and the fact that it distinctively represents the most thoroughly consistent school of old Calvinists gives it high classical interest. It was subscribed by nearly all the Swiss Churches, but ceased to have public authority as a Confession since A.D. 1722.5 All the Confessions of the Reformed Churches may be found collected in one convenient volume in the “Collectio Confessionum in Eddlesiss Reformatis publicatarum ”,:by Dr. H. A. Niemeyer, Leipsic, 1840, and in Dr. Schaff’s “ Creeds of Christendom.”

3 Added by Decree of the a Sacred Congregation of the Council, Jan. 2, 1877.

4 See Herzog’s Real–Encyclopedia. Bomberger’s translation. Article “Helvetic Confessions.”

5 An accurate translation will be found in the Appendix.

02.08. The Attributes of God

Chapter 8 The Attributes of God 1. What are the three methods of determining the attributes of the divine Being?

1st. The method of analyzing the idea of infinite and absolute perfection. This method proceeds upon the assumption that we are, as intelligent and moral agents, created in the image of God. In this process we attribute to him every excellence that we have any experience or conception of, in an infinite degree, and in absolute perfection, and we deny of him every form of imperfection or limitation.

2nd. The method of inferring his characteristics from our observation of his works around us and our experience of his dealings it ourselves.

3rd. The didactic (instructional) statements of Scripture, the illustration of his character therein given in his supernatural revelation and gracious dispensations, and above all in the personal revelation of God in his Son Jesus Christ.

All these methods agree and mutually supplement and limit each other. The idea of absolute and infinite perfection, which in some sense is native to us, aids us in interpreting Scripture —and the Scriptures correct the inferences of the natural reason, and set the seal of divine authority upon our opinions about the divine nature.

2. To what extent can we have assurance that the objective reality correspondence with our subjective conceptions of the divine nature?

There are upon this subject two opposite extreme positions which it is necessary to avoid.

1st. The extreme of supposing that our conceptions of God either in kind or degree are adequate to represent the objective reality of his perfections. God is incomprehensible to us in the sense (a) that there remains an immeasurably greater part of his being and excellence of which we have and can have no knowledge, and (b) in the sense that even what we know of him we know imperfectly, and at best conceive of very inadequately. In this respect the imperfection of the knowledge which men God is analogous in kind, though indefinitely greater in degree to the imperfection of the knowledge which a child may have of the life of a great philosopher or statesman dwelling in the same city. The child not only knows that the philosopher or statesman in question lives—but he knows also in some real degree what that life is—yet that knowledge is imperfect both in respect to the fact that it apprehends a very small proportion of that life, and that it very imperfectly comprehends even that small proportion.

2nd. The second extreme to be avoided is that of supposing that our knowledge of God is purely illusory, that our conceptions of the divine perfections can not correspond in any degree to the objective reality. Sir Wm. Hamilton, Mr. Mansel, and others hold that all the representations of God conveyed in the Scriptures, and the best conceptions we are with the aid of scripture able to form in our minds, do not at all correspond to the outward reality, but are designed simply to be

accepted not as actual scientific knowledge, but as regulative assumptions “abundantly instructive in point of sentiment and action” and practically sufficient for our present needs; “sufficient to guide our practice, but not to satisfy our intellect—which tell not what God is in himself, but how he wills that we should think of him.” – Mansel’s “ Limits of Religious Thought,” p. 132. This view, although not so intended, really leads to skeptical if not to dogmatic atheism.

(1.) It is founded upon an artificial and inapplicable definition of certain abstract notions entertained by philosophers concerning the “ absolute ” and the “infinite.” As shown below, Question 6, a true definition of the absolute and infinite, in the sense in which the Scriptures and the unsophisticated minds of men hold God to be absolute and infinite, involves no contradictions or absurdities whatsoever.

(2.) It will be shown below, Questions 3 and 5, that there is adequate ground for the assumption that as intellectual and moral beings we are really and truly created in the image of God and therefore capable of knowing him as he really exists.

(3.) If our consciousness and the Sacred Scriptures present us illusory conceptions as to what God is, we have no reason to trust to their assurance that God is.

(4.) This principle leads to absolute skepticism. If our Creator wills that we should think of him as he does not really exist, we have no reason to trust our constitutional instincts or faculties in any department.

(5.) This principle is immoral since it makes a false representation of the divine attributes the regulative principle of man’s moral and religious life.

(6.) The highest and most certain dictates of human reason necessitates the conviction that moral principles, and the essential nature of moral attributes, must be identically the same in all worlds and in all beings possessed of a moral character in any sense. Truth and Justice and loving–kindness must be always and only the same in Creator and creature, in God and man.

3. What is anthropomorphism, and in what different senses the word used?

Anthropomorphism (■νθρωπος, man; μορφη, form) is a phrase employed to designate any view of God’s nature which conceives of him as possessing or exercising any attributes common to him with mankind. The Anthropomorphites in ancient times held that God possessed bodily parts and organs like ours, and hence that all those passages of Scripture which speak of his eyes, hands, etc., are to be interpreted literally. The Pantheists, Sir William Hamilton, and other philosopher designate all our conceptions of God as a personal Spirit etc., as anthropomorphic – that is, as modes of conception not conformed to objective fact, but determined necessarily by the subjective conditions of our own human modes of thought.

It hence follows that this phrase is to be taken in two senses.

1st. A good sense, in which, since man as a free rational spirit was created in the image of God, it is both Scriptural, rational, and according to objective fact, for man to conceive of God as possessing all the essential attributes which belong to our spirits in absolute perfection of kind, and with no limit inconsistent with absolute perfection in degree. When we say that God knows, and wills, and feels, that he is just, true, and merciful, we mean to ascribe to him attributes of the same

kind as the corresponding ones belonging to men, only in absolute perfection, and without limit.

2nd. The word is used in a had sense when it designates any mode of conceiving of God which involves the ascription to him of imperfection or limitation of any kind. Thus to conceive of God as possessing hands or feet, or as experiencing the perturbations of human passion, or the like, is a false and unworthy anthropomorphism.

4. How are we to understand those passages of Scripture which attribute to God bodily parts and the infirmities of human passion? The passages referred to are such as speak of the face of God, Exodus 33:11; Exodus 33:20; his eyes, 2 Chronicles 16:9; his nostrils, 2 Samuel 22:9; 2 Samuel 22:16; his arms and feet, Isaiah 52:10, and Psalms 18:9; and such as speak of his repenting and grieving, Genesis 6:6-7; Jeremiah 15:6; Psalms 95:10; of his being jealous, Deuteronomy 29:20, etc. These are to be understood only as metaphors. They represent the truth with respect to God only analogically, and as seen from our point of view. That God can not be material is shown below, Question 20. When he is said to repent, or to be grieved, or to be jealous, it is only meant that he acts towards us as a man would when agitated by such passions. These metaphors occur principally in the Old Testament, and in highly rhetorical passages of the poetical and prophetical books.

5. State the proof that Anthropomorphic conceptions of God, in the good sense of the word, are both necessary and valid. The fundamental fact upon which all science, all theology, and all religion rests is that God made man a living soul in his own image. Otherwise man could have no understanding of God's works any more than of his nature, and all relations of thought or feeling between them would be impossible. That man has the right thus far to conceive of God as the original and all perfect fountain of the moral and rational qualities in which he is himself endowed is proved.

1st. It is determined by the necessary laws of our nature. (a.) This is a matter of consciousness. If we believe in God at all we must conceive of him as a rational and righteous personal spirit. (b.) Such a conception of God has universally prevailed even amidst the degrading adulterations of heathen mythology.

2nd. We have no other possible mode of knowing God. The alternative ever must be the principle for which we contend, or absolute atheism.

3rd. The same is determined by the necessities of our moral nature. The innate and indestructible moral nature of man includes a sense of subjection to a righteous will superior to ourselves, and accountability to a moral Governor. This is nonsense unless the moral Governor is in our sense of the word an intelligent and righteous personal spirit.

4th. The most enduring and satisfactory argument for establishing the facts of God's existence is the a posteriori argument from the evidences of "design" in the works of God. If this argument has any force to prove that God is, it has equal force to prove that he must possess and exercise intelligence, benevolent intention and choice, i. e., that he must be in our sense of the terms an intelligent personal spirit.

5th. The Scriptures characteristically ascribe the same attributes to God, and everywhere assume their existence.

6th. God manifested in the person of Jesus Christ, who is the express image of his person, has in all situations exhibited these very attributes, yet in such a way as to prove himself to be God as truly as he was man.

6. What is the meaning of the terms “infinite” and “absolute,” and in what sense are they applied to the being of God, and to his attributes severally?

Hamilton and Mansel define the infinite “that which is free from all possible limitation; that than which a greater is inconceivable, and which, consequently, can receive no additional attributes or mode of existence which it had not from eternity;” and the absolute as“that which exists by itself, having no necessary relations to any other being.” Hence they argue (a) that that which is infinite and absolute must include the sum total of all things, evil and good, actual and possible; for if any thing actual or possible is excluded from it, it must be finite and relative; (b) that it can not be an object of knowledge for to know is both to limit—to define – and to bring into relation to the one knowing; (c) that it can not be a person, for personal consciousness implies limitation and change; (d) that it cannot know other things, because to know implies relation as before said.—Hamilton’s “Discussions,” Art. 1; Mansel’s “ Limits of Religious Thought,” Lectures 1, 2, 3.

All of this logical bewilderment results from these philosophers starting from the false premise of an abstract, notional “infinite” and “absolute” and substituting their definition of that in the place of the true infinite and absolute person revealed in Scripture and consciousness as the first cause of all things, the moral Governor and Redeemer of mankind.

“ Infinite” means that which has no limits. When we say is infinite in his being, or in his knowledge or in his power, we mean that his essence and the active properties thereof, have no limitations which involve imperfections of any kind whatsoever. He transcends all the limitations of time and space, he knows all things in an absolutely perfect manner. He is able to effect whatsoever he wills to effect with or without means, and with facility and success. When say that God is infinite in his justice, or his goodness, or his truth, they mean that his inexhaustible and unchangeable being possesses these properties in absolute perfection.

“Absolute” when applied to the being of God signifies that he is an eternal self–existent person, who existed before all other beings, and is the intelligent and voluntary cause of whatsoever else has or will exist in the universe, etc., that he sustains, consequently, no necessary relation to any thing without Himself. Whatever exists is conditioned upon God, as the circle is conditioned upon its center, but God himself neither in his existence, nor in any of the modes or states of it, is conditioned upon any of his creatures, nor upon his creation as a whole. God is what he is because he is, and he wills whatsoever he does will because “ it seemeth good in his sight.” All other things are what they are because God has willed them to be as they are. Whatsoever relation He sustains to any thing without himself is voluntarily assumed.

7. In what different ways do the Scriptures reveal God?

They reveal God—

1st. By his names.

2nd. By the works which they ascribe to him.

3rd. By the attributes which they predicate of him.

4th. By the worship they direct to be paid to him.

5th. By the manifestation of God in Christ.

8. State the etymology(linguistic development) and meaning of the several names appropiated to God in the Scriptures.

1st.JEHOVAH, from the Hebrew verb ■■■■■ to be. It expresses self–existence and unchangeableness; it is the incommunicable name of God, which the Jews superstitiously refused to pronounce always substituting in their reading the word Adonai, Lord. Hence it is represented in our English version by the word LORD, printed in capital letters.

JAH, probably an abbreviation of the name Jehovah, is used principally in the Psalms.—Psalms 18:4. It constitutes the concluding syllable of hallelujah, praise Jehovah.

God gave to Moses his peculiar name, “I AM THAT I AM,”Exodus 3:14, from the same root, and bearing the same fundamental significance as Jehovah.

2nd. El, might, power, translated God, and applied alike to the true and to the false gods.—Isaiah 44:10.

3rd. ELOHIM and ELOAH, the same name in its singular and plural form, derived from ■■■■■to fear, reverence.“In its singular form it is used only in the latter books and in poetry.” In the plural form it is sometimes used with a plural sense for gods, but more commonly as a pluralis excellentice, for God. It is applied to false gods, but pre–eminently, to Jehovah as the great object of adoration.

4th. ADONAI, the Lord, a pluralis excellentice, applied exclusively to God, expressing possession and sovereign dominion, equivalent to κυριο, Lord, so frequently applied to Christ in the New Testament.

5th. SADDAI, almighty a pluralis excellentice. Sometimes it stands by itself. – Job 5:17; and sometimes combined with a preceding El.—Genesis 17:1.

6th. ELYON, Most High a verbal adjective from ■■■■■ to go up, ascend. – Psalms 9:3; Psalms 21:8.

7th. The term TZEBAOTH, of hosts, is frequently used as an epithet qualifying one of the above–mentioned names of God. Thus, Jehovah of Hosts, God of Hosts, Jehovah, God of Hosts.–Amos 4:13; Psalms 24:10. Some have thought this equivalent to God of Battles. The true force of the epithet, however, is “sovereign of the stars, material hosts of heaven, and of the angels their inhabitants.”—Dr. J. A. Alexander, “Commentary on Psalms 24:10,” and Gesenius’s “ Heb. Lex.”

8th. Many other epithets are applied to God metaphorically, to set forth the relation he sustains to us and the offices he fulfills, e.g., King, Lawgiver, Judge.—Isaiah 33:17; Psalms 24:8; Psalms 1:6. Rock, Fortress, Tower, Deliverer.—2 Samuel 22:2-3; Psalms 62:2. Shepherd, Husbandman.—Psalms 23:1; John 15:1. Father. – Matthew 6:9; John 20:17, etc.

9. What are the divine attributes? The divine attributes are the perfections which are predicated of the divine essence in the Scriptures, or visibly exercised by God in his works of creation and providence and redemptions. They are not properties or states of the divine essence separable in tact or idea from the divine essence, as the properties and modes of every created thing are separable from the essence of the creature. God's knowledge is his essence knowing, and his love is his essence loving, and his will is his essence willing, and all these are not latent capacities of action, nor changing states, but co–existent and eternally unchangeable states of the divine essence which in state and mode as well as in existence is "the same yesterday, today and forever " and " without variableness or shadow of turning."

Concerning the nature and operations of God, we can know only what he has granted to reveal to us, and with every conception, either of his being or his acts, there must always attend an element of incomprehensibility, which is inseparable from infinitude. His knowledge and power are as truly beyond all understanding as his eternity or immensity.—Job 11:7-9; Job 26:14; Psalms 139:5-6; Isaiah 40:28. The moral elements of his glorious nature are the norm or original type of our moral faculties; thus we are made capable of comprehending the ultimate principles of truth and justice upon which he acts. Truth and justice and goodness are of course the same in essence in God and in angel and in man. Yet his action upon those principles is often a trial of our faith, and an occasion of our adoring wonder.—Romans 11:33-36; Isaiah 55:8-9.

10. What do theologians mean by the phrase SIMPLICITY, when applied to God? The term simplicity is used, first, in opposition to material composition whether mechanical, organic, or chemical; second, in a metaphysical sense in negation of the relation of substance and property, essence and mode. In the first sense of the word human souls are simple, because they are not composed of elements, parts, or organs. In the second sense of the word our souls are complex, since there is in them a distinction between their essence and their properties, and their successive modes or states of existence. As, however, God is infinite, eternal, self–existent from eternity, necessarily the same without succession, theologians have maintained that in him essence, and property and mode are one. He always is what he is; and his various states of intellection, emotion, and volition are not successive and transient but co–existent and permanent He is what he is essentially, and by the same necessity that he exists. Whatever is in God, whether thought, emotion, volition, or act, is God.

Some men conceive of God as passing through various transient modes and states just as men do, and therefore they suppose the properties of the divine nature are related to the divine essence as the properties of created things are related to the essences which are endowed with them. Others press the idea of simplicity so far that they deny any distinction in the divine attributes in themselves, and suppose that the only difference between them is to be found in the mode of external manifestation, and in the effects produced. They illustrate their idea by the various effects produced on different objects by the same radiance of the sun. In order to avoid both extremes theologians have been accustomed to say that the divine attributes differ from the divine essence and from one another, 1st, not realiter or as one thing differs from another, or in any such way as to imply composition in God. Nor 2d, merely nominaliter, as though there were nothing in God really corresponding to our of conception of his perfections. But 3d, they are said to differ literally so that there is in him a foundation or adequate reason for all the representations which are made in Scripture with regard to the divine perfections, and for the consequent

conceptions which we have of them.—Turretin's "Institutio Theologicae," Locus 3., Ques. 5 and 7, and Dr. C. Hodge's " Lectures."

11. State the different principles upon which the divine attributes are generally classified. From the vastness of the subject and the incommensurateness of our faculties, it is evident that no classification of the divine attributes we can form can be any thing more than approximately accurate and complete. The most common classifications rest upon the following principles:

1st. They are distinguished as absolute and relative. An absolute attribute is a property of the divine essence considered in itself:e. g., self–existence, immensity, eternity, intelligence. A relative attribute is a property of the divine essence considered in relation to the creation:e.g., omnipresence, omniscience, etc.

2nd. They are also distinguished as affirmative and negative An affirmative attribute is one which expresses some positive perfection of the divine essence:e. g., omnipresence, omnipotence, etc. A negative attribute is one which:denies all defect or limitation of any kind to God:e. g., immutability, infinitude, incomprehensibility, etc.

3rd. The attributes of God, distinguished as communicable and incommunicable. The communicable are those to which the attributes of the human spirit bear the nearest analogy:e. g., his power, knowledge, will, goodness, and righteousness. The incommunicable are those to which there is in the creature nothing analogous, as eternity, immensity, etc. This distinction, however, must not be pressed too far. God is infinite in his relation to space and time; we are finite in our relation to both. But he is no less infinite as to his knowledge, will, goodness, and righteousness in all their modes, and we are finite in all these respects. All God's attributes known to us, or conceivable by us, are communicable, inasmuch as they have their analogy in us, but they are all alike incommunicable, in as much as they are all infinite.

4th. The attributes of God, distinguished as natural and moral. The natural are all those which pertain to his existence as an infinite, rational Spirit:e. g., eternity, immensity, intelligence, will, power. The moral are those additional attributes which belong to him as an infinite, righteous Spirit:e. g., justice, mercy, truth.

I would diffidently propose the following fourfold classification:

(1.) Those attributes which equally qualify all the rest— Infinitude, that which has no bounds; absoluteness, that which is determined either in its being, or modes of being or action, by nothing whatsoever without itself. This includes immutability.

(2.) Natural attributes. God is an infinite Spirit, self– existent, eternal, immense, simple, free of will, intelligent, powerful.

(3.) Moral attributes. God is a Spirit infinitely righteous, good, true faithful.

(4.) The consummate glory of all the divine perfections in union. The beauty of HOLINESS. THE UNITY OF GOD.

12. In what two senses of the word is UNITY predicated of God?

1st. God is unique:there is only one God to the exclusion of all others.

2nd. Notwithstanding the threefold personal distinction in the unity of the Godhead, yet these three Persons are numerically one substance or essence, and constitute one indivisible God.

13. How may the proposition, that God is one and indivisible, be proved?

1st. There appears to be a necessity in reason for conceiving of God as one. That which is absolute and infinite can not but be one and indivisible in essence. If God is not one, then it will necessarily follow that there are more gods than one.

2nd. The uniform representation of Scripture.—John 10:30.

14. Prove from Scripture that the proposition, there is but one God, is true.

Deuteronomy 6:4; 1 Kings 8:60; Isaiah 44:6; Mark 12:29; Mark 12:32; 1 Corinthians 8:4; Ephesians 4:6.

15. What is the argument from the harmony of creation in favor of the divine unity? The whole creation, between the outermost range of telescopic and of microscopic observation, is manifestly one indivisible system. But we have already (Chapter 2.) proved the existence of God from the phenomena of the universe; and we now argue, upon the same principle, that if, an effect proves the prior operation of a cause, and if traces of design prove a designer, then singleness of plan and operation in that design and its execution prove that the designer Is ONE.

16. What is the argument upon this point from necessary existance? The existence of God is said to be necessary, because it has its cause from eternity in itself. It is the same in all duration and in all space alike. It is absurd to conceive of God not existing at any time or in any portion of space, while all other existence whatsoever, depending upon his mere will, is contingent. But the necessity which is uniform in all times and in every portion of space, is evidently only one and indivisible, and can be the ground of the existence only of one God. This argument:is logical, and has been prized highly by many distinguished theologians. It however appears to involve the error of presuming human logic to be the measure of existence.

17. What is the argument from infinite perfection, in proof that there can be but one God?

God is infinite in his being and in all of his perfection's. But the infinite, by including all, excludes all others, of the same kind. If there were two infinite beings, each would necessarily include the other, and be included by it, and thus they would be the same, one and identical. It is certain that the idea of the co–existence of two infinitely perfect beings is as repugnant to human reason as to Scripture.

18. What is polytheism? And what dualism?

Polytheism, as the etymology of the word indicates, is a general term designating every system of religion which teaches the existence of a plurality of gods.

Dualism is the designation of that system which recognizes two original and independent principles in the universe, the one good and the other evil. At present these principles are in a relation of ceaseless antagonism, the good ever struggling to oppose the evil, and to deliver its province from its baneful intrusion. THE SPIRITUALITY OF GOD.

19. What is affirmed and what is denied in the proposition that God is a Spirit?

We know nothing of substance except as it is manifested by its properties. Matter is that substance whose properties manifest themselves directly to our bodily senses. Spirit is that substance whose properties manifest themselves to us directly in sell consciousness, and only inferentially by words and other signs or modes of expression through our senses. When we say God is a Spirit we mean— Negatively, that he does not possess bodily or that he is composed of no material elements; that he is not subject to any of the limiting conditions of material existence; and, consequently, that he is not to be apprehended as the object of any of our bodily senses.

2nd. Positively, that he is a rational being, who distinguishes with infinite precision between the true and the false; that he is a moral being, who distinguishes between the right and the wrong; that he is a free agent, whose action is self–determined by his own will; and, in fine, that all the essential properties of our spirits may truly be predicated of him in an infinite degree. This great truth is inconsistent with the doctrine that God is the soul of the world (anirna mundi) a plastic organizing force inseparable from matter; also with the Gnostic doctrine of emanation, and with all forms of modern Materialism and Pantheism.

20. Exhibit the proof that God is a Spirit.

1st. It is explicitly asserted in Scripture.—John 4:24.

2nd. It follows from our idea of infinite and absolute perfections. Matter is obviously inferior to Spirit, and inseparable from many kinds of imperfections and limitations. Matter consisting of separate and ceaselessly reacting atoms cannot be “one,” nor “infinite”, nor “immutable, ” etc. The idea that matter may be united with spirit in God, as it is in man, is felt to degrade him, and bind him fast under the limitations of time and space.

3rd. There is no trace anywhere of material properties in the Creator and Providential Governor of the universe—whereas all the evidence that a God exists conspires to prove also that he is a supremely wise, benevolent, righteous, and power person—that is, that he is a personal spirit.

GOD’ S RELATION TO SPACE.

21. What is meant by the immensity of God? The immensity of God is the phrase used to express the fact that God is infinite in his relation to space, i. e., that the entire indivisible essence of God is at every moment of time cotempopresent to every point of infinite space. This is not in virtue of the infinite multiplication of his Spirit, since He is eternally one and individual; nor does it result from the infinite diffusion of his essence through infinite space, as air is diffused over the surface of the earth, since, being a Spirit he is not composed of parts, nor is he capable of extension, but the whole Godhead in the one indivisible essence is equally present in every moment of eternal duration to the whole of infinite space, and to every part of it.

22. How does immensity differ from omnipresence?

Immensity characterizes the relation of God to space viewed abstractly in itself. Omnipresence characterizes the relation of God to his creatures as they severally occupy their several positions in space. The divine essence is immense in its own being, absolutely. It is omnipresent relatively to all his creatures.

23. What are the different modes of the divine presence, and how may it be proved that He is everywhere present as to His essence?

God may be conceived of as present in any place, or with any creature, in several modes, first, as to his essence; second, as to his knowledge; third, as manifesting that presence to any intelligent creature; fourth, as exercising his power in any way, in or upon the creature. As to essence and knowledge, his presence is the same everywhere and always. As to his self–manifestation and the exercise of his power, his presence differs endlessly in different cases in degree and mode. Thus God is present to the church as he is not to the world. Thus He is present in hell in the manifestation and execution of righteous wrath, while He is present in heaven in the manifestation and communication of gracious love and glory.

24. Prove that God is omnipresent as to His essence. That God is everywhere present as to his essence is proved, first from Scripture (1 Kings 8:27; Psalms 139:7-10; Isaiah 66:1; Acts 17:27-28); second, from reason.

(1.) It follows necessarily from his infinitude.

(2.) From the fact that his knowledge is his essence knowing, and his actions are his essence acting. Yet his knowledge and his power reach to all things.

25. State the different relations that bodies, created spirits, and God sustain to space.

Turretin says:Bodies are conceived of as existing in space circumscriptively, because occupying a certain portion of space they are bounded by space upon every side. Created spirits do not occupy any portion of space, nor are they embraced by any, they are, however, in space definitely, as here and not there. God, on the other hand, is in space abundantly, because in a transcendental manner His essence fills all space. He is included in no space; he is excluded from none. Wholly present to each point, he comprehends all space at once.

Time and Space are neither substances, nor qualities, nor mere relations. They constitute a genus by themselves, absolutely distinct from all other entities, and therefore defying classification. We know that space and time exist; we know on sufficient evidence that God exists; but we have no means of knowing how space and time stand related to God. THE RELATION OF GOD TO TIME.

26. What is eternity?

Eternity is infinite duration; duration discharged from all limits, without beginning, without succession, and without end. The schoolmen phrase it a punctum stans, an ever–abiding present.

We, however, can positively conceive of eternity only as duration indefinitely extended from the present moment in two directions, as to the past and as to the future, improperly expressed as eternity a parte ante, or past, and eternity a parse post, or future. The eternity of God, however, is one and indivisible. Externitas est una individua et tote simul.

27. What is time?

Time is limited duration, measured by succession, either of thought or motion. It is distinguished in reference to our perceptions into past, present, and future.

28. What relation does time bear to eternity?

Eternity, the unchanging present, without beginning or end, comprehends all time, and co–exists as an undivided moment, with all the successions of time as they appear and pass in their order.

Thought is possible to us, however, only under the limitations of time and space. We can conceive of God only under the finite fashion of first purposing and then acting, of first promising or threatening and then fulfilling his word, etc. He that inhabiteth eternity infinitely transcends our understanding. Isaiah 57:15.

29. When we say that God is eternal, what do we affirm and what do we deny?

We affirm, first, that as to his existence, he never had any beginning, and never will have any end; second, that as to the mode of his existence, his thoughts, emotions, purposes, and acts are, without succession, one and inseparable, the same forever; third, that he is immutable.

We deny, first, that he ever had a beginning or ever will have an end; second, that his states or of occur in succession; third, that his essence, attributes, or purposes will ever change.

30. In what sense are the acts of God spoken of as past, present, and future? The acts of God are never past, present, or future as respects God himself, but only in respect to the objects and effects of his acts in the creature. The efficient purpose comprehending the precise object, time, and circumstance was present to him always and changelessly; the event, however, taking place in the creature occurs in time, and is thus past, present, or future to our observation.

31. In what sense are events past or future as it regards God? As God's knowledge is infinite, every event must, first, be ever equally present to his knowledge from eternity to eternity; second, these events must be know to him as they actually occur in themselves, e. a., in their true nature, relations, and such– This distinction, therefore, holds true—God's knowledge of all events is without beginning, end, or succession; but he knows them as in themselves occurring in the successions of time, past, present, or future, relatively to one another. THE IMMUTABILITY OF GOD.

32. What is meant by the immutability of God? By his immutability we mean that it follows from the infinite perfection of God; that he can not be changed by any thing from without himself; and that he will not change from any principle within himself that as to his essence, his will, and his states of existence, he is the same from eternity to eternity. Thus he is absolutely immutable in himself. He is also immutable relatively to the creature, inasmuch as his knowledge, purpose, and truth, as these are conceived by us and are revealed to us, can know neither variableness nor shadow of turning—James 1:17.

33. Prove from Scripture and reason that God is immutable.

1st. Scripture: Malachi 3:6; Psalms 33:11; Isaiah 46:10; James 1:17.

2nd.

(1.) God is self–existent. As he is caused by none, but causes all, so he can be changed by none, but changes all.

(2.) He is the absolute being. Neither his existence, nor the manner of it, nor his will, are determined by any necessary relation which they sustain to any thing exterior to himself. As he preceded all and caused all, so his sovereign will freely determined the relations which all things are permitted to sustain to him.

(3.) He is infinite in duration, and therefore he cannot know succession or change.

(4.) He is infinite in all perfection, knowledge, wisdom, righteousness, benevolence, will, power, and therefore cannot change, for nothing can be added to the infinite nor taken from it. Any change would make him either less than infinite before, or less than infinite afterwards.

34. How can the creation of the world and the incarnation of the Son be reconciled with the immutability of God?

1st. As to the creation. The effective purpose, the will and power to create the world dwelleth in God from eternity without change, but this very efficacious purpose itself provided that the effect should take place in its proper time and order. This effect took place from God, but of course involved no shadowy of change in God, as nothing was either taken from him or added to him.

2nd. As to the incarnation. The divine Son assumed a created human nature into personal union with himself. His uncreated essence of course was not changed. His eternal person was not changed in itself, but only brought into a new relation. The change effected by that stupendous event occurred only in the created nature of the man Christ Jesus. THE INFINITE INTELLIGENCE OF GOD.

35. How does God’s mode of knowing differ from from ours?

God’s knowledge is, 1st, his essence knowing; 2d, it is one eternal, all–comprehensive, indivisible act.

(1.) It is not discursive, i. e., proceeding logically from the known to the unknown; but intuitive, i. e., discerning all things directly in its own light.

(2.) It is independent, i. e., it does in no way depend upon his creatures or their actions, but solely upon his own infinite intuition of all things possible in the light of his own reason, and of all things actual and future in the light of his own eternal purpose.

(3.) It is total and simultaneous, not successive. It is one single, indivisible act of intuition, beholding all things in themselves, their relations and successions, as ever present.

(4.) It is perfect and essential, not relative, i. e., he knows all things directly in their hidden essences, while we know them only by their properties, as they stand related to our senses.

(5.) We know the present imperfectly, the past we remember dimly, the future we know not at all but God knows all things, past, present, and future, by one total, unsuccessive, all comprehensive vision.

36. How has this divine perfection been defined by theologians?

Locus 3., Q. 12.—“ Concerning the knowledge of God, before all else, two things are to be considered, viz.. its mode and its object. The Mode of the divine knowledge consists in this, that he

perfectly, individually, distinctly, and immutably knows all things, and his knowledge is thus distinguished from the knowledge of men and angels. He knows all things perfectly, because he has known them through himself or his own essence, and not by the phenomena of things, as the creatures know objects. 2. He knows all things individually because he knows them intuitively, by a direct act of cognition, and not inferentially, by a process of discursive reasoning, or by comparing one thing with another. 3. He knows all things distinctly, not that he unites by a different conception the various predicates of things, but that he sees through all things by one most distinct act of intuition, and nothing, even the least thing, escapes him. 4. And he knows all immutably because that with him there is no shadow of change, and he remaining himself unmoved, moves all things, and so perceives all the various changes of things, by one immutable act of cognition."

37. How may the objects of divine knowledge be classified?

1st. God himself in his own infinite being. It is evident that this, transcending the sum of all other objects is the only adequate object of a knowledge really infinite.

2nd. All possible objects, as such, whether they are or ever have been, or ever will be or not, seen in the light of his own infinite reason.

3rd. All things actual, which have been, are, or will be, he comprehends in one eternal, simultaneous act of knowledge, as ever present actualities to him, and as known to be such in the light of his own sovereign and eternal purpose.

38. What is the technical designation of the knowledge of things possible, and what is the foundation of that knowledge? Its technical designation is scientia simplicis intelligentiae knowledge of simple intelligence, so called, because it is conceived by us as an act simply of the divine intellect, without any concurrent act of the divine will. For the same reason it has been styled scientia necessaria, necessary knowledge, i. e., not voluntary, or determined by will. The foundation of that knowledge is God's essential and infinitely perfect knowledge of his own omnipotence.

39. What is the technical designation of the knowledge of things actual, whether past, present, or future, and what is the foundation of that knowledge?

It is called scientia visions, knowledge of vision, and scientia libera, free knowledge, because his intellect is in this case conceived of as being determined by a concurrent act of his will. The foundation of this knowledge is God's infinite knowledge of his own all–comprehensive and unchangeable eternal purpose.

40. Prove that the knowledge of God extends to future contingent events. The contingency of events in our view of them has a twofold ground:first, their immediate causes may be by us indeterminate, as in the case of the dice; second, their immediate cause may be the volition of a free agent. The first class are in no sense contingent in God's view. The second class are foreknown by him as contingent in their cause, but as none the less certain in their event. That he does foreknow all such is certain— Scripture affirms it.—1 Samuel 23:11-12; Acts 2:23; Acts 15:18; Isaiah 46:9-10.

2nd. He has often predicted contingent events future, at the time of the prophecy, which has been fulfilled in the event. Mark 14:30.

3rd. God is infinite in all his perfections, his knowledge, therefore, must (1) be perfect, and comprehend all things future as well as past, (2) independent of the creature. He knows all things in themselves by his own light, and can not depend upon the will of the creature to make his knowledge either more certain or more complete.

41. How can the certainty of the foreknowledge of God be reconciled with the freedom of moral agents in their acts? The difficulty here presented is of this nature. God's foreknowledge is certain; the event, therefore, must be certainly future; if certainly future, how can the agent be free in enacting it. In order to avoid this difficulty some theologians, on the one hand, have denied the reality of man's moral freedom, while others, on the other hand, have maintained that, God's knowledge being free, he voluntarily abstains from knowing what his creatures endowed with free agency will do.

We remark— God's certain foreknowledge of all future events and man's free agency are both certain facts, impregnably established by independent evidence. We must believe both, whether we can reconcile them or not.

2nd. Although necessity is inconsistent with liberty, moral certainty is not, as is abundantly shown in Chapter 15., Question 25.

42. What is scientia media? This is the technical designation of God's knowledge of future contingent events, presumed, by the authors of this distinction, to depend not upon the eternal purpose of God making the event certain, but upon the free act of the creature as foreseen by a special intuition. It is called scientia media, middle knowledge, because it is supposed to occupy a middle ground between the knowledge of simple intelligence and the knowledge of vision. It differs from the former, since its object is not all possible things, but a special class of things actually future. It differs from the latter, since its ground is not the eternal purpose of God, but the free action of the creature as simply foreseen.

43. By whom was this distinction introduced, and for what purpose? By Luis Molina, a Jesuit, born 1535 and died 1601, professor of theology in the University of Evora, Portugal, in his work entitled "Liberi arbitrii cum gratae donis, divine praescientia, praedestinatione et reprobatione concordia." —Ha– " Hist. of Doc.," vol. 2, p. 280. It was devised for the purpose of explaining how God might certainly foreknow what his free creatures would do in the absence of any sovereign foreordination on his part, determining their action. Thus making his foreordination of men to happiness or misery to depend upon his foreknowledge of their faith and obedience, and denying that his foreknowledge depends upon his sovereign foreordination.

44. What are the arguments against the validity of this distinction?

1st. The arguments upon which it is based are untenable. Its advocates plead—

(1.) Scripture.—1 Samuel 23:9-12; Matthew 11:22-23.

(2.) That this distinction is obviously necessary, in order to render the mode of the divine foreknowledge consistent with man's free agency. To the first argument we answer, that the events mentioned in the above–cited passages of Scripture were not future. They simply teach that God, knowing all causes, free and necessary, knows how they would act under any proposed condition. Even we know that if we add fire to powder an explosion would ensue. This comes

under the first class we cited above (Question 38), or the knowledge of all possible things. To the second argument we answer, that the certain foreknowledge of God involves the certainty of the future free act of his creature as much as his foreordination does; and that the sovereign foreordination of God, with respect to the free acts of men, only makes them certainly future and does not in the least provide for causing those acts in any other way than by the free will of the creature himself acting freely.

2nd. This middle knowledge is unnecessary, because all possible objects of knowledge, all possible things, and all things actually to be, have already been embraced under the two classes already cited (Questions 38, 39).

3rd. If God certainly foreknows any future event, then it must be certainly future, and he must have foreknown it to be certainly future, either because it was antecedently certain, or because his foreknowing it made it certain. If his foreknowing it made it certain, then his foreknowledge involves foreordination. If it was antecedently certain, then we ask, what could have made it certain, except what we affirm, the decree of God, either to cause it himself immediately, or to cause it through some necessary second cause, or that some free agent should cause it freely? We can only choose between the foreordination of God and a blind fate.

4th. This view makes the knowledge of God to depend upon the acts of his creatures exterior to himself:This is both absurd and impious, if God is infinite, eternal, and absolute.

5th. The Scriptures teach that God does foreordain as well as foreknow the free acts of men.—Isaiah 10:5-15; Acts 2:23; Acts 4:27-28.

45. How does wisdom differ from knowledge, and wherein does the wisdom of God consist?

Knowledge is a simple act of the understanding, apprehending that a thing is, and comprehending its nature and relations, or how it is.

Wisdom presupposes knowledge, and is the practical use which the understanding, determined by the will, makes of the material of knowledge. God’s wisdom is infinite and eternal. It is conceived of by us as selecting the highest possible end, the manifestation of his own glory, and then in selecting and directing in every department of his operations the best possible means to secure that end. This wisdom is gloriously manifested to us in the great theaters of creation, providence, and grace. THE INFINITE POWER OF GOD.

46. What is meant by the omnipotence of God?

Power is that efficiency which, by an essential law of thought, we recognize as inherent in a cause in relation to its effect. God is the uncaused first cause, and the causal efficiency of his will is absolutely unlimited by anything outside of the divine perfection themselves.

47. What distinction has been marked between the Potestas absoluta and the Potestas ordinata of God? The Scriptures and right reason teach us that the causal efficiency of God is not confined to the universe of second causes, and their active properties and laws. The phrase Potestas absoluta(absolute rule) expresses the omnipotence of God absolutely considered in himself and specifically that infinite reserve of power which remains with him as a free personal attribute, above and beyond all the powers of nature and his ordinary providential actings upon and through

them. Creation, miracles, etc., are exercises of this power of God. The Potestas ordinata(order of rule) on the other hand is the power of God as it is now exercised in and through the established system of second causes, in the ordinary course of Providence. Rationalists and advocates of mere naturalism, who deny miracles, and any form of divine interference with the established order of nature, of course admit only the latter and deny the former mode of divine power.

48. In what sense is the power of God limited and in what sense is it unlimited?

We are conscious with respect to our own causal efficiency.

1st. That it is very limited. We have direct control only over the course of our thoughts, and the contractions of a few muscles. 2d. That we depend upon the use of means to produce the effects we design. 3d. We are dependent upon outward circumstances which limit and condition us continually. The power inherent in the divine will on the other hand can produce whatever effects he intends immediately, and when he condescends to use means he freely endows them with whatever efficiency they possess. All outward circumstances of every kind are his own creation, conditioned upon his will, and therefore incapable of limiting him in any way. He is absolutely unlimited in the exercise of his power. He can not do wrong, nor work contradictions, because his power is the causal efficiency of an infinitely rational and righteous essence. His power therefore is limited only by his own perfections.

49. Is the distinction in us between power and will a perfection or a defect and does it exist in God?

It is objected that if our power was equal to our design, and every volition resulted immediately in act, we would not be conscious of the difference between power and will. We admit that when a man's power fails to be commensurate with his will it is a defect,and that this never is the case with God. But on the other hand when a man is conscious that he possesses powers which he might but does not will to exercise, he is conscious that it is an excellence—and that his nature is the more perfect for the possession of such reserves of power than it would otherwise be. To hold that there is nothing in God which is not in actual exercise, that his power extends no further than his will, is to make him no greater than his finite creation. The actions of a great man impress us chiefly as the exponents of vastly greater power which remains in reserve. So it is with God.

50. How can absolute omnipotence be prayed to belong to God?

1st. It is asserted by Scripture. Jeremiah 32:17; Matthew 19:26; Luke 1:37; Revelation 19:6.

2nd. It is necessarily involved in the very idea of God as an infinite being.

3rd. Although we have seen but part of his ways (Job 26:14), yet our constantly extending experience is ever revealing to us new and more astonishing evidences of his power, which always indicate an inexhaustible reserve. THE WILL OF GOD.

51. What is meant by the will of God? The will of God is the infinitely and eternally wise, powerful, and righteous essence of God willing. In our conception it is that attribute of the Deity to which we refer his purposes and decrees as their principle.

52. In what sense is the will of God said to be free, and in what sense necessary? The will of God is the wise, powerful, and righteous essence of God willing. His will, therefore, in every act is

certainly and yet most freely both wise and righteous. The liberty of indifference is evidently foreign to his nature, because the perfection of wisdom is to choose the most wisely, and the perfection of righteousness is to choose the most righteously. On the other hand, the will of God is from eternity absolutely independent of all his creatures and all their actions.

53. What is intended by the distinction between the decretive and the preceptive will of God? The decretive will of God is God efficaciously purposing the certain futurition of events. The preceptive will of God is God, as moral governor, commanding his moral creatures to do that which he sees it right and wise that they in their circumstances should do.

These are not inconsistent. What he wills as our duty may very consistently be different from what he wills as his purpose. What it is right for him to permit may be wrong for him to approve, or for us to do.

54. What is meant by the distinction between the secret and revealed will of God? The secret will of God is his decretive will, called secret. because although it is sometimes revealed to man in the prophecies and promises of the Bible, yet it is for the most part hidden in God. The revealed will of God is his preceptive will, which is always clearly set forth as the rule of our duty.—Deuteronomy 29:29.

55. In what sense do the Armenians maintain the distinction between the antecedent and consequent will of God, and what are the objections to their view of the subject? This is a distinction invented by the schoolmen, and adopted by the Armenians, for reconciling the will of God with their theory of the free agency of man.

They call that an antecedent act of God's will which precedes the action of the creature, e. a., before Adam sinned God willed him to be happy. They call that a consequent act of God's will which followed the act of the creature, and is consequent upon that act, e. a., after Adam sinned God willed him to suffer the penalty due to his sin.

It is very evident that this distinction does not truly represent the nature of God's will, and its relation to the acts of his creatures:first, God is eternal, and therefore there can be no distinction in his purposes as to time; second, God is eternally omniscient and omnipotent. If he wills any thing, therefore, he must from the beginning will the means to accomplish it, and thus secure the attainment of the end willed. Otherwise God must have, at the same time, two inconsistent wills with regard to the same object. The truth is that God, eternally and unchangeable, by one comprehensive act of will, willed all that happened to Adam from beginning to end in the precise order an succession in which each event occurred; third, God is infinitely independent. It is degrading to God to conceive of him as first willing that which he has no power to effect, and then changing his will consequently to the independent acts of his creatures.

It is true, indeed, that because of the natural limits of our capacities we necessarily conceive of the several intentions of God's one, eternal, indivisible purpose, as sustaining a certain logical (not temporal), relation to each other as principal and consequent. Thus we conceive of God's first (in logical order) decreeing to create man, then to permit him to fall, then to elect some to everlasting life, and then to provide a redemption.—Turretin.

56. In what sense do Armenians hold the distinction between the absolute and conditional will of God, and what are the objecttions to that view? In their views that is the absolute will of God which is suspended upon no condition without himself, e. g., his decree to create man. That is the conditional will of God which is suspended upon a condition, e. g., his decree to save those that believe i. e., on condition of their faith.

It is evident that this view is entirely inconsistent with the nature of God as an eternal, self existent, independent being, infinite in all his perfections. It degrades him to the position of being simply a coordinate part of the creation, mutually limiting and being limited by the creature. The mistake results from detaching a fragment of God's will from the one whole, all–comprehensive, eternal purpose. It is evident that, when properly viewed as eternal and one, God's purpose must comprehend all conditions, as well as their consequence God's will is suspended upon no condition, but he eternally wills the event as suspended upon its condition, and its condition as determining the event.

It is admitted by all that God's preceptive will, as expressed in commands, promises, and threatenings, is often suspended upon condition. If we believe we shall certainly be saved. This is the relation which God has immutably established between faith as the condition, and salvation as the consequent, i. e., faith is the condition of salvation. But this is something very different from saying that the faith of Paul was the condition of God's eternal purpose to save him, because the same purpose determined the faith as the condition. and the salvation as its consequent. See further, Chapter 10.. on the decrees.

57. In what sense is the will of God said to be eternal?

It is one eternal, unsuccessive, all–comprehensive act, absolutely determining either to effect or to permit all things, in all of their relations, conditions, and successions, which ever were, are, or ever will be.

58. In what sense may the will of God be said to be the rule of righteousness?

It is evident that in the highest sense, with respect to God willing, his mere will cannot be regarded as the ultimate ground of all righteousness, any more than it can be as the ultimate ground of all wisdom. Because, in that case, it would follow, first, that there would be no essential difference between right and wrong in themselves, but only a difference arbitrarily constituted by God himself; and, second, that it would be senseless to ascribe righteousness to God, for then that would be merely to say that he wills as he wills. The truth is, that his will acts as his infinitely righteous wisdom sees to be right. On the other hand, God's revealed will is to us the absolute and ultimate rule of righteousness, alike when he commands things in themselves indifferent, and thus makes them right, as when he commands things in themselves essentially right, because they are right. THE ABSOLUTE JUSTICE OF GOD.

59. What is meant by the distinctions, absolute and relative, rectoral, distributive, and punitive or vindicatory justice of God? The absolute justice of God is the infinite moral perfection or universal righteousness of his own being. The relative justice of God is his infinitely righteous nature, viewed as exercised in his relation to his moral creatures, as their moral governor. This last is called rectoral, when viewed as exercised generally in administering the affairs of his universal government, in providing for and governing his creatures and their actions. It is called distributive,

when viewed as exercised in giving unto each creature his exact proportionate due of rewards or punishment. It is called punitive or vindicatory, when viewed as demanding and inflicting the adequate and proportionate punishment of all sin, because of its intrinsic ill desert.

60. What are the different opinions as to the nature of the punitive justice of God, i. e., what are the different reasons assigned why God punishes sin? The Socinians deny the punitive justice of God altogether, and maintain that he punishes sin simply for the good of the individual sinner, and of society, only so far as it may be interested in his restraint or improvement. Those theologians who maintain the governmental theory of the Atonement, hold that God punishes sin not because of a changeless principle in himself demanding its punishment, but for the good of the universe, on the basis of great and changeless principles of governmental policy. Thus resolving justice into a form of general benevolence. God's purpose in punishing sin is not a desire to promote happiness as some contend.

Some hold that the necessity for the punishment of sin is only hypothetical, i. e., results only from the eternal decree of God. The true view is that God is immutably determined by his own eternal and essential righteousness to visit every sin with a proportionate punishment.

61. Prove that disinterested benevolence is not the whole of virtue.

1st. Some exercises of disinterested benevolence, for example, natural parental affection, are purely instinctive, and have no positive moral character.

2nd. Some exercises of disinterested benevolence, such as the weak yielding of a judge to sympathy with a guilty man or his friends, are positively immoral.

3rd. There are virtuous principles incapable of being resolved into disinterested benevolence, such as proper prudential regard for one's own highest good; aspiration and effort after personal excellence; holy abhorrence of sin for its own sane, and just punishment of sin in order to vindicate righteousness.

4th. The idea of oughtness is the essential constitutive idea of virtue. No possible analysis of the idea of benevolence will give the idea of moral obligation. This is simple, unresolvable, ultimate. Oughtness is the genus, and benevolence one of the species comprehended in it.

62. State the evidence derived from the universal principles of human nature, that the justice of God must be an ultimate and unchangeable principle of his nature, determining him to punish sin because of its intrinsic ill desert. The obligation of a righteous ruler to punish sin, the intrinsic ill desert of sin, the principle that sin ought to be punished, are ultimate facts of moral consciousness. They cannot be resolved into any other principle whatsoever. This is proved, because they are involved in every awakened sinner's consciousness of his own demerit.—Ps. lit 4. "I have done this evil in thy sight; that thou mightest be just when thou speakest, and clear when thou judgest." In its higher degree this feeling. rises into remorse, and can be allayed only by expiation. Thus many murderers have had no rest until they have given themselves up to the law, when they have experienced instant relief and millions of souls have found peace in the application of the blood of Jesus to their wounded consciences.

2nd. All men judge thus of the sins of others. The consciences of all good men are gratified when the just penalty of the law is executed upon the offender, and outraged when he escapes.

3rd. This principle is witnessed to by all the sacrificial rites common to all ancient religions, by the penance's in some form universal even in modern times, by all penal laws, and by the synonyms for guilt, punishment, justice, etc., common to all languages.

4th. It is self–evident, that to inflict an unjust punishment is itself a crime, no matter how benevolent the motive which prompts it, nor how good the effect which follows it. It is no less self–evident that it is the justice of the punishment so deserved which renders its effect on the effect good, and not its effect on the community which renders it just. To hang a man for the good of the community is both a crime and a blunder, unless the hanging is justified by the ill desert of man. In that case his ill desert is seen by all the community to be the real reason of the hanging.

63. Prove the same from the nature of the divine law.

Grotius in his great work, "Defensio Fidei Catholicce De Satisfactione Christi," in which he originates the Governmental Theory of the Atonement, maintains that the divine law is a product of the divine will, and therefore at the option of God relaxable, alike in its preceptive and its penal elements. But the truth is (a) that the penalty is an essential part of the divine law; (b) that the law of God, as to all its essential principles of right and wrong, is not a product of the divine will, but an immutable transcript of the divine nature; (c) therefore the law is immutable and must need be fulfilled in every iota of it. This is proved—

1st. Because fundamental principles must have their changeless ground in the divine nature, or (a) otherwise the distinction between right and wrong would be purely arbitrary—whereas they are discerned by our moral intuitions to be absolute and independent of all volition divine or human; (b) otherwise it would be meaningless to say that God is right– if righteousness be an arbitrary creature of his own will; (c) because he declares that he "cannot lie," that "he cannot deny himself."

2nd. The scriptures declare that the law cannot be relaxed that it must be fulfilled.—John 7:23; John 10:35; Luke 24:44, Matthew 5:25-26.

3rd. The scriptures declare that Christ came to fulfill the law, not to relax it.—Matthew 5:17-18; Romans 3:31; Romans 10:4.

64. How may it be argued from the independence and absolute self–sufficiency of God, that punitive justice is an essential attribute of his nature?

It is inconsistent with these essential attributes to conceive of God as obliged to any course of action by the external exigencies of his creation. Both the motive and the end of his action must be in himself.—Colossians 1:16; Romans 11:36; Ephesians 1:5-6; Romans 9:22-23. If he punishes sin because determined so to do by the principles of his own nature, then he acts independently. But if he resorts to this merely as the necessary means of restraining and governing his creatures, then their actions control his.

65. How may it be proved from God's love of holiness and hatred of sin?

God's love for holiness and hatred of sin is represented in Scripture as essential and intrinsic. He loves holiness for its own sake. He hates sin and is determined to punish it because of its intrinsic ill desert. He hates the wicked every day – Psalms 5:5; Psalms 7:11. "To me belongeth vengeance and recompense." — Deuteronomy 32:35. " According to their deeds accordingly he will

repay."—Isaiah 59:18; 2 Thessalonians 1:6. "See Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you."—Romans 1:32. " Knowing the judgment of God that they which commit such things are worthy of death."—Deuteronomy 17:6; Deuteronomy 21:22.

66. How can this truth be proved from what the Scriptures teach as to the nature and necessity of the atonement of Christ? As to its nature the Scriptures teach that Christ suffered the penalty of sin vicariously in the place and stead of his elect people, and that he thus expiated their guilt, and reconciled God and redeemed their souls by giving himself the ransom price demanded in their stead. The Scriptures everywhere and in every, way teach that the design of Christ's death was to produce a sin–expiating effect upon the Governor of the moral universe, and not a moral impression either upon the heart of the individual sinner, or upon the public conscience of the intelligent universe. All this will be proved at length under Chapters 25. and 33. As to the necessity of the Atonement the scriptures teach that it was absolute. That Christ must die or sinners perish. Galatians 2:21; Galatians 3:21. But the propriety of producing a moral impression upon each sinner personally, or upon the public mind of the universe generally, can not give rise to an absolute necessity on the part of God—since God who created the universe and all its members might, of course, if he so pleased, produce moral impressions upon them of whatever kind, either without means, or by whatsoever means he pleases. An absolute necessity must have its ground in the unchangeable nature of God, which lies back of and determines his will in all its acts. Therefore the eternal nature of God immutably determines him to punish all sin.

"Political Science," Presidebt Theodore D. Woolsey, vol. 1., pp. 330–335. The theory that correction is the main end of punishment will not bear examination.

(1.) The state is not a humane institution.

(2.) The theory makes no distinction between crimes. If a murderer is apparently reformed in a week, the ends of detention are accomplished, and he should be set free; while the petty offender must stay for months or years until the inoculation of good principles becomes manifest.

(3.) What kind of correction is to be aimed at? Is it such as will insure society itself against his repeating his crime? In that case it is society, and not the person himself who is to be benefited by the corrective process. Or must a thorough cure, a recovery from selfishness and covetousness, an awakening of the highest principle of soul be aimed at; an established church, in short, be set up in the house of correction? The explanation that the state protects its own existence, or the innocent inhabitants of the country, by striking its subjects with awe and deterring them from evil–doing through punishment, is met by admitting that, while this effect is real and important, it is not as yet made out that the state has a right to do this. Crime and desert of punishment must be pre–supposed before the moral sense can be satisfied with the infliction of evil. And the measure of the amount of punishment, supplied by the public good for the time, is most fluctuating and tyrannical; moreover mere awe, unaccompanied by an awakening of the sense of justice, is as much a source of hatred as a motive to obedience. The theory that in punishing an evil–doer the state renders to him his deserts, is the only one that seems to have a solid foundation. It assumes that moral evil has been committed by disobedience to rightful commands, that according to a propriety which commends itself to our moral nature it is fit and right that evil, physical or mental, suffering or shame should be incurred by the wrong–doer, and that in all forms of government over

moral beings there ought to be a power able to decide how much evil ought to follow special kinds and instances of transgressions. The state is in fact, as St. Paul calls it, the minister of God to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. But only in a very limited sphere and for special ends. . . It punishes acts, not thoughts, intentions appearing in acts, not feelings; it punishes persons within a certain territory over which it has the jurisdiction, and perhaps its subjects who do wrong elsewhere, but none else, it punishes acts hurtful to its own existence and to the community of its subjects; it punishes not according to an exact scale of deserts, for it cannot, without a revelation find out what the deserts of individuals are, nor what is the relative guilt of different actions of different persons.6 THE ABSOLUTE GOODNESS OF GOD.

67. What distinctions are signified by the terms benevolence, complacency, mercy, and grace? The infinite goodness of God is a glorious perfection which pre–eminently characterizes his nature, and which he, in an infinitely wise, righteous, and sovereign manner, exercises towards his creatures in various modes according to their relations and conditions.

Benevolence is the goodness of God viewed generically. It embraces all his creatures, except the judicially condemned on account of sin, and provides for their welfare. The love of complacency is that approving affection with which God regards his own infinite perfections, and every image and reflection of them in his creatures, especially in the sanctified subjects of the new creation.

God's mercy, of which the more passive forms are pity and compassion, is the divine goodness exercised with respect to the miseries of his creatures, feeling for them, and making provision for their relief, and in the case of impenitent sinners, leading to long–suffering patience. The grace of God is his goodness seeking to communicate his favors, and, above all, the fellowship of his own life and blessedness to his moral creatures,—who, as creatures, must be destitute of all merit,—and pre–eminently his electing love, securing at infinite cost the blessedness of its objects, who, as sinful creatures, were positively ill deserving.

68. State a false definition of divine benevolence often given, and state how it is rightly defined. The infinite Benevolence of God is often defined as that attribute in virtue of which he communicates to all his creatures the greatest possible amount of happiness, i. e., as great as they are capable of receiving, or as great as is consistent with the attainment of the greatest amount of happiness on the age– in the moral universe. But this supposes that God is limited by something out of himself, that he could not have secured more happiness for his creatures than he has actually done. It also makes happiness paramount in the view of God to excellence.

Benevolence should, on the other hand, be defined as that attribute in virtue of which God produces all the happiness in the universe, which is consistent with the end he had in view in its creation. These ends stand in this order. 1. The manifestation of his own glory. 2. The highest moral excellence of his creatures. 3. Their highest blessedness in himself.—Dr. Charles Hodge's Lectures.

69. What are the sources of our knowledge of the fact that God is benevolent?

1st. Reason. Benevolence is an essential element of moral perfection. God is infinitely perfect, and therefore infinitely benevolent.

2nd. Experience and observation. The wisdom of God in designing, and the power of God in executing, in the several spheres of creation, providence, and revealed religion, have evidently been constantly determined by benevolent intentions.

3rd. The direct assertions of Scripture.—Psalms 65:8-9; 1 John 4:8.

70. How may it be proved that God is gracious and willing to forgive sin?

Neither reason nor conscience can ever raise a presumption on this subject. It is the evident duty of fellow–creatures mutually to forgive injuries, but we have nothing to do with forgiving sin as sin.

It appears plain that there can be no moral principle making it essential for a sovereign ruler to forgive sin as transgression of law. All that reason or conscience can assure us of in that regard is, that sin can not be forgiven without an atonement. The gracious affection which should prompt such a ruler to provide an atonement, must, from its essential nature, be perfectly free and sovereign, and therefore it can be known only so far as it is graciously revealed. The gospel is, therefore, good news confirmed by signs and wonders.—Exodus 24:6-7; Ephesians 1:7-9.

71. What are the different theories or assumptions on which it has been attempted to reconcile the existence of sin with the goodness of God?

1st. It has been argued by some that free agency is essential to a moral system, and that absolute independence of will is essential to free agency. That to control the wills of free agents is no more an object of power than the working of contradictions; and consequently God, although omnipotent, could not prevent sin in a moral system without violating its nature.

2nd. Others have argued that sin was permitted by God in infinite wisdom as the necessary means to the largest possible measure of happiness in the universe as a whole. On both of these we remark— That the first theory above cited is founded on a false view of the conditions of human liberty and responsibility (see below, Chapter XV); and, further, that it grossly limits the power of God by representing him as desiring and attempting what he cannot effect, and that it makes him dependent upon his creatures.

2nd. With reference to the second theory it should be remembered that God’s own glory, and not the greatest good of the universe, is the great end of God in creation and providence.

3rd. The permission of sin, in its relation both to the righteousness and goodness of God, is an insolvable mystery, and all attempts to solve it only darken counsel with words without knowledge. It is, however, the privilege of our faith to know, though not of our philosophy to comprehend, that it is assuredly a most wise, righteous, and merciful permission; and that it shall redound to the glory of God and to the good of his chosen.

72. How can the attributes of goodness and justice be shown to be consistent?

Goodness and justice are the several aspects of one unchangeable, infinitely wise, and sovereign moral perfection. God is not sometimes merciful and sometimes just, nor so far merciful and so far just, but he is eternally infinitely merciful and just. Relatively to the creature this infinite perfection of nature presents different aspects, as is determined by the judgment which infinite wisdom delivers in each individual case.

Even in our experience these attributes of our moral nature are found not to be inconsistent in principle though our want both of wisdom and knowledge, a sense of our own unworthiness, and a mere physical sympathy, often sadly distract our judgments as well as our hearts in adjusting these principles to the individual cases of life.

GOD'S ABSOLUTE TRUTH.

73. What is truth considered as a divine attribute? The truth of God in its widest sense is a perfection which qualifies all his intellectual and moral attributes. His knowledge is infinitely true in relation to its objects, and his wisdom unbiased either by prejudice or passion. His justice and his goodness in all their exercises are infinitely true to the perfect standard of his own nature. In all outward manifestations of his perfections to his creatures, God is always true to his nature —always self–consistently divine. This attribute in its more special sense qualifies all God's intercourse with his rational creatures. He is true to us as well as to himself; and thus is laid the foundation of all faith, and therefore of all knowledge. It is the foundation of all confidence, first, in our senses; second, in our intellect and conscience; third, in any authenticated, supernatural revelation. The two forms in which this perfection is exercised in relation to us are, first, his entire truth in all his communications; second, his perfect sincerity in undertaking and faithfulness in discharging all his engagements.

74. How can the truth of God be reconciled with the apparent non–performance of some of his threatenings? The promises and threatenings of God are sometimes absolute, when they are always infallibly fulfilled in the precise sense in which he intended them. They are often also conditional made to depend upon the obedience or repentance of the creature.—Jonah 3:4; Jonah 3:10; Jeremiah 18:7-8. This condition may be either expressed or implied, because the individual case is understood to be, of course, governed by the general principle that genuine repentance and faith delivers from every threatening and secures every promise.

75. How can the invitations and exhortations of the Scriptures, addressed to those whom God does not propose to save, be reconciled with his sincerity?

See above (Question 42), the distinction between God's preceptive and his decretive will. His invitations and exhortations are addressed to all men in good faith:first, because it is every man's duty to repent and believe, and it is God's preceptive will that every man should; second, because nothing ever prevents the obedience of any sinner, except his own unwilling– third, because in every case in which the condition is fulfilled the promise implied will be performed; fourth, God never has promised to enable every man to believe; fifth, these invitations and exhortations are not addressed to the reprobate as such, but to all sinners as such, with the avowed purpose of saving; thereby the elect. THE INFINITE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD.

76. What is meant by the sovereignty of God? His absolute right to govern and dispose of all his creatures, simply according to his own good pleasure.

77. Prove that this right is asserted in Scripture.

Daniel 4:25; Daniel 4:35; Revelation 4:11; 1 Timothy 6:15; Romans 9:15-23.

78. On what does the absolute sovereignty of God rest? lst. His infinite superiority in being and in all his perfections to any and to all his creatures.

2nd. As creatures they were created out of nothing, and are now sustained in being by his power, for his own glory and according to his own good pleasure.—Romans 11:36.

3rd. His infinite benefits to us, and our dependence upon and blessedness in him, are reasons why we should not only recognize, but rejoice, in this glorious truth. The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice.

79. Is there any sense in which there are limits to the sovereignty of God? The sovereignty of God, viewed abstractly as one attribute among many, must of course be conceived of as qualified by all the rest. It can not be otherwise than an infinitely wise, righteous, and merciful sovereignty. But God, viewed concretely as an infinite sovereign, is absolutely unlimited by any thing without himself:"He doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth.",—Daniel 4:35. THE INFINITE HOLINESS OF GOD.

80. What is meant by the holiness of God? The holiness of God is not to be conceived of as one attribute among others; it is rather a general term representing the conception of his consummate perfection and total glory. It is his infinite moral perfection crowning his infinite intelligence and power. There is a glory of each attribute, viewed abstractly, and a glory of the whole together. The intellectual nature is the essential basis of the moral. Infinite moral perfection is the crown of the Godhead. Holiness is the total glory thus crowned.

Holiness in the Creator is the total perfection of an infinitely righteous intelligence. Holiness in the creature is not mere moral perfection, but perfection of the created nature of moral agents after their kind, in spiritual union and fellowship with the infinite Creator.—1 John 1:3. The word holiness, as applied to God in Scripture, represents, first, moral purity—Leviticus 11:44; Psalms 145:17; second, his transcendental august and venerable majesty.— Isaiah 5:3; Psalms 22:3; Revelation 4:8. To "sanctify the Lord", i. e., to make him holy, is to declare and adore his holiness by venerating his august majesty wherever and whereinsoever his person or character is represented, 8:13; 29:23; Ezekiel 38:23; Matthew 6:9; 1 Peter 3:15.

6 This extract is slightly condensed .

02.09. The Holy Trinity.

Chapter 9 The Holy Trinity.

1. What is the etmology(linguistic development) and meaning of the word Trinity, and when was it introduced into the language of the Church? The word trinity (Trinitas) is derived either from tres–unus, trinus, or from τρια three in one, or the one which is three, and the three which are one; not triplex—trinitas not triplicitas. This word is not found in the Scriptures. Technical terms are however an absolute necessity in all sciences. In this case they have been made particularly essential because of the sub– perversions of the simple, untechnical Biblical statements by infidels and heretics. This term, as above defined, admirably expresses the central fact of the great doctrine of the one essence eternally subsisting as three Persons, all the elements of which are explicitly taught in the Scriptures. The Greek word τρια was first used in this connection by Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, in Syria, from A. D. 168 to A. D. 183. The Latin term Trinitas was first used by Tertullian, circum. 220. Mosheim's "Eccle. Hist.," vol. 1., p. 121, note 7; Hagenbach, " Hist. of Doc.," vol. 1., 129 2. What is the theological meaning of the term substantia (substance) what change has occurred in its usage?

Substantia as now used, is equivalent to essence, independent being. Thus, in the Godhead, the three persons are the same in substance, i. e., of one and the same indivisible, numerical essence. The word was at first used by one party in the church as equivalent to subsistentia(subsistence), or mode of existence. In which sense, while there is but one essence, there are three substantiae or persons, in the Godhead.—See Turretin, Tom. 1., locus 3., quest 23.

3. What other terms have been used as the equivalents of substantia in the definitions of this doctrine? The Greek ουσια and φυσι. The Latin essentia, natura. The English essence, substance, nature, being.

4. What is the theological meaning of the word subsistentia (subsistence)?

It is used to signify that mode of existence which:distinguishes one individual thing from every other individual thing, one person from every other person. As applied to the doctrine of the Trinity, subsistence is that mode of existence which is peculiar to each of the divine persons, and which in each constitutes the one essence a distinct person.

5. What is the New Testament sense of the word v~rodror~zS (hypostasis)? This word, as to its etymology, is precisely equivalent to substance; it comes from υφιστημι "to stand under.", In the New Testament it is used five times—

1st. Figuratively, for confidence, or that state of mind which is conscious of a firm foundation, 2 Corinthians 9:4; Hebrews 3:14, which faith realizes, Hebrews 11:1.

2nd. Literally, for essential nature, Hebrews 1:3.—See Sampson's " Commentary on Heb."

6. In what sense is this word used by the ecclesiastical writers?

Until the middle of the fourth century this word, in connection with the doctrine of the Trinity, was generally used in its primary sense, as equivalent to substance. It is used in this sense in the creed published by the Council of Nice A. D. 325, and again in the decrees of the Council of Sardica, in Illyria, A. D. 347. These agreed in affirming that there is but one hypostasis in the Godhead. Some, however, at that time understanding the word in the sense of person, its usage was changed by general consent, chiefly through the influence of Athanasius, and ever since it has been established in theological language in the sense of person, in contradistinction to ουσια essence. It has been transferred into the English language in the form of an adjective, to designate the hypostatical or personal union of two natures in the God–man.

7. What is essential to personality, and how is the word person to be defined in connection with the doctrine of the Trinity? The Latin word, “suppositum,” signifies a distinct individual existence, e. g., a particular tree or horse. A person is “sup–intellectual,” a distinct individual existence, to which belongs the properties of reason and free will. Throughout the entire range of our experience and observation of personal existence among creatures, personality rests upon and appears to be inseparable from distinction of essence. Every distinct person is a distinct soul, with or without a body. That distinguishing mode of existence which constitutes the one divine essence coordinately three separate persons, is of course an infinite mystery which we can not understand, and therefore cannot adequately define, and which we can know only so far as it is explicity revealed. All that we know is, that this distinction, which is called personality, embraces all those incommunicable properties which eternally belong to Father, Son, or Holy Ghost separately, and not to all in common; that it lays the foundation for their concurrence in counsel, their mutual love and action one upon another, as the Father sending the Son, and the Father and Son sending the Spirit, and for use of the personal pronouns I, thou, He, in the revelation which one divine person gives of himself and of the others. In relation to this great mystery of the divine trinity of persons in the unity of essence Calvin’s definition of Person is better because more modest. “By person. then, I mean a subsistence in the divine essence—a subsistence which while related to the other two, is distinguished from them by incommunicable properties.”—“ Institutes,” Book 1., Chap. 13, §6.

8. What other terms have been used by theologians as the equivalent of Person in this connection?

Greek, υποστασι and προσωπον —aspect; Latin, persona, hypostasis, substentia aspectus; LX a English, person, hpostasis.—Shedd’s “Hist. Christ Doc.,” B. 3., Ch. 3, § 5.

9. What is meant by the termsομοουσιον (of the same substance), and ομοιουσιον (of similar substance)? In the first general council of the church which, consisting of three hundred and eighteen bishops, was called together by the Emperor Constantine at Nice, in Bithynia, A. D. 325, there were found to be three great parties representing different opinions concerning the Trinity.

1st. The orthodox party, who maintained the opinion now held by all Christians, that the Lord Jesus is, as to his divine nature, of the same identical substance with the Father. These insisted upon applying to him the definite term ομοουσιον, compounded of ομο , same, and ουσια, substance, to teach the great truth that the three persons of the Godhead are one God, because

they are of the same numerical essence.

2nd. The Arians, who maintained that the Son of God is the greatest of all creatures, more like God than any other, the only–begotten Son of God, created before all worlds, through whom God created all other things, and in that sense only divine. They held that the Son was ετερουσιον of different or generically unlike essence from the Father.

3rd. The middle party, styled Semiarians, who confessed that the Son was not a creature, but denied that he was in the same sense God as the Father is. They held that the Father is the only absolute self–existent God; yet that from eternity he, by his own free will, caused to proceed from himself a divine person of like nature and properties. They denied, therefore, that the Son was of the same substance homoousion with the Father, but admitted that he was of an essence truly similar, and derived from the Father (homoiousion, ομοιουσοιν, from, ομιο, like, and ουσια, substance), generically though not numerically one. The opinions of the first, or orthodox party, prevailed at that council, and have ever since been represented by the technical phrase, homoousian. For the creed promulgated by that council, see Chapter 7.

10. What are the several propositions essentially involved in the doctrine of the Trinity?

1st. There is but one God, and this God is one, i.e., indivisible.

2nd. That the one indivisible divine essence, as a whole, exists eternally as Father, and as Son, and as Holy Ghost; that each person possesses the whole essence, and is constituted a distinct person by certain incommunicable properties, not common to him with the others.

3rd. The distinction between these three is a personal distinction, in the sense that it occasions (l) the use of the personal pronouns, I, thou, he, (2) a concurrence in counsel and a mutual love, (3) a distinct order of operation.

4th Since there is but one divine essence, and since all attributes or active properties are inherent in and inseparable from the essence to which they pertain, it follows that all the divine attributes must be identically common to each of the three persons who subsist in common of the one essence. Among all creatures every distinct person is a distinct numerical substance, and possesses a distinct intelligence, a distinct will etc. In the Godhead, however, there is but one substance, and one intelligence, one will, etc., and yet three persons eternally co–exist of that one essence, and exercise that one intelligence and one will, etc. In Christ on the contrary, there are two spirits, two intelligences, two wills, and yet all the while one indivisible person.

5th. These divine persons being one God, all the divine attributes being common to each in the same sense, nevertheless they are revealed in the Scriptures in a certain order of subsistence and of operation.

(1.) Of subsistence inasmuch as the Father is neither begotten nor proceedeth, while the Son is eternally begotten by the Father, and the Spirit eternally proceedeth from the father and the Son;

(2.) of operation, inasmuch that the first person sends and operates through the second, and the first and second send and operate through the third.

Hence the Father is always set forth as first, the Son as second, the Spirit as third.

6th. While all the divine attributes are common equally to the three persons, and all divine works wrought ad extra such as creation, providence, or redemption, are predicated alike of the one divine being—the one God considered absolutely—and of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost severally; nevertheless the Scriptures attribute some divine works wrought ad intra, exclusively to each divine person respectively, e. g., generation to the Father, filiation to the Son, procession to the Holy Ghost; and there are likewise some divine works wrought ad extra which are attributed pre–eminently to each person respectively, e. g., creation to the Father, redemption to the Son, and sanctification to the Holy Ghost. In order, therefore, to establish this doctrine in all its parts by the testimony of Scripture, it will be necessary for us to prove the following propositions in their order:

1st. That God is one.

2nd. That Jesus of Nazareth, as to his divine nature, was truly God, yet a distinct person from the Father.

3rd. That the Holy Spirit is truly God, yet a distinct person.

4th. That the Scriptures directly teach a trinity of persons in one Godhead.

5th. It will remain to gather what the Scriptures reveal as to the eternal and necessary relations which these three divine persons sustain to each other. These are distributed under the following heads:(1) The relation which the second person sustains to the first, or the eternal generation of the Son; (2) the relation which the third person sustains to the first and second, or the eternal procession of the Holy Ghost; and, (3) their personal properties and order of operation, ad extra.

I. GOD IS ONE, AND THERE IS BUT ONE GOD. The proof of this proposition, from reason and Scripture, has been fully set forth above, in Chap. 8., on the Attributes of God, questions 12–18. The answer to the question, how the co–ordinate existence of three distinct persons in the Trinity can be reconciled with this fundamental doctrine of the divine unity, is given below in question 94 of this chapter.

II. JESUS OF NAZARETH, AS TO HIS DIVINE NATURE, IS TRULY GOD, AND YET A DISTINCT PERSON FROM THE FATHER.

11. What different views have been entertained with respect to the person of Christ? The orthodox doctrine as to the person of Christ, is that he from eternity has existed as the co–equal Son of the Father, constituted of the same infinite self–existent essence with the father and the Holy Ghost. The orthodox doctrine as to his person as at present constituted, since his incarnation, is set forth in chap. 23. An account of the different heretical opinions as to his person are given below, in questions 96–99, of this chapter.

12. To what extent did the Jews at the time of Christ expect the Messiah to appear as a divine person? When Christ appeared, it is certain that the great mass of the Jewish people had ceased to entertain the Scriptural expectation of a divine Saviour, and only desired a temporal prince, in a pre–eminent sense, a favorite of heaven. It is said, however, that scattered hints in some of the rabbinical writings indicate that some of the more learned and spiritual still continued true to the ancient faith.

13. How may the pre–existence of Jesus before his birth by the Virgin be proved from Scripture?

1st. Those passages which say that he is the creator of the world.—John 10:3; Colossians 1:15-18.

2nd. Those passages which directly declare that he was with the Father before the world was; that he was rich, and possessed glory.—John 1:1; John 1:15; John 1:30; John 6:62; John 8:58; John 17:5; 2 Corinthians 8:9.

3rd. Those passages which declare that he “came into the world” , “came down from heaven.”—John 3:13; John 3:31; John 13:3; John 16:28; 1 Corinthians 15:47.

14. How can it be proved that the Jehovah who manifested himself as the God of the Jews under the old economy was the second person of the Trinity, who became incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth? As this fact is not affirmed in any single statement of Scripture, it can be established only by a careful comparison of many passages. The evidence, as compiled from Hill’s Lects., Book 3., ch. 5., may be summed up as follows:

1st. All the divine appearances of the ancient economy are referred to one person.—Compare Genesis 18:2, Genesis 18:17, Genesis 28:13, Genesis 32:9, Genesis 32:31, 31; Exodus 3:14-15; Exodus 13:21; Exodus 20:1-2; Exodus 25:21; Deuteronomy 4:33; Deuteronomy 4:36; Deuteronomy 4:39; Nehemiah 9:7-28. This one person is called Jehovah, the incommunicable name of God, and at the same time angel, or one sent.—Compare Genesis 31:11; Genesis 31:13; Genesis 48:15-16; Hosea 12:2; Hosea 12:5. Compare Exodus 3:14-15, with Acts 7:30-35; and Exodus 13:21, with Exodus 14:19; and Exodus 20:1-2, with Acts 7:38; Isaiah 13:7; Isaiah 13:9.

2nd. But God the Father has been seen by no man (John 1:18; John 6:46):neither could he be an angel, or one sent by any other; yet God the Son has been seen (1 John 1:1-2), and sent (John 5:36).

3rd. This Jehovah, who was at the same time the angel, or one sent, of the old economy, was also set forth by the prophets as the Savior of Israel, and the author of the new dispensation. In Zechariah 2:10-11, one Jehovah is represented as sending another. See Micah 5:2. In Malachi 3:1, it is declared that “ the Lord I, the messenger of the covenant,” shall come to his own temple. This applied to Jesus (Mark 1:2).—Com– Psalms 97:7, with Hebrews 1:6; and Isaiah 6:1-5, with John 12:41.

4th. Certain references in the New Testament to passages in the Old appear directly to imply this fact. Compare Psalms 28:15,16, 35, with 1 Corinthians 10:9.

5th. The Church is one under all dispensations, and Jesus from the beginning is the Redeemer and Head of the Church; it is, therefore, most consistent with all that has been revealed to us as to the offices of the three divine persons in the scheme of redemption, to admit the view here presented. See also John 8:56; John 8:58; Matthew 23:37; 1 Peter 1:10-11.

15. In what form are the earliest disclosures made in the Old Testament of the existence and agency of a Person distinct from God and yet as divine? In the earlier books an Angel is spoken of, sent from God, often appearing to men, and yet himself God.—Genesis 16:7-13. The Angel of Jehovah appears to Hagar, claims divine power, and is called God.—Genesis 18:2-33. Three

angels appeared to Abraham, one of whom is called Jehovah, 5:17.—Genesis 32:25. An Angel wrestles with Jacob and blesses him as God, and in Hosea 12:3-5, that Angel is called God.—Exodus 3:2. The Angel of Jehovah appeared to Moses in the burning bush, and in the following verses this angel is called Jehovah, and other divine titles are ascribed to him. This Angel led the Israelites in the wilderness.—Ch. 14:19; Isaiah 63:9. Jehovah is represented as saving his people by the Angel of his Presence Thus Malachi 3:1—"The Lord, the Angel of the covenant shall suddenly come to his temple.", This applied to Christ.—Mark 1:2.

16. What evidence of the divinity of the Messiah does the 2d Psalm present?

It declares him to be the Son of God, and as such to receive universal power over the whole earth and its inhabitants. All are exhorted to submit to him, and to trust him, on pain of his anger. In Acts 13:33, Paul declares that Psalm refers to Christ.

17. What evidence is furnished by the 45th Psalm? The ancient Jews considered this Psalm addressed to the Messiah, and the fact is established by Paul (Hebrews 1:8-9). Here, therefore, Jesus is called God, and his throne eternal.

18. What evidence is furnished by Psalms 110:1-7? That this Psalm refers to the Messiah is proved by Christ (Matthew 22:43-44), and by Paul (Hebrews 5:6; Hebrews 7:17). He is here called David's Lord (Adonai), and invited to sit at the right hand of Jehovah until all his enemies be made his footstool.

19. What evidence is furnished by Isaiah 9:6? This passage self–evidently refers to the Messiah, as is confirmed by Matthew 4:14-16. It declares explicitly that the child born is also the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.

20. What is the evidence furnished by Micah 5:2? This was understood by the Jews to refer to Christ, which is confirmed by Matthew 2:6, and John 7:42. The passage declares that his goings forth have been from ever of old,,, i. e., from eternity.

21. What evidence is furnished by Malachi 3:1-2? This passage self–evidently refers to the Messiah, as is confirmed by Mark 1:2. The Hebrew term (Adonai), here translated Lord, is never applied to any other than the supreme God. The temple, which was sacred to the presence and worship of Jehovah, is called his temple. And in verse 2d, a divine work of Judgment is ascribed to him.

22. What evidence is afforded by the way in which the writers of the New Testament apply the writings of the Old Testament to Christ? The apostles frequently apply the language of the Old Testament to Christ, when it is evident that the original writers intended to speak of Jehovah, and not of the Messiah as such.

Psalms 102:1-28 is evidently an address to the supreme Lord, ascribing to him eternity, creation, providential government, worship, and the hearing and answering of prayer. But Paul (Hebrews 1:10-12) affirms Christ to be the subject of the address. In Isaiah 14:20-25, Jehovah speaks and asserts his own supreme Lordship. But Paul, in Romans 14:11, quotes a part of Jehovah's declaration with regard to himself, to prove that we must all stand before the judgment of Christ.—Compare also Isaiah 6:3, with John 12:41.

23. What is the general character of the evidence upon this subject afforded by the New Testament? This fundamental doctrine is presented to us in every individual writing, and in every separate paragraph of the New Testament, either by direct assertion or by necessary implication, as may be ascertained by every honest reader for himself. The mass of this testimony is so great, and is so intimately interwoven with every other theme in every passage, that I have room here to present only a general sample of the evidence, classified under the usual heads.

24. Prove that the New Testament ascribes divine titles to Christ.

John 1:1; John 20:28; Acts 20:28; Romans 9:5; 2 Thessalonians 1:12; 1 Timothy 3:16; Titus 2:13; Hebrews 1:8; 1 John 5:20.

25. Prove that the New Testament ascribes divine perfections to Christ.

Eternity.—John 1:2; John 8:58; John 17:5; Revelation 1:8; Revelation 1:17-18; Revelation 22:13.

Immutability.—Hebrews 1:11-12; Hebrews 13:8.

Omnipresence.—John 3:13; Matthew 18:20, Matthew 28:20.

Omniscience.—Matthew 11:27; John 2:23-25; John 21:17; Revelation 2:23.

Omnipotence.—John 5:17; Hebrews 1:3; Revelation 1:8; Revelation 11:1-19 :

26. Prove that the New Testament ascribes divine works to Christ.

Creation.—John 1:3; John 1:10; Colossians 1:16-17.

Preservation and Providence.—Hebrews 1:3; Colossians 1:17; Matthew 28:18.

Miracles.—John 5:21; John 5:36.

Judgment.—2 Corinthians 5:10; Matthew 25:31-32; John 5:22. A work of grace, including election.—John 13:18.

Sanctification, Ephesians 5:26; sending the Holy Ghost, John 16:7; John 16:14; giving eternal life, John 10:28; Turretin, Tom. 1., 50. 3, Q. 28.

27. Prove that The New Testament teaches that supreme word should be paid to Christ.

Matthew 28:19; John 5:22-23; John 14:1; Acts 7:59-60; 1 Corinthians 1:2; 2 Corinthians 13:14; Php 2:9-10; Hebrews 1:6; Revelation 1:5-6; Revelation 5:11-12; Revelation 7:10.

28. Prove that the Son, although God, is a distinct person from the Father. This fact is so plainly taught in Scripture, and so universally implied, that the Sabellian system, which denies it, has never obtained any general currency.

Christ is sent by the Father, comes from him, returns to him, receives his commandment, does his will, loves him, is loved by him, addresses prayer to him, uses the pronouns thou and he when speaking to and of him. This is necessarily implies also, in the relative titles, Father and Son. See the whole New Testament. In establishing the doctrine of the Trinity, as far as the Second Person is involved, the stress lies altogether in proving the absolute Divinity of Christ, his distinct personality being so obvious as to be practically beyond dispute. While in vindicating the truth of

the doctrine as it respects the Third Person the whole stress lies in proving His distinct personality, his absolute divinity being so clearly revealed as to be unquestionable.

III. THE HOLY GHOST IS TRULY GOD, YET A DISTINCT PERSON.

29. What sects have held that the Holy Ghost is a creature? The divinity of the Holy Ghost is so clearly revealed in Scripture that very few have dared to call it in question. The early controversies of the orthodox:with the Arians precedent and consequent to the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, to such a degree absorbed the mind of both parties with the question of the divinity of the Son, that very little prominence was given in that age to questions concerning the Holy Ghost. Arius, however, is said to have taught that as the Son is the first and greatest creature of the Father, so the Holy Ghost is the first and greatest creature of the Son; a κτισμα κτισματος a creature of a creature.—See Neander's " Ch. Hist.," Vol. 1., pp. 416 420.

Some of the disciples of Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, A. D. 341–360, are said to have held that the Holy Ghost was not Supreme God. These were condemned by the second General Council, which met at constantinople A. D. 381. This council defined and guarded the orthodox:faith, by adding definite clauses to the simple reference which the ancient creed had made to the Holy Ghost.—See the Creed of the Council of Constantinople, Chapter 7.

30. By whom has the Holy Spirit been regarded mercy as an energy of God?

Those early heretical sects, generally styled Monarchians and Patripassians, all with subordinate distinctions taught that there was but one person as well as one essence in the Godhead, who, in different relations, is called Father, Son, or Holy Ghost. In the sixteenth century Socinus, who taught that Jesus Christ was a mere man, maintained that the term Holy Ghost is in Scripture used as a designation of God's energy, when exercised in a particular way. This is now the opinion of all modern Unitarians and Rationalists.

31. How can it be proved that all the attributes of personality are ascribed to the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures? The attributes of personality are such as intelligence, volition, separate agency. Christ uses the pronouns, 1, thou, he, when speaking of the relation of the Holy Spirit to himself and the Father:" I will send him."" He will testify of me.""Whom the Father will send in my name." Thus he is sent; he testifies; he takes of the things of Christ, and shows them to us. He teaches and leads to all truth. He knows, because he searches the deep things of God. He works all supernatural gifts, dividing to every man as he wills.—John 14:17; John 14:26; John 15:26; 1 Corinthians 2:10-11; 1 Corinthians 12:11. He reproves, glorifies, helps, intercedes.—John 16:7-13; Romans 8:26.

32. How may his personality be argued from the of– fices which he is said in the Scriptures to execute? The New Testament throughout all its teachings discovers the plan of redemption as essentially involving the agency of the Holy Ghost in applying the salvation which it was the work of the Son to accomplish. He inspired the prophets and apostles; he teaches and sanctifies the church; he selects her officers, qualifying them by the communication of special gifts at his will. He is the advocate, every Christian is his client. He brings all the grace of the absent Christ to us, and gives it effect in our persons in every moment of our lives. His personal distinction is obviously involved in the very nature of these functions which he discharges.—Luke 12:12; Acts 5:32; Acts 15:28; Acts 16:6; Acts 28:25; Romans 15:16; 1 Corinthians 2:13; Hebrews 2:4; Hebrews 3:7; 1 Peter 1:21.

33. What argument for the personality of the Holy Ghost may be deduced from the form of baptism?

Christians are baptized “in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.” It would be inconsistent with every law of language and reason to speak of the name, of an energy, or to associate an energy coordinately with two distinct persons.

34. How may his personality be proved by what is said of the sin against the Holy Ghost? In Matthew 12:31-32; Mark 3:28-29; Luke 12:10, this sin is called “blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.” Now, blasphemy is a sin committed against a person, and it is here distinguished from the same act as committed against the other persons of the Trinity.

35. How can such expressions as “giving” and “pouring out the Spirit,” be reconciled with his personality?

These and other similar expressions are used figuratively to set forth our participation in the gifts and influences of the Spirit. It is one of the most natural and common of all figures to designate the gift by the name of the giver. Thus we are said “to put on Christ,”“to be baptized into Christ,” etc.—5:30; Romans 13:14; Galatians 3:27.

36. Show that the names of God are applied to the Spirit.

Compare Exodus 17:7, and Psalms 95:7, with Hebrews 3:7-11.— See Acts 5:3-4.

37. What divine attributes do the Scriptures ascribe to him?

Omnipresence.—Psalms 139:7; 1 Corinthians 12:13. Omniscience.—1 Corinthians 2:10-11. Omnipotence.—Luke 1:35; Romans 8:11.

38. What agency in the external world do the Scriptures ascribe to him?

Creation.—Genesis 1:2; Job 26:13; Psalms 104:30. The power of working miracles.—Matthew 12:28; 1 Corinthians 12:1-31 :

39. How is his supreme divinity established by what the Scripture teach of his agency in redemption?

He is declared to be the immediate agent in regeneration, John 3:6; Titus 3:5; and in the resurrection of our bodies, Romans 8:11. His agency in the generation of Christ’s human nature, in his resurrection, and in the inspiration of the Scriptures, were exertions of his divine power in preparing the redemption which he now applies.

40. How can such expressions as, “he shall not speak of himself,” be reconciled with his divinity? This and other similar expressions are to be understood as referring to the official work of the Spirit; just as the Son is said in his official character to be sent by and to be subordinate to the Father. The object of the Holy Ghost, in his official work in the hearts of men, is not to reveal the relations of his own person to the other persons of the Godhead, but simply to reveal the mediatorial character and work of Christ.

IV. THE SCRIPTURES DIRECTLY TEACH A TRINITY OF PERSONS IN ONE GODHEAD.

41. How is this trinity of persons directly taught in the formula of baptism?

Baptism in the name of God implies the recognition of God's divine authority, his covenant engagement to give us eternal life, and our engagement to render him divine worship and obedience. Christians are baptized thus into covenant relation with three persons distinctly named in order. The language necessarily implies that each name represents a person. The nature of the sacrament proves that each person must be divine.—See Matthew 28:19.

42. How is this doctrine directly taught in the formula of the apostolic benediction?

See 2 Corinthians 13:14. We have here distinctly named three persons, and each communicating a separate blessing, according to his own order and manner of operation. The benevolence of the Father in designing, the grace of the Son in the acquisition, the communion of the Holy Ghost in the application of salvation. These are three distinct personal names, three distinct modes of personal agency, and each equally divine.

43. What evidence is afforded by the narrative of Christ's baptism?

See Matthew 3:13-17. Here also we have presented to us three persons distinctly named and described as severally acting, each after his own order. The Father speaking from heaven, the Spirit descending like a dove and fighting upon Christ. Christ acknowledged as the beloved Son of God ascending from the water.

44. State the argument from John 15:26, and the context. In this passage again we have three persons severally named at the same time, and their relative action affirmed. The son is the person speaking of the Father and the Spirit, and claiming for himself the right of sending the Spirit. The Father is the person from whom the Spirit proceeds. Of the spirit the Son says that " he will come,"" he will be sent,"" he proceedeth,"" he will testify."

45. What is the state of the evidence with regard to the genuiness of 1 John 5:7?

1st. The disputed clause is as follows, including part of the eighth verse:"in heaven , the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth."

2nd. Learned and pious men are divided in their opinions as to the preponderance of the evidence; the weight of opinion inclining against the genuineness of the clause.

3rd. The doctrine taught is so scriptural, and the grammatical and logical connection of the clause with the rest of the passage is so intimate, that for the purpose of edification, in the present state of our knowledge, the clause ought to be retained, although for the purpose of establishing doctrine, it ought not to be relied upon.

4th. The rejection of this passage does in no degree lessen the irresistible weight of evidence of the truth of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity which the Scriptures afford.

46. What passages in The Old Testament imply the existence of more than one person in the Godhead?

Mark the use of the plural in the following passages.—Genesis 1:26; Genesis 3:22; Genesis 11:7; Isaiah 6:8; Compare the three–fold repetition of the name Jehovah (Numbers 6:24-26) with the apostolical benediction—2 Corinthians 13:14. Mark also in Isaiah 6:3, the threefold repetition of the ascription of holiness.

47. What passages in the Old Testament speak of the Son as a distinct person the Father and yet as divine? In Psalms 14:6-7, we have the Father addressing the Son as God, and anointing him.—See also Psalms 110:1; Isaiah 44:6-7; Isaiah 44:14. The prophecies always set forth the Messiah as a person distinct from the Father, and yet he is called " Mighty God," etc.—Isaiah 9:6; Jeremiah 23:6.

48. What passages of the Old Testament speak of the Spirit as a distinct person from the Father, and yet as divine?

Genesis 1:2; Genesis 6:3, Psalms 104:30; Psalms 139:7; Job 26:13; Isaiah 48:16.

V. IT REMAINS FOR US TO CONSIDER WHAT THE SCRIPTURES TEACH CONCERNING THE ETERNAL AND NECESSARY RELATIONS WHICH THE THREE DIVINE PERSONS SUSTAIN TO EACH OTHER.

(1.) THE RELATION WHICH THE SECOND PERSON SUSTAINS TO THE FIRST, OR THE ETERNAL GENERATION OF THE SON.

49. What is the idiomatic use of the Hebrew word 13 (son)?

It is used in the sense—

1st. Of Song of Solomon 2:1-17 d. Of descendant; hence in the plural "children of Israel," for Israelites. Also when joined to a name of place or nation to denote inhabitants or citizens thereof, as "sons of Zion," etc. 3d. Of pupil, disciple, worshipper; thus,' sons of the prophets,' (1 Kings 20:35); and ' sons of God,' applied, (1) to kings, Pa. 2:7; (2) to angels, Genesis 6:2; (3) to worshippers of God, his own people, Deuteronomy 14:1; (4th. In combination with substantives, expressing age or quality, etc.; thus, "sons of years," for aged, Leviticus 12:6; "son of Belial," for worthless fellow, Deuteronomy 13:13; "son of death,, for one deserving to die,"1 Sam. 20:31; "a hill son of fatness," for a fruitful hill. The same idiom has been carried into the Greek of the New Testament.—See Gesenius' "Heb Lex."

50. In what sense are men called " sons of God " in Scripture? The general idea embraced in the relation of sonship includes, lst., similarity and derivation of nature;

2nd., parental and filial love; and

3rd, heirship. In this general sense all God's holy, intelligent creatures are called his sons. The term is applied in an eminent sense to kings and magistrates who receive dominion from God (Psalms 82:6), and to Christians who are the subjects of spiritual regeneration and adoption (Galatians 3:26, the special objects of divine favor (Matthew 5:9), and are like him (Matthew 5:45). When applied to creatures, whether men or angels (Job 1:6), this word is always used in the plural. In the singular it is applied only to the second person of the Trinity, with the single exception of its application once to Adam (Luke 3:38), when the reason is obviously to mark the peculiarity of

his derivation from God immediately without the intervention of a human father.

51. What reasons do Scoinians assign for the application of the term Son of God to Christ?

1st. Some Socinians hold that he is called Son of God only as an official title, as it is applied in the plural to ordinary kings and magistrates.

2nd. Other Socinians hold that he was called Son of God only because he was brought into being by God's supernatural agency, and not by ordinary generation. To maintain this they appeal to Luke 1:35.

52. How can you. answer the Socinian argument derived from Luke 1:35; to the effect that Christ was called "Son of God" because of his miraculous birth alone?

We answer—

1st. If that reason is the fundamental one why the phrase "Son of God," is generally applied to Christ it should render him the " Son of the Spirit," who overshadowed the Virgin, and not the " Son of the Father." But he is never once so called, nor is any such relation ever indicated in Scripture.

2nd. Even if this was one reason for the application of the phrase it would not follow that there are not other and deeper reasons for its use revealed in Scripture—which will be proved below to be the fact.

3rd. Probably the real design of the passage was simply to convey to Mary the knowledge that in consequence of his supernatural generation her son, that is the man child born of her, is to be called "the Son of God." It was not a common child—the thing born of her was to be regarded as peculiarly related to God, until the complete revelation of his eternal Sonship as a divine person.

53. What reason do Arians assign for the ascription of this title to Christ?

Arians hold that he is so called because he was created by God more in his own likeness than any other creature, and first in the order of time.

54. What reason do some Trinitarians, who at this point depart from the orthodox faith, give for the application of this title to Christ, and to what passages do they appeal?

They hold that the title "Son of God " applies to Christ not as Logos, the eternal Second Person of the Trinity but as Theanthropos. They object to the orthodox doctrine of the eternal Sonship of Christ.

1st. That sonship implies derivation and hence inferiority.

2nd. That the term "Son" in many passages is applied to him interchangeably with the term " Christ " and other official titles, belonging to his Mediatorial office and not to his eternal relations within the Godhead. They refer to Matthew 16:16; John 1:49, etc.

3rd. That in Psalms 2:7 it is expressly declared that Christ is constituted "Son of God" in time, instead of his co–existing as such from eternity with the Father by necessity of nature.

4th. The same is argued from Romans 1:4.

55. Show that the orthodox doctrine is not open to the objection that it represents the Second Person as inferior to the First. This objection derives all its plausibility from unduly pressing the analogy between the human relations of Father and Son and the divine relations signalized by the same terms. The one may be so far the best existing analogy of the other known to us, as to lay the foundation for the proper application of the terms derived from the known relation to designate the unknown, while we must remember that the two things are necessarily as different as the material is from the spiritual, as the temporal is from the eternal, as the finite is from the infinite. Besides it rests upon a misapprehension of the orthodox doctrine as to the following particulars:

1st. The church doctrine is that the Person, not the essence of the son is generated by the Father. The self–existent essence of the Godhead belongs to the Son equally with the Father from eternity.

2nd. That the Father begets the Son by an eternal and necessary constitutional (not voluntary) act. This prevents the Son from being in any sense dependent upon or inferior to the Father, an:distinguishes the church doctrine from Semiarianism, see below, Question 97.

56. Show that their objection to the church doctrine based upon Matthew 16:16; John 1:49, etc., does not hold good. In none of these passages is it affirmed that he is Son as the Christ, i. e., as Mediator, but that being the eternal Son of God he is the Christ, the King of Israel, etc.

57. Prove that neither Psalms 2:1-12 nor Romans 1:4, teach that Christ was made Son of God.

Dr. Alexander says (see “Commentary on Psalms”) with relation to Psalms 2:7, that it means simply, “Thou art my Son, this day I am thy Father now always eternally thy Father. Even if ‘this day ’ be referred to the inception of the filial relation, it is thrown indefinitely back by the form of reminiscence, or narration, in the first clause of the verse. Jehovah said to me,‘ but when’? If understood to mean from everlasting the form of expression would be perfectly in keeping with the other figuratively forms by which the Scriptures represent things really ineffable in human language.”

Romans 1:4–“And declared ορισθεντος to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.“ The word ορισθεντος everywhere else in the New Testament signifies to constitute, to appoint, but here it is insisted that it signifies to manifest. The word strictly means to bound to define, and may naturally mean to set forth, to characterize. This sense is said (Dr. Charles Hodge, “Commentary Rom.”) to be adopted by the great majority of commentators. including some of the ancient Greek Fathers. Besides, even if our opponents interpretation of this passage were allowed, the indubitable evidence afforded to our position by other passages would remain. The two reasons for calling Christ Son are not inconsistent

It is very, evident that Christ called himself Son of God, and was so recognized by his disciples before his resurrection, and, therefore, he might have been revealed or manifested to be the Son of God, but could not have been constituted such by that event.

58. Show that Acts 13:32-33, does not prove that Jesus was made Son of God.

It is argued from this passage that Jesus was constituted Son of God by his resurrection, as the first stage of his official exaltation. This can not be—

1st. Because he was sent into the world as Son of God.

2nd. Because the word αναστησας having raised up, refers to the raising up Christ at his birth, and not to his resurrection (there is nothing in the Greek corresponding to the word again in the English). When this word is used to designate the resurrection it is usually qualified by the phrase from the dead, as inverse 34. Οτι δε ανεστησεν αυτον εκ νεκρων. Verse 32 declares the fulfillment of the promise referred to in verse 23.—See Alexander's "Commentary on Acts."

59. State the orthodox answer to the question why Christ is called "Son of God." The orthodox doctrine is that Christ is called "Son of God" in Scripture to indicate his eternal and necessary personal relation as the Second Person of the Godhead to the first Person, who is called Father to indicate the reciprocal relation.

60. How is the doctrine stated in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds and in the Westminster Confession?

Nicene Creed.–" 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."Athanasian Creed.—"The Son is from the Father alone, neither made, nor created, but begotten."

Westminster Confession.—" The Father is of none, neither begotten nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son.,"

61. What is the common statement and explanation of this doctrine given by orthodox writers? The eternal generation of the Son is commonly defined to be an eternal personal act of the Father, wherein by necessity of nature, not by choice of will, he generates the person (not the essence) of the Son, by communicating to him the whole indivisible substance of the Godhead, without division, alienation, or change, so that the Son is the express image of his Father's person, and eternally continues, not from the Father, but in the Father, and the Father in the Son.—See particularly Hebrews 1:3; John 10:38; John 14:11; John 17:21. The principal Scriptural support of the doctrine of derivation is John 5:26.—Turretin, Tom. 1., L. 3, Q. 29.

Those theologians who insist upon this definition believe that the idea of derivation is necessarily implied in generation; that it is indicated by both the reciprocal terms Father and Son, and by the entire representation given in the Scriptures as to the relation and order of the persons of the Godhead, the Father always standing for the Godhead considered absolutely; and they hold that this theory is necessary to the vindication of the essential unity of the three persons. The older theologians, therefore styled the Father πηγη θεοτητος fountain of Godhead, and αιτια υιου principle or cause of the Son, while the Son and Holy Ghost were both called αιτιατοι(those depending upon another as their principle or cause).

They at the same time guarded the essential equality of the Son and the Holy Ghost with the Father, by saying, 1st, that the whole divine essence, without division or change, and, therefore, all the divine attributes, were communicated to them; and, 2d, that this communication was made by an eternal and necessary act of the Father, and not of his mere will.

62. State how they endeavored to guard their doctrine from all anthropomorphic grossness. In order to guard their doctrine of derivation and eternal generation from all gross anthropomorphic

conceptions they carefully maintained that it was—(1) αχρονοςtimeless, eternal; (2)ασωματωςnot bodily, spiritual; (3)αορατοςinvisible; (4)αχωριστωςnot a local transference, a communication not without but within the Godhead ; (5)απαθωςwithout passion or change; (6)παντελως ακαταληπτος, altogether incomprehensible.

63. What is essential to the Scriptural doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son? In the above rendered account of the orthodox doctrine there is nothing inconsistent with revealed truth. The idea of derivation, as involved in the generation of the Son by the Father, appears rather to be a rational explanation of revealed facts than a revealed fact itself. On such a subject, therefore, it should be held in suspense. All that is explicitly revealed is, 1st, the term Son is applied to Christ as the second person of the Godhead.

2nd. This term, and the equivalent one, “only begotten,” reveal some relation, within the Godhead, of the person of the Son to the person of the Father; the designation Father being reciprocal to that of Son.

3rd. That this relation is such that Father and Son are the same in substance, and are personally equal; that the Father is first and the Son second in the order of revelation and operation, that the Son is the express image of the Father’s person, not the Father of the Son’s and that the Son is not from the Father, but in the Father, and the Father in the Son.

64. How may it be shown that the common doctrine is not self–contradictory?

There is evidently no inconsistency in the simple Scriptural statement given in the answer to the last question. Heterodox controversialists, however, have claimed that there is a manifest inconsistency in the orthodox theory that the Father communicates to the Son the whole divine essence without alienating it from himself, dividing or otherwise changing it. This subject does not fall within the legitimate sphere of human logic, yet it is evident that this theory involves no contradiction and no mystery greater than that involved in the whole essence of God being at the same time present, without division or diffusion to every point of space.

65. By what terms, besides that of “Son” is the personal character of the Second Person, and his relation to the First Person designated?

Λογος προς τον θεον και θεος ην ο λογος. The Word with God, and who is God—John 1:1. Εικων του θεου του αορατου. The Image of the invisible God—2 Corinthians 4:4; Colossians 1:15. Χαρακτηρ της υποστασεως αυτου. The image or impression of his being or sub– i. 3.Εν μορφη θεου. The form of God—Php 2:6;Απαυγασμα της δοξης αυτου. “The shining forth of his glory.”

66. What is the distinction which some of the fathers made between the eternal, the ante–mundane, and the mundane generation of the Son?

1st. By his eternal generation they intended to mark his essential relation to the Father as his consubstantial and eternal Son.

2nd. By his ante–mundane generation they meant to signify the commencement of the outgoings of his energy, and the manifestation of his person beyond the bosom of the Godhead, in the sphere of external creation, etc.—Colossians 1:15.

3rd. By his mundane generation they intended his supernatural birth in the flesh.—Luke 1:35.

67. What is the distinction which some of the fathers made between the$\lambda o\gamma o\varsigma$ $\varepsilon\nu\delta\iota\alpha\theta\varepsilon\tau o\varsigma$(ratio insita, reason), and the$\lambda o\gamma o\varsigma$ $\pi\rho o\varphi o\rho\iota\kappa o\varsigma$(ratio prolata, reason brought forth, or expressed)? The orthodox fathers used the phrase logos endiatheos to designate the Word, whom they held to be a distinct person, dwelling from eternity with the Father. The ground of their use of this phrase was a fanciful analogy which they conceived existed between the relation which the eternal Lagos (word, or reason) (John 1:1) sustains to the father, and the relation which the reason of a man sustains to his own rational soul. Thus the logos endiathetos was God's own reflective idea hypostatized. They were led to this vain attempt to philosophize upon an incomprehensible subject by the influence exerted upon them by the Platonic philosophers of that age, who taught a sort of metaphysical trinity, e. a., that in the one God there were three constituent principles, τo $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta o\nu$, goodness,$\nu o\upsilon\varsigma$intelligence,$\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ vitality. Their immediate object was to illustrate the essential unity of the Trinity, and to prove, against the Arians, the essential divinity of the Son, from the application to him by John of the epithet $\lambda o\gamma o$ $\theta\varepsilon o\upsilon$. By the phrase logos prophoricpicos they intended to designate him as the reason of God revealed, when he proceeded from the father in the work of creation.—See Hill's "Lectures." The Arians, taking advantage of the essential inadequacy of this language, confused the controversy by acknowledging that the phrase logos prophoricos did truly apply to Christ, since he came forth from God as the first and highest creation and image of his mind. But declaring, with some color of truth, that the phrase logos endiathetos, when applied to Christ, taught pure Sabellianism, since it marked no personal distinction, but signified nothing else than the mind of the Father itself.

68. If God is " ens a se ipso ," self–existent, how can the Son be really God, if he be"$\theta\varepsilon o\varsigma$ $\varepsilon\kappa$ $\theta\varepsilon o\upsilon$ "God from the Father? The objection presented in this question does not press against the Scriptural statement of the eternal generation of the Son presented above (Question 63), but solely against the theory of derivation as involved in the ordinary definition (see Question 61). Those who insist upon the validity of that view rebut the objection by saying that self–existence is an attribute of essence, not of person. The Father, as a person, generates the person, not the essence of the Son, whose person is constituted of the very same self–existent essence with the Father's. Thus the Son is $\alpha\upsilon\tau o\theta\varepsilon o\varsigma$ i. e.,Deus a se ipso as to his essence, but $\theta\varepsilon o\varsigma$ $\varepsilon\kappa$ $\theta\varepsilon o\upsilon$, God from God, as to his person.

69. What argument for the eternal sonship of Christ may be derived from the designation of the persons of the Trinity as Father, Son and Holy Ghost? In the apostolical benediction and the formula of baptism the one God is designated as Father, Son, and Holy ghost. The term Son can not here be applied to Christ as an official title, or as a miraculously generated man, because, 1st, he is so called as one of the three divine persons constituting the Godhead.

2nd. The term Son is reciprocal to the term Father, and therefore designates the relation of the second person to the first. Whatever this relation may involve besides, it evidently must be eternal and necessary, and includes paternity on the part of the first person, and filiation on the part of the second.

70. What argument in support of this doctrine may be derived from the use of the word son in Matthew 11:27 and Luke 10:22? In both of these passages the term Son is used to designate the divine nature of the second person of the Trinity in his relation to the first. The Son, as Son, knows

and is known by the Father as Father. He is infinite in knowledge and therefore knows the Father. He is infinite in being and therefore can be known by none other than the father.

71. State the argument from John 1:1-14.

Here the eternal Word, who was God, discovered himself as such to his disciples by the manifestation of his native divine glory, " the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." He was " only begotten Son", therefore as God, and not either as Mediator or as man.

72. State the argument from the application in Scripture of the terms$\mu o\nu o\gamma \varepsilon \nu \eta \varsigma$, (only begotten) and$\iota \delta \iota o \varsigma$, (own) to the Sonship of Christ.

Although many of God's creatures are called his sons, the phrase, Son of God, in the singular, and when limited by the terms " own " and " only begotten," is applied only to Christ.

Christ is called "only begotten Son of God."—John 1:14; John 1:18; John 3:16; John 3:18; 1 John 4:9. In John 5:18, Christ calls God his own Father (see Greek). He is called the own Son of the Father.—Romans 8:32. The use of these qualifying terms proves that Christ is called Son of God in a sense different from that in which any other is so called. Therefore it designates him as God and not as man, nor as the bearer of an office.

73. What is the argument derived from John 5:22, and context, and from John 10:33-37? In the first passage the terms Father and Son are used to designate two divine and equal persons. As Son, Christ does whatsoever the Father doeth, and is to receive equal honor. In the second passage, Jesus assumes the title, "Son of God," as equivalent to asserting that he was God. The Jews charging it upon him as blasphemy.

74. What is the evidence furnished by such passages as speak of the manifestation, giving or sending of the Son?

See 1 John 3:8; Romans 8:3; John 3:16, etc. To say that the Son was sent or manifested implies that he was Son before he was sent or manifested as such.

75. State the argument from Romans 1:3-4. The argument from this passage is twofold:

1st. The Son of:God is declared to have been made flesh, and therefore must have pre–existed as Son.

2nd. By the resurrection he was powerfully manifested to be the Son of God as to his divine nature. The phrases, according to the flesh, and according to the spirit of holiness, are evidently antithetical, designating severally the Lord's human and divine natures.

76. State the argument from Romans 8:3.

Here God's own son was sent in the likeness of sinful flesh. Obviously he must have pre–existed as such before he assumed the likeness of sinful flesh the assumption of which certainly could not have constituted him the own Son of God.

77. State the argument from Colossians 1:15-21. In this passage the apostle sets forth at length the nature and glory of him whom, in the thirteenth verse, he had called God's dear Son. Thus he proves that Christ as Son is the image of the invisible God, and that by him all things consist, etc.

78. State the argument from Hebrews 1:5-8.

Paul is here setting forth the superiority of Christ as a divine person. As divine he calls him “the son”, “the first begotten.” This Son is brought into the world, and therefore must have pre–existed as such. As son he is declared to be God, and to reign upon an everlasting throne.

79. How can those passages which speak of the Son as inferior and subject to the Father be reconciled with this doctrine?

It is objected that such passages prove that Jesus, as Son, is inferior and subject to the Father.

We answer that in John 3:13, the “ Son of Man ” is said to have come down from heaven, and to be in heaven. But surely Jesus, as Son of Man was not omnipresent. In Acts 20:28 God is said to purchase his church with his own blood; but surely Christ, as God, did not shed his blood. The explanation of this is that it is the common usage of Scripture to designate the single person of the God–man by a title belonging to him as the possessor of one nature, while the condition, attribute, relation, or action predicated of him is true only of the other nature. Thus in the passages in question he is called “ Son of God,” because he is the eternal Word, while at the same time he is said to be inferior to the Father, because he is also man and mediator.

(2.) THE RELATION WHICH THE THIRD PERSON SUSTAINS TO THE FIRST AND SECOND, OR THE ETERNAL PROCESSION OF THE HOLY GHOST.

80. What is the etymology (linguistic development) of the word Spirit, and the usage of its Hebrew and Greek equivalents? The English word spirit is from the Latin spiritus, breath, wind, air, life, soul, which in turn is from the verb spiro, to breathe. The equivalent Hebrew word, ■■■■■ has a perfectly analogous usage.

1st. Its primary sense is wind, air in motion, Genesis 8:1; then, 2nd, breath, the breath of life, Genesis 6:17; Job 17:1;

3rd, animal soul, vital principle in men and animals, 1 Samuel 30:12;

4th, rational soul of man, Genesis 12:8, and hence, metaphorically, disposition, temperament, Numbers 5:14;

5th, Spirit of Jehovah,, Genesis 1:2; Psalms 2:11.—Gesenius, “ Lex.” The equivalent Greek word, πνευμα, has also the same usage. It is derived from πνεω, to breathe, to blow. It signifies, 1st breath, Revelation 11:11; Revelation 2:1-29 nd, air in motion, John 3:8; (3rd, the vital principle, Matthew 27:50; Matthew 4:1-25, the rational soul, spoken (1) of the disembodied spirits of men, Hebrews 12:23; (2) of devils, Matthew 10:1; (3) of angels, Hebrews 1:14; (4) the Spirit of God, spoken of God, a, absolutely as an attribute of his essence, John 4:24; and b as the personal designation of the third person of the Trinity, who is called Spirit of God, or of the Lord, and the Holy Spirit, and the Spirit of Christ, or of Jesus, or of the Son of God, Acts 16:6-7; Romans 8:9; 2 Corinthians 3:17; Galatians 4:6; Php 1:19; 1 Peter 1:11.

81. Why is the third person of the Trinity called the Spirit? As the one indivisible divine essence which is common to each of the divine persons alike is spiritual, this term, as the personal designation of the third person, can not be intended to signify the fact that he is a spirit as to his

essence, but rather to mark what is peculiar to his person, i. e., his personal relation to the Father and the Son, and the peculiar mode of his operation ad extra. As the reciprocal epithets Father and Son are used to indicate, so far forth, the mutual relations of the first and second persons, so the epithets, Spirit, Spirit of God, Spirit of the Son, Spirit which proceedeth from the Father are applied to the third person to indicate, so far forth, the relation of the third person to the first and second.

82. Why is he called Holy Spirit? As holiness is an attribute of the divine essence, and the glory equally of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, it can not be applied in any pre–eminent sense as a personal characteristic to the third person. It indicates, therefore, the peculiar nature of his operation. He is called the Holy Spirit because he is the author of holiness throughout the universe. As the Son is also styled Logos, or God, the Revealer, so the Holy Spirit is God, the Operator, the end and glory of whose work in the moral world is holiness, as in the physical world beauty.

83. Why is he called the Spirit of God? This phrase expresses his divinity, his relation to the Godhead as himself God, 1 Corinthians 2:11; his intimate personal relation to the father as his consubstantial spirit proceeding from him, John 15:26; and the fact that he is the divine Spirit, which proceeding from God operates upon the creature, Psalms 104:30; 1 Peter 4:14.

84. Why is the third person called the Spirit, of Christ?

See Galatians 4:6; Romans 8:9; Php 1:19; 1 Peter 1:11. As the form of expression is identical in the several phrases, Spirit of God, and spirit of the Son, and as the Scriptures, with one exception, John 15:26, uniformly predicate everything of the relation of the spirit to the Son, that they predicate of the relation of the Spirit to the Father, it appears evident that he is called Spirit of the Son for the same reason that he is called Spirit of God. This phrase also additionally sets forth the official relation which the Spirit in his agency in the work of redemption sustains to the God–man, in taking of his, and showing them to us, John 16:14.

85. What is meant by the theological phrase, Procession of the Holy Ghost?

Theologians intend by this phrase to designate the relation which the third person sustains to the first and second, wherein by an eternal and necessary, i. e, not voluntary, act of the Father and the Son, their whole identical divine essence, without alienation, division, or change, is communicated to the Holy Ghost.

86. What distinction do theologians make between “procession” and “generation?” As this entire subject infinitely transcends the measure of our faculties, we can do nothing further than classify and contrast those predicates which inspiration has applied to the relation of Father and Son with those which it has applied to the relation of the Spirit to the father and Son.

Thus Turretin, Vol. 1., L. 3., Q. 31. They differ, “

1st. As to source, the Son emanates from the Father only, but the Spirit from the Father and the Son at the same time.

2nd. As to mode. The Son emanates in the way of generation, which affects not only personality, but similitude, on account of which the Son is called the image of the Father, and in consequence

of which he receives the property of communicating the same essence to another person, but the Spirit, by the way of spiration, which effects only personality, and in consequence of which the person who proceeds does not receive the property of communicating the same essence to another person.

3rd. As to order. The Son is second person, and the Spirit third, and though both are eternal, without beginning or succession, yet, in our mode of conception, generation precedes procession."

"The schoolmen vainly attempted to found a distinction between generation and spiration upon the different operations of the divine intellect and the divine will. They say the Son was generated per modum intellectus(through the mind), whence he is called the Word of God. The Spirit proceeds per modum voluntatis(through the will), whence he is called Love."

87. What is the Scripture ground for this doctrine?

What we remarked above (Question 53), concerning the common theological definition of the eternal generation of the Son, holds true also with reference to the common definition of the eternal procession of the Holy Ghost, viz., that in order to make the method of the divine unity in Trinity more apparent, theologians have pressed the idea of derivation and subordination in the order of personal subsistence too far. This ground is at once sacred and mysterious. The points given by Scripture are not to be pressed nor speculated upon, but received and confessed nakedly. The data of inspiration are simply as follows:

1st. Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three divine persons, possess from eternity the one whole identical, indivisible, unchangeable essence.

2nd. The Father from his characteristic personal name, and the order in which his name uniformly occurs in Scripture, and from the fact that the Son is called his and his only begotten, and that the Spirit is called his, the one proceeding from him, and from the order of his manifestation and operation ad extra, is evidently in some way first in order of personal subsistence relatively to the Son and Spirit.

3rd. For the same reason (see below, Question 89) the Son, in the order of personal subsistence, is before the Spirit. 4th. What the real nature of these distinctions in the order of personal subsistence may be is made known to us only so far—

(1.) That it involves no distinction as to time, since all are alike eternal.

(2.) It does not depend upon any voluntary action, for that would make the second person dependent upon the first, and the third upon the first and second, while they are all "equal in power and glory."

(3.) It is such a relation that the second person is eternally only begotten Son of the first, and the third is eternally the Spirit of the first and second.

88. What was the difference between the Greek and Latin churches in this doctrine? The famous Council of Nice, A. D. 325, while so accurately defining the doctrine of the Godhead of the Son, left the testimony concerning the Holy Ghost in the vague form in which it stood in the ancient creed, "in the Holy Ghost." But the heresy of Macedonius, who denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost,

having sprung up in the meantime, the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381, completed the testimony of the Nicene Creed thus, “I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, the Author of Life, who proceedeth from the Father.”

There subsequently arose a controversy upon the question, whether the Scriptures do or do not represent the Holy Spirit as sustaining precisely the same relation to the Son that he does to the Father. This the Latins generally affirmed, and at the third ecclesiastical assembly at Toledo, A. D. 589, they added the word filioque(and the Son) to the Latin version of the Constantinopolitan Creed, making the clause read “Credimus in Spiritum Sanctum qui a Patre Filioque pro cedit.” The Greek Church violently opposed this, and to this day reject it. For a short time they were satisfied with the compromise, The Spirit proceeding from the Father through the Son,,, which was finally rejected by both parties. The Constantinopolitan Creed, as amended at the Council of Toledo, is the one now adopted by the Catholic Church, and recognized by all Protestants, currently bearing the title of “Nicene Creed.”

89. How may it be proved that, as far as revealed, the Spirit sustains precisely the same relation to the Son which he does to the Father? The epithet “ Spirit” , is the characteristic personal designation of the third Person. Whatever is revealed of his eternal and necessary personal relation to either the Father or the Son is indicated by this word. Yet he is called the Spirit of the Son, as well as the Spirit of the Father. He possesses the same identical essence of the Son as of the Father. The Son sends and operates through the Spirit as the Father does. Wherever their Spirit is there both Father and Son are revealed, and there they exercise their power.——John 14:16; John 14:26; John 15:26; John 16:7. With the single exception of the phrase, “which proceedeth from the Father” (John 15:26), the Scriptures apply precisely the same predicates to the relation of the Spirit to the Son that they do to his relation to the father.

90. What office does the Spirit discharge in the economy of redemption? In the economy of redemption, as universally in all the actings of the Godhead upon the creature, God the Son is the revealed God, God as known, and God the Spirit is that divine person who exerts his energy immediately upon and in the creature. He is styled in this relation in the creed το Κυριον, και το σωοποιον. The Lord, and the Giver of life. For a more detailed answer see Chapter 24., on “The Mediatorial Office of Christ” , Question 9.

III. THE PERSONAL PROPERTIES PECULIAR TO EACH OF THE THREE PERSONS OF THE GODHEAD, AND THEIR ORDER OF OPERATION AD EXTRA.

91. What is the theological meaning of the word property as applied to the doctrine of the Trinity? And what are severally the personal properties of each Person of the Godhead. The attributes of God are the perfections of the divine essence, and therefore common to each of the three persons, who are “the same in substance,” and therefore “equal in power and glory.” These have been discussed under Chapter 8. The properties of each divine person, on the other hand, are those peculiar modes of personal subsistence whereby each divine person is constituted as such, and that peculiar order of operation whereby each person is distinguished from the others. The peculiar distinguishing properties which belong to each Person severally is called technically his charater hypostatus—personal character. As far as these are revealed to us the personal properties of the father are as follows:He is begotten by none, and proceeds from none; he is the Father of the Son, having begotten him from eternity; the Spirit proceeds from him and is his Spirit.

Thus he is the first in order and in operation, sending and operating through the Son and Spirit. The personal properties of the Son are as follows:He is the Son, from eternity the only begotten of the Father. The Spirit is the Spirit of the Son even as he is the Spirit of the Father, he is sent by the Father, whom he reveals:he, even as the father, sends and operates through the Spirit. The personal properties of the Spirit are as follows:He is the Spirit of the Father and the Son, from eternity proceeding from them:he is sent by the Father and the Son, they operating through him; he operates immediately upon the creature.

92. What kind of subordination did the early writers attribute to the second and third persons in relation to the first?

They held, as above shown, that the eternal generation of the Son by the Father, and the eternal procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son involved in both instances the derivation of essence. They illustrated their idea of this eternal and necessary act of communication by the example of a luminous body, which necessarily radiates 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 as 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.

93. What is expressed by the use of the terms first, second, and third in reference to the persons of the Trinity.

These terms are severally applied to the persons of the Trinity because—

1st. The Scriptures uniformly state their names in this order.

2nd. The personal designations, Father and Son, and Spirit of the Father and of the Son, indicate this order of personal subsistence.

3rd. Their respective modes of operation ad extra is always in this order. The Father sends and operates through the Son, and the Father and Son send and operate through the Spirit. The Scriptures never either directly or indirectly indicate the reverse order. As to the outward bearing of the Godhead upon the creature it would appear, that the Father is revealed only as he is seen in the Son, who is the eternal Logos, or divine Word, the express image of the Father person. “No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.”—John 1:18. And the Father and Son act immediately upon the creature only through the spirit.

“The Father is all the fullness of the Godhead invisible, without form, whom no man hath seen or can see.”

“The son is all the fullness of the Godhead manifested.”

“The Spirit is all the fullness of the Godhead acting immediately upon the creature, and thus making manifest the Father in the image of the Son, and through the power of the Spirit.”—“Higher Christian Life,” by Rev. W. E. Boardman, p. 105.

94. How can the assumption of personal distinctions in the Godhead be reconciled with the divine unity?

Although this tripersonal constitution of the Godhead is altogether beyond the capacity of reason, and is ascertained to us only through a supernatural revelation, there is evidently no contradiction in the twofold proposition, that God is one, and yet father, Son, and Holy Ghost are that one God. They are one in one sense, and threefold in an entirely different sense. The eternal, self–existent, divine essence, constituting all those divine perfections called attributes of God is, in the same sense and degree, common to all the persons. In this sense they are one. But this divine essence exists eternally as Father, and as Son, and as Holy Ghost, distinguished by personal properties. In this sense they are three. We believe this, not because we understand it, but because thus God has revealed himself:

95. How can the separate incarnation of the Son be reconciled with the divine unity? The Son is identical with the Father and Spirit as to essence, but distinct from them as to personal subsistence. In the incarnation, the divine essence of the son was not made man, but as a divine person he entered into a personal relation with the human nature of the man Christ Jesus. This did not constitute a new person, but merely introduced a new element into his eternal person. It was the personal union of the Son with a human soul and body, and not any change either in the divine essence, or in the personal relation of the Son to the Father or the Spirit.

HERETICAL OPINIONS.

96. What are the three great points which together embrace the mystery of the Trinity as revealed in Scripture, and the apparent irreconcilability of which, with each other, occasions the great objection to this doctrine in the minds of heretics of all classes? The three great points are as follows.

1st. There is absolutely but one God, but one self–existent, eternal, immutable, spiritual substance.

2nd. Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are each equally this one God—are each in common constituted of the whole of this inalienable indivisible essence, having the same identical numerical essence, and the same identical attributes.

3rd. Nevertheless father, Son, and Holy Ghost are three distinct persons, distinguished each by his several personal properties. The difficulty is, that in the case of the only created spirits of which we know anything, every person is a separate spiritual essence, and distinct personality is definitely discriminated by numerical difference of attribute. We can not conceive how three persons can have among them but one intelligence and one will.

Hence all heresies on this subject have sprung from one or other of three distinct tendencies, or efforts to disembarrass this doctrine of its apparent inconsistencies by the denial or abatement of one or other of its three constituent elements.

1st. One tendency is to cut the knot of the difficulty by denying the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the personality of the Holy Ghost. This makes God the Father the only divine Person and the possessor of the only divine substance.

2nd. A second heretical tendency is to deny the divine unity and to maintain the co–existence of three distinct Gods, distinct in essence as well as in person.

3rd. The third heretical tendency is to press the divine unity so far as to make Father, Son, and Holy Ghost on and the same identical Person as well as the same divine essence, admitting them only to be different names, or different aspects or functions of the one divine Person.

97. What different opinions have been held by those who deny the divinity of Christ, and either the divinity or personality of the Holy Ghost?

1st. That of the Humanitarians, or those who maintain that Christ is a mere Man. These in the early Church were known by the name of Ebionites, and Alogi—the deniers of the Logos, while in the Modern Church they are known as Socinians. For a statement of the History and Doctrine of the SOCINIANS, see above, Chapter 6., Ques. 11 and 13. Those who have held that Christ is a mere man have differed among themselves as to whether he was miraculously conceived in the womb of the Virgin or not, and as to the question of his supernatural endowments as a prophet, and as to the degree of honor and obedience owed from us to him. Some admit that he possessed a supernatural divine commission and qualification beyond that vouchsafed to any other prophet. Others deny the supernatural element altogether, and regard him as a mere man naturally endowed with a very superior moral and religious genius.

All of this class, of course, hold that God is one Person as well as one essence, and for the most part they regard the term Holy Ghost as only a designation of the divine energy exercised in human affairs. Some of the German Rationalists, who for the most part agree with the Socinians, hold that the phrase Holy Ghost properly designates the one divine person working in the world of nature—Creation and Providence. Others hold it designates God in the church.

2nd. The Gnostics, as a general class, held that the supreme God is one alike in essence and in Person, and that from him emanates different orders of spiritual beings, none of them in any proper sense God, yet all divine, since they all proceeded by way of emanation from him. These are called Aeons. The Old Testament Jehovah, or Creator, was one of these Aeons, of which class Christ was one of the greatest. The entire sum of these Aeons constituted, in the view of the Gnostics, the entire sum of all the actual or possible self–revelations, or self–communications, of the unapproachable Godhead, which the Apostle Paul declared to be alone and fully realized in Christ.——Colossians 2:9.

3rd. The earlier Nomin Trinitarians."In their construction of the doctrine of the trinity, the Son is not a subsistenceυποσται in the Essence, but only an effluenceδυναμι or energy issuing from it, hence they could not logically assert the union of the divine nature, or the very substance of the Godhead with the humanity of Jesus. A merely effluent energy proceeding from the deity, and entering the humanity of Christ, would be nothing more than an indwelling inspiration kindred to that of the prophets."—Shedd's "Hist. Christ. Doc.," Book 3., Ch. 5, §1.

4th. The Arians, so called from Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria during the first part of the fourth century, the great opponent of Athanasius. He maintained that the Godhead consists of one eternal person, who in the beginning, before all worlds, created in his own image a super–angelic being ετεροουσιον a different essence), his only begotten Son, the of the creation of God, by whom also he the worlds. The first and greatest creature thus created, through the Son of God,

was the Holy Ghost. In the fullness of time this Son became incarnate in the person of Jesus of Nazareth.

5th. The doctrine of the Semiarians. This party was so called as occupying middle ground between the Arians and the Orthodox. They held that the absolute, self–existent God was one person, but that the Son was a divine person of a glorious essence, like to ομοιυσιον but not identical with ομοοσιον that of the Father, and from eternity begotten by the Father by a free exercise of will and power, and therefore subordinate to and dependent upon him.

98. What was the position of those who sought to relieve the difficulty of the doctrine by denying the divine unity?

These were the TRITHEISTS, who admitted that there were three ουσιαι numerically considered, as well as three υποστασεις in the Godhead. They held the idea of ουσια(essence) by which the essence was expressed, should be understood as the mere concept of a genus, and the υποστασις as an individual (a species) falling under this generic conception. “That is there are three Gods generically one, individually distinct”.—Smith’s edition of Hagenbach’s “Hist. of Doc.,” Vol. 1., pp. 267, 268.

99. What was the position of those who pressed the divine unity in opposition to the Tritheists so far as to make Father, Son, and Holy Ghost one Person as well as one essence? The Monarchians, so called because they rejected the Triad and maintained the Monad, or absolute unity as to person as well as to essence in the Godhead, were of several kinds; some, as the Alogi, were very much the same as the modern Unitarian, which term is intended to express the same idea. Others, as Praxeas of Asia Minor, circum. A. D. 200; Noetus of Smyrna, circum. A. D. 230, and Beryl of Bostra in Arabia, circum. A. D. 250, held that this one single divine Person became incarnate in the man Christ, and hence they were called Patripassians. “ Sabellius, a presbyter of Ptolemais, who lived about the middle of the third century, adopted the notions of the earlier Monarchians, and maintained in opposition to the doctrine propounded by Origen and his followers, that the appellations Father, Son, and Holy Spirit were only so many different manifestations and names of one and the same divine being. He thus converted the objective and real distinction of persons (a Trinity of essence) into a merely subjective and moralistic view (the Trinity of manifestation).” Smith’s edition of Ha– “Hist. of Doctrine,” Vol. 1., p. 246. “They affirmed that there is only one divine Person. This one only Person conceived of in his abstract simplicity and eternity was denominated God the Father; but in his incarnation, he was denominated God the Son. Sometimes a somewhat different mode of apprehension and statement was employed. God in his concealed, unrevealed nature and being was denominated God the father, and when he comes forth from the depths of his essence, creating a universe, and revealing and communicating himself to it, he therein takes on a different relation, and assumes another denomination; namely, God the Son, or the Logos.”——Shedd’s “History of Christian Doctrine,” Book 3., Ch. 2, § 2.

100. By what considerations may it be shown that the doctrine of the Trinity is a fundamental element of the Gospel?

It is not claimed that the refinements of theological speculations upon this subject are essential points of faith, but simply that it is essential to salvation to believe in the three persons in one

Godhead, as they are revealed to us in the Scriptures.

1st. The only true God is that God who has revealed himself to us in the scriptures, and the very end of the gospel is to bring us to the knowledge of that God precisely in the aspect in which he has revealed himself. Every other conception of God presents a false God to the mind and conscience. There can be no mutual toleration without treason. Socinians, Arians, and Trinitarians worship different Gods.

2nd. The Scriptures explicitly assert that the knowledge of this true God and of Jesus Christ whom he hath sent is eternal life, and that it is necessary to honor the Son even as we honor the Father.——John 5:23; John 14:1; John 17:3; 1 John 2:23; 1 John 5:20.

3rd. In the initiatory rite of the Christian church we are baptized into the name of every several person of the Trinity. Matthew 28:19.

4th. The whole plan of redemption in all its parts is founded upon it. Justification, sanctification, adoption, and all else that makes the gospel the wisdom and power of God unto salvation, can be understood only in the light of this fundamental truth.

5th. As an historical fact it is beyond dispute that in whatever church the doctrine of the Trinity has been abandoned or obscured, every other characteristic doctrine of the gospel has gone with it.

02.10. The Decrees God in General.

Chapter 10 The Decrees God in General.

1. What are the decrees of God?

See “Confession of Faith,” chap. 3. “Larger Cat.,” Q. 12, and “Shorter Catechism,” Q. 7. The decree of God is his eternal, unchangeable, holy, wise, and sovereign purpose, comprehending at once all things that ever were or will be in their causes, conditions, successions, and relations, and determining their certain futurition. The several contents of this one eternal purpose are, because of the limitation of our faculties, necessarily conceived of by us in partial aspects, and in logical relations, and are therefore styled DECREES.

2. How are the acts of God classified, and to which class do theologians refer the decrees?

All conceivable divine actions may be classified as follows:

1st. Those actions which are immanent and intrinsic, belonging essentially to the perfection of the divine nature, and which bear no reference whatever to any existence without the Godhead. These are the acts of eternal and necessary generation, whereby the Son springs from the Father, and of eternal and necessary procession, whereby the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, and all those actions whatsoever involved in the mutual society of the divine persons.

2nd. Those actions which are extrinsic and transient i.e., those free actions proceeding from God and terminating upon the creature, occurring successively in time, as God’s acts in creation, providence, and grace.

3rd. The third class are like the first, inasmuch as they are intrinsic and immanent, essential to the perfection of the divine nature and permanent states of the divine mind, but they differ, on the other hand, from the first class, inasmuch as they have respect to the whole dependent creation exterior to the Godhead. These are the eternal and immutable decrees of God respecting all beings and events whatsoever exterior to himself.

3. What is the essential nature and source of the difficulties which oppress the human, reason when speculating on this subject?

These difficulties all have their ground in the perfectly inscrutable relations of the eternal to the temporal, of the infinite to the finite, of God’s absolute sovereignty to man’s free agency, and of the unquestionable fact of the origination of sin to the holiness, goodness, wisdom, and power of God. They are peculiar to no system of theology, but press equally upon any system which acknowledges the existence and moral government of God, and the moral agency of man. They have perplexed heathen philosophers of old, and deists in modern times, and Socinians, Pelagians, and Arminians just as sorely as Calvinists.

4. From what fixed point of view are we to start in the study of this subject? A self–existent, independent, all–perfect, and unchangeable God, existing alone from eternity, began to create the

universe physical and moral in an absolute vacuum, moved to do so from motives and with reference to ends, and according to ideas and plans, wholly interior and self–prompted. Also, if God governs the universe, he must, as an intelligent being, govern it according to a plan; and this plan much be perfect in its comprehension, reaching to all details. If he has a plan now, he must have had the same plan unchanged from the beginning. The decree of God therefore is the act of an infinite, absolute, eternal, unchangeable, and sovereign person, comprehending a plan including all his works of all kinds, great and small, from the beginning of creation to an unending eternity. It must therefore be incomprehensible, and it cannot be conditioned by any thing exterior to God himself——since it was matured before any thing exterior to him existed. and hence itself embraces and determines all these supposed exterior things and all the conditions of them forever.

5. What is the distinction between foreknowledge and foreordination and what is the general position of the Socinians on this point?

Foreknowledge is an act of the infinite intelligence of God, knowing from all eternity, without change, the certain futurition of all events of every class whatsoever that ever will come to pass.

Foreordination is an act of the infinitely intelligent, foreknowing, righteous, and benevolent will of God from all eternity determining the certain futurition of all events of every class whatsoever that come to pass. Foreknowledge recognizes the certain futurition of events, while foreordination makes them certainly future.

Socinians admit that the foreknowledge and the foreordination of God are co–extensive, but they limit both to such events in creation and providence as God has determined to do by his own immediate agency, or to bring about through the agency of such second causes as act under the law of necessity. They deny that God has either foreordained or foreknown the voluntary actions of free agents, which from their very nature are contingent, and not objects of knowledge until alter their occurrence.

6. What is the position of the Arminians on this subject? The Arminians agree with the Socinians in denying that God foreordains the voluntary acts of free agents, or in any way whatever determines them beforehand to be certainly future. But they differ from the Socinians and agree with us in holding that the certain foreknowledge of God extends equally to all events, as well to those in their nature contingent, as to those produced by second causes acting under the law of necessity. They hold that he foresees with absolute certainty from all eternity the futurition of the free actions of moral agents, and that he embraces and adjusts them in his eternal plan—which plan embraces all things, the free actions of moral agents as simply foreseen, and the actions of necessary agents as absolutely foreordained.

7. State under several heads the Calvinistic doctrine on this subject.

1st. God foreknows all events as certainly future because he has decreed them and thus made them certainly future.

2nd. God’s decree relates equally to all future events of every kind, to the free actions of moral agents, as well as to action of necessary agents, to sinful as well as morally right actions.

3rd. Some things God has eternally decreed to do himself immediately, e. g., creation; other things to bring to pass through the action of second causes acting under a law of necessity, and again other things he has decreed to prompt or to permit free agents, to do in the exercise of their free agency; yet the one class of events is rendered by the decree as certainly future as the other.

4th. God has decreed ends as well as means, causes as well as effects, conditions and instrumentalities as well as the events which depend upon them.

5th. God's decree determines only the certain futurition of events, it directly effects or causes no event. But the decree itself provides in every case that the event shall be effected by causes acting in a manner perfectly consistent with the nature of the event in question. Thus in the case of every free act of a moral agent the decree itself provides at the same time—(a.) That the agent shall be a free agent. (b.) That his antecedents and all the antecedents of the act in question shall be what they are. (c.) That all the present conditions of the act shall be what they are. (d.) That the act shall be perfectly spontaneous and free on the part of the agent. (e.) That it shall be certainly future.

6th. God's purposes relating to all events of every kind constitute one single, all–comprehensive intention comprehending all events, the free as free, the necessary as necessary, together with all their causes, conditions, and relations, as one indivisible system of things, every link of which is essential to the integrity of the whole.

8. Show that as respects the eternal plan of an omniscient and omnipotent Creator, foreknowledge is equivalent to foreordination.

God possessing infinite foreknowledge and power, existed alone from eternity; and in time, self–prompted, began to create in an absolute vacuum. Whatever limiting causes or conditions afterwards exist were first intentionally brought into being by himself, with perfect foreknowledge of their nature, relations, and results. If God then foreseeing that if he created a certain free agent and placed him in certain relations he would freely act in a certain way, and yet with that knowledge proceeded to create that very free agent and put him in precisely those positions, God would, in so doing, obviously predetermine the certain futurition of the act foreseen. God can never in his work be reduced to a choice of evils, because the entire system, and each particular end and cause, and condition, was clearly foreseen and by deliberate choice admitted by himself.

9. What reasons may be assigned for contemplating the decrees of God as one all–comprehensive intention?

1st. Because as shown below it is an eternal act, and oeternitas est una, individua et tota simul(an eternal, yet wholly individual act).

2nd. Because every event that actually occurs in the system of things is interlaced with all other events in endless involution. No event is isolated. The color of the flower and the nest of the bird are related to the whole material universe. Even in our ignorance we can trace a chemical fact as related to myriad other facts, classified under the heads of mechanics, electricity, and light and life.

3rd. God decrees events as they actually occur, i. e., events produced by causes, and depending upon conditions. The decree that determines the event cannot leave out the cause or the condition upon which it depends. But the cause of one event, is the effect of another, and every event in the

universe is more immediately or remotely the condition of every other, so that an eternal purpose on the part of God must be one all comprehensive act. As our minds are finite, as it is impossible for us to embrace in one act of intelligent comprehension an infinite number of events in all their several relations and bearings, we necessarily contemplate events in partial groups, and we conceive of the purpose of God relating to them as distinct successive acts. Hence the Scriptures speak of the counsels, the purposes, and the judgments of God in the plural, and in order to indicate the intended relation of one event to another, they represent God as purposing one event, as the means or condition upon which anther is suspended. This is all true because these events do have these relations to one another, but they all alike fall within, and none remain without, that one eternal design of God which comprehends equally all causes and all effects, all events and all conditions.

All the speculative errors of men on this subject, spring from the tendency of the human mind to confine attention to one fragment of God's eternal purpose, and to regard it as isolated from the rest. The Decree of God separates no event from its causes or conditions any more than we find them separated in nature. We are as much unable to take in by one comprehensive act of intelligence all the works of God in nature as we are to take in all his decrees. So we are forced to study his decrees part by part. No intelligent theologian or student of nature thinks that any event is isolated.

10. How may it be proved that the decrees of God are eternal?

1st. As God is infinite, he is necessarily eternal and unchangeable, from eternity infinite in wisdom and knowledge, and absolutely independent in thought and purpose of every creature. There can never be any addiction to his wisdom, nor surprise to his foreknowledge nor resistance to his power, and therefore there never can be any occasion to reverse or modify that infinitely wise and righteous purpose which, from the perfection of his nature, he formed from eternity.

2nd. It is asserted in Scripture.—(απ αιωνο) Acts 15:18; (προ καταβολη κοσμου) Ephesians 1:4; 1 Peter 1:20; (απ αρχη) 2 Thessalonians 2:13; (προ χρονων αιωνιων) 2 Timothy 1:9; (προ των αιωνων) 1 Corinthians 2:7; Ephesians 3:11, etc.

11. Prove that the decrees are immutable.

1st. This is certain from the fact that they are eternal, as just shown.

2nd. from the fact that God is eternal, absolute, immutable, and all–perfect in wisdom and power.

3rd. It is taught in Scripture.—Psalms 33:11; Isaiah 46:9, etc.

12. Prove from reason that the decrees of God comprehend all events. As shown above no event is isolated. If one event is decreed absolutely all events must therefore be determined with it. If one event is left indeterminate all future events will be left in greater or less degrees indeterminate with it.

13. Prove the same from Scripture.

1st. They affirm that the whole system in general is embraced in the divine decrees.—Ephesians 1:11; Acts 17:26; Daniel 4:34-35.

2nd. They affirm the same of chance events.—Proverbs 16:33; Matthew 10:29-30.

3rd. Of the free actions of men.—Ephesians 2:10-11; Php 2:13.

4th. Even of the wicked actions of men. “Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and with wicked hands have crucified and slain.” —Acts 2:23. “For of a truth against thy Holy Child whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined beforehand to be done.”—Acts 4:27-28; Acts 13:29; 1 Peter 2:8; Jude 1:4; Revelation 17:17. As to the history of Joseph, compare Genesis 37:28 with Genesis 45:7-8; Genesis 1:20 :“So now it was not you that sent me hither but God.”“But as for you, ye thought evil against me, but God meant it unto good.”—See also Psalms 17:13-14, and Isaiah 10:5 and Isaiah 10:15, etc.

14. Prove the universality of God’s decrees from providence.

It follows from the eternity, immutability, and infinite wisdom, foreknowledge, and power of God, that his temporal working in providence must in all things proceed according to his eternal purpose.—Ephesians 1:11, and Acts 15:18. But both Scripture and reason alike teach us that the providential government of God comprehends all things in heaven and on earth as awhole, and every event in detail.—Proverbs 16:33; Daniel 4:34-35; Matthew 10:29-30.

15. Prove this doctrine from prophecy.

God has in the Scriptures foretold the certain occurrence of many events, including the free actions of men, which have afterwards surely come to pass. Now the ground of prophecy is foreknowledge, and the foundations of the foreknowledge of an event as certainly future, is God’s decree that made it future. The eternal immutability of the decree is the only foundation of the infallibility either of the foreknowledge or of the prophecy. But if God has decreed certain future events, he must also have included in that decree all of their causes, conditions, coordinates, and consequences. No event is isolated; to make one certainly future implies the determination of the whole concatenation of causes and effects which constitute the universe.

16. In what sense are the decrees of God free? The decrees of God are free in the sense that in decreeing he was solely actuated by his own infinitely wise, righteous, and benevolent good pleasure. He has always chosen as he pleased, and he has always pleased consistently with the perfection of his nature.

17. In what sense are the decrees of God sovereign?

They are sovereign in the sense that while they determine absolutely whatever occurs without God, their whole reason and motive is within the divine nature, and they are neither suggested nor occasioned by, nor conditioned upon anything whatsoever without him.

18. What is the distinction between absolute and conditional decrees? An absolute decree is one which, while it may include conditions, is suspended upon no condition, i. e., it makes the event decreed, of whatever kind, whether of mechanical necessity or of voluntary agency, certainly future, together with all the causes and conditions, of whatever nature, upon which the event depends. A conditional decree is one which decrees that an event shall happen upon the condition

that some other event, possible but uncertain (not decreed), shall actually occur. The Socinians denied that the free actions of men, being intrinsically uncertain, are the objects of knowledge, and therefore affirmed that they are not foreknown by God. They held that God decreed absolutely to create the human race, and after Adam sinned he decreed absolutely to save all repenting and believing sinners, yet that he decreed nothing concerning the sinning nor the salvation of individual men. The Arminians, admitting that God certainly foreknows the acts of free agents as well as all other events, maintain that he absolutely decreed to create man, and foreseeing that man would sin he absolutely decreed to provide a salvation for all, and actually to save all that repent and believe, but that he conditionally decreed to save individual men on the condition, foreseen but not foreordained, of their faith and obedience.

19. What are the objections to attributing conditional decrees to God?

Calvinists admit that the all–comprehensive decree of God determines all events according to their inherent nature, the actions of free agents as free, and the operation of necessary causes, necessarily. It also comprehends the whole system of causes and effects of every kind; of the motives and conditions of free actions, as well as the necessary causes of necessary events. God decreed salvation upon the condition of faith, yet in the very same act he decreed the faith of those persons whose salvation he has determined. “Whom he did predestinate, them he also called.” Thus his decree from the beginning embraced and provided for the free agency of man, as well as the regular procedures of nature, according to established laws. Thus also his covenants, or conditional promises, which he makes in time, are in all their parts the execution of his eternal purpose, which comprehended the promise, and the condition in their several places as means to the end. But that the decree of God can be regarded as suspended upon conditions which are not themselves determined by the decree is evidently impossible.

1st. This decree has been shown above (Questions 3–7) to be eternal and all–comprehensive. A condition implies liability to change. The whole universe forming one system, if one part is contingent the whole must be contingent, for if one condition failed the whole concatenation of causes and effects would be deranged. If the Arminian should rejoin that although God did not foreordain the free acts of men, yet he infallibly foreknew and provided for them, and therefore his plans cannot fail; then the Calvinist replies that if God foresaw that a given man, in given circumstances, would act at a given juncture in a certain way, then God in decreeing to create that very man and place him in those very circumstances, at that very juncture, did foreordain the certain futurition of that very event, and of all its consequences. That God’s decree is immutable and does not depend upon uncertain conditions, is proved (1) from its eternity, (2) from the direct assertions of Scripture.—Isaiah 14:24; Isaiah 14:27; Isaiah 46:10; Psalms 33:11; Proverbs 19:21; Romans 9:11; Ephesians 3:11.

2nd. The foreknowledge of God, as Arminians admit, is eternal and certain, and embraces all events, free as well as necessary. But, (1) as shown in the preceding paragraph, this foreknowledge involves foreordination, and (2) certainty in the foreknowledge implies certainty in the event; certainty implies determination; determination leaves us to choose between the decree of an infinitely wise, righteous, and benevolent God, and a blind fate.

3rd. A conditional decree would subvert the sovereignty of God and make him, as to the administration of his whole government and the execution of all his plans, dependent upon the

uncontrollable actions of his own creatures. But the decrees of God are sovereign.—Isaiah 40:13-14; Daniel 4:35; Romans 9:15-18.

4th. His decree is declared to depend upon his own “good pleasure,” and the “counsel of his own will.”—Ephesians 1:5; Ephesians 1:11; Romans 9:11; Matthew 11:25-26.

5th. The decree of God includes the means and conditions. 2 Thessalonians 2:13; 1 Peter 1:2; Ephesians 1:4.

6th. His decree absolutely determines the free actions of men.—Acts 4:27-28; Ephesians 2:10.

7th. God himself works in his people that faith and obedience, which are called the conditions of their salvation.—Php 2:13; Ephesians 2:8; 2 Timothy 2:25.

20. To what extent are the decrees of God efficacious and to what extent are they permissive?

All the decrees of God are equally efficacious in the sense that they all infallibly determine the certain futurition of the event decreed. Theologians, however, classify the decrees of God thus:

1st. As effective in as far as they respect those events which, he has determined to effect through necessary causes, or in his own immediate agency.

2nd. As permissive as far as they respect those events which he has determined to allow dependent free agents to effect.

21. How may it be proved that the decree of God renders the event certain?

1st. From the nature of the decree itself as sovereign and unchangeable (see above).

2nd. From the essential nature of God in his relation to his creation, as an infinitely wise and powerful sovereign.

3rd. The foreknowledge of God regards future events as certain. The ground of this certainty must be either in God, or in the events themselves, which last is fatalism.

4th. The Scriptures ascribe a certainty of futurition to the events decreed. There is a needs–be that the event should happen “as it was determined.”—Luke 18:31-33; Luke 24:46; Acts 2:23; Acts 13:29; 1 Corinthians 11:19; Matthew 16:21.

22. How does this doctrine, that God’s universal decree renders the occurrence of future events certain, differ from the ancient doctrine of faith? The Calvinistic doctrine of Decrees agrees with Fatalism only at one point, i. e., in maintaining that the events in question are certainly future. But the Arminian doctrine of divine foreknowledge does precisely the same thing. In every other point our doctrine differs from the heathen doctrine of fate.

Fatalism supposes all events to be certainly determined by a universal law of necessary causation, acting blindly and by a simple unintelligent force effecting its end irresistibly and irrespective of the free wills of the free agents involved. There was no room left for final ends or purposes, no place for motive or choice, no means or conditions, but a simple evolution of necessity. On the other hand the Calvinistic doctrine of Decrees postulates the infinite all–comprehensive plan of an infinitely wise, righteous, powerful, and benevolent Father, whose

plan is determined not by mere will, but according to the “counsel of his will,” securing the best ends, and adopting the best means in order to attain those ends—and whose plan is not executed by mere force, but through the instrumentality of all classes of second causes, free as well as necessary, each pre–adapted to its place and function, and each acting without constraint according to its nature.

There is an infinite difference between a machine and a man, between the operation of motives, intelligence, free choice, and the mechanical forces which act upon matter. There is precisely the same difference between the system of divine decrees, and the heathen doctrine of fate.

23. What objection to this doctrine of unconditional decrees is derived from the admitted fact of man’s free agency?

Objection. — Foreknowledge implies the certainty of the event. The decree of God implies that he has determined it to be certain. But that he has determined it to be certain implies, upon the part of God, an efficient agency in bringing about that event which is inconsistent with the free agency of man.

We answer:It is evidently only the execution of the decree, and not the decree itself which can interfere with the free agency of man. On the general subject of the method in which God executes his decrees, see below, the chapters on Providence, Effectual Calling, and Regeneration.

We have here room only for the following general statement:

1st. The Scriptures attribute all that is good in man to God; these “he works in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure.” All the sins which men commit the Scriptures attribute wholly to the man himself. Yet God’s permissive decree does truly determine the certain futurition of the act; because God knowing certainly that the man in question would in the given circumstances so act, did place that very man in precisely those circumstances that he should so act. But in neither case, whether in working the good in us, or in placing us where we will certainly do the wrong, does God in executing his purpose ever violate or restrict the perfect freedom of the agent.

2nd. We have the fact distinctly revealed that God has decreed the free acts of men, and yet that the actors were none the less responsible, and consequently none the less tree in their acts.—Acts 2:23; Acts 3:18; Acts 4:27-28; Genesis 1:20, etc. We never can understand how the infinite God acts upon the finite spirit of man, but it is none the less our duty to believe.

3rd. According to that theory of the will which makes the freedom of man to consist in the liberty of indifference, i. e., that the will acts in every case of choice in a state of perfect equilibrium equally independent of all motives for or against, and just as free to choose in opposition to all desires as in harmony with them, it is evident that the very essence of liberty consists in uncertainty. If this be the true theory of the will, God could not execute his decrees without violating the liberty of the agent, and certain foreknowledge would be impossible. But as shown below, in Chapter 15., the true theory of the will is that the liberty of the agent consists in his acting in each case as, upon the whole, he pleases, i. e., according to the dispositions and desires of his heart, under the immediate view which, his reason takes of the case. These dispositions and desires are determined in their turn by the character of the agent in relation to his circumstances, which character and circumstances are surely not beyond the control of the infinite God.

24. What is meant by those who teach that God is the author of sin?

Many reasoners of a Pantheistic tendency, e. g., Dr. Emmons, maintain that as God is infinite in sovereignty, and by his decree determines, so by his providence he effects every thing which comes to pass, so that he is actually the only real agent in the universe. Still they religiously hold that God is an infinitely holy agent in effecting that which, produced from God, is righteous, but, produced in us, is sin.

25. How may it be shown that God is not the author of sin? The admission of sin into the creation of an infinitely wise, powerful, and holy God is a great mystery, of which no explanation can be given. But that God cannot be the author of sin is proved—

1st. From the nature of sin, which is, as to its essence, ανομια want of conformity to law, and disobedience to the Lawgiver.

2nd. From the nature of God, who is as to essence holy, and in the administration of his kingdom always forbids and punishes sin.

3rd. From the nature of man, who is a responsible free agent who originates his own acts. The Scriptures always attribute to divine grace the good actions, and to the evil heart the sinful actions of men.

26. How may it be shown that the doctrine of unconditional decrees does not represent God as the author of sin? The whole difficulty lies in the awful fact that sin exists. If God foresaw it and yet created the agent, and placed him in the very circumstances under which he did foresee the sin would be committed, then he did predetermine it. If he did not foresee it, or, foreseeing it, could not prevent it, then he is not infinite in knowledge and in power, but is surprised and prevented by his creatures. The doctrine of unconditional decrees presents no special difficulty. It represents God as decreeing that the sin shall immediately result as the free act of the sinner, and not as by any form of co–action causing, nor by any form of temptation inducing, him to sin.

27. What is the objection to this doctrine derived from the use of means? This is the most common form of objection in the mouths of ignorant and irreligious people. If an immutable decree makes all future events certain, “if what is to be, will be,” then it follows that no means upon our part can avoid the result, nor can any means be necessary to secure it.

Hence as the use of means is commanded by God, and instinctively natural to man, since many events have bees effected by their use, and many more in the future evidently depend upon them, it follows that God has not rendered certain any of those events which depend upon the use of means on the part of men.

28. What is the ground upon which the use of means is founded? This use is founded upon the command of God, and upon that fitness in the means to secure the end desired, which, our instincts, our intelligence, and our experience disclose to us. But neither the fitness nor the efficiency of the means to secure the end, reside inherently and independently in the means themselves, but were originally established and are now sustained by God himself; and in the working of all means God always presides and directs providentially. This is necessarily involved in any Christian theory of Providence, although we can never explicate the relative action (concursus) of God on man, the infinite upon the finite.

29. How may it be shown that the doctrine of decrees does not afford a rational ground of discouragement in the use of means? This difficulty (stated above, Question 27) rests entirely in a habit of isolating one part of God's eternal decree from the whole (see Question 7), and in confounding the Christian doctrine of decrees with the heathen doctrine of fate (see Ques. 22.) But when God decreed an event he made it certainly future, not as isolated from other events, or as independent of all means and agents, but as dependent upon means and upon agents freely using those means. The same decree which, makes the event certain, also determines the mode by which it shall be effected, and comprehends the means with the ends. This eternal, all–comprehensive act embraces all existence through all duration, and all space as one system, and at once provides for the whole in all its parts, and for all the parts in all their relations to one another and to the whole. An event, therefore, may be certain in respect to God's decree and foreknowledge, and at the same time truly contingent in the apprehension of man, and in its relation to the means upon which it depends.

30. What are the distinctions to be borne in mind between the objections to the proof of a doctrine, and objections to the doctrine when proved?

Reasonable objections to the evidence, Scriptural or otherwise, upon which the claims of any doctrine is based, are evidently legitimate. These objections against the proof establishing the truth of the doctrine ought always to be allowed their full weight. But when once the doctrine has been proved to be taught in Scripture objections leveled against it, obviously have no weight at all until they amount to a sufficient force to prove that the Scriptures themselves are not the word of God. Before they reach that measure, objections level led against the doctrine itself, which do not affect the evidence upon which it rests (and most of the objections to the Calvinistic doctrine of Decrees are of this order) only illustrate the obvious truth that the finite mind of man cannot fully comprehend the matters partially revealed and partially concealed in the word of God.

31. What are the proper practical effects of this doctrine?

Humility, in view of the infinite greatness and sovereignty of God, and of the dependence of man. Confidence and implicit reliance upon the wisdom, righteousness, goodness, and immutability of God's purposes, and cheerful obedience to his commandments; always remembering that God's precepts, as distinctly revealed, and not his decrees, are the rule of our duty.

02.11. Predestination.

Chapter 11

Predestination.

1. What the different senses in which the word predestination is used by theologians?

1st. As equivalent to the generic word decree, as including all God's eternal purposes.

2nd. As embracing only those purposes of God which, specially respect his moral creatures.

3rd. As designating only the counsel of God concerning fallen men, including the sovereign election of some and the most righteous reprobation of the rest.

4th. It is sometimes restricted in the range of its usage so far as to be applied only to the eternal election of God's people to everlasting life. The sense marked as 3rd., above, is the most proper usage.— See Acts 4:27-28.

2. In what senses are the words$\pi\rho o\gamma\iota\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$ (to know beforehand), and$\pi\rho o\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota$ (foreknowledge), used in the New Testament?

$\Pi\rho o\gamma\iota\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$ is compounded of $\pi\rho o$ before, and $\gamma\iota\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\omega$ of which the primary sense is to know, and the secondary sense to approve, e. g.,2 Timothy 2:19; John 10:14-15; Romans 7:15. This word occurs five times in the New Testament. Twice, e. g.,Acts 26:5 and 2 Peter 3:17, it signifies previous knowledge, apprehension, simply. In the remaining three instances, Romans 8:29; Romans 11:2; 1 Peter 1:20, it is used in the secondary sense of approve beforehand. This is made evident from the context, for it is used to designate the ground of God's predestination of individuals to salvation, which elsewhere is expressly said to be "not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace," and "to the good pleasure of his will,"2 Timothy 1:9; Romans 9:11; Ephesians 1:5.

$\Pi\rho o\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota$ occurs but twice in the New Testament, e. g.,Acts 2:23 and 1 Peter 1:2, in both of which instances it evidently signifies approbation, or choice from beforehand. It is explained by the equivalent phrase "determinate counsel."

3. What is the New Testament usage of the words$\varepsilon\kappa\lambda\varepsilon\gamma\omega$ (to elect) and$\varepsilon\kappa\lambda o\gamma\eta$ (election) ?

$\Epsilon\kappa\lambda\varepsilon\gamma\omega$ occurs twenty–one times in the New Testament. It is used to signify, 1st., Christ's choice of men to be apostles. Luke 6:13; John 6:70.

2nd. God's choice of the Jewish nation as a peculiar people.—Acts 13:17.

3rd. The choice of men by God, or by the church, for some special service.—Acts 15:7; Acts 15:22.

4th. The choice made by Mary of the better part. Luke 10:42.

5th. In the great majority of instances God's eternal election of individual men to everlasting life.—John 15:16; 1 Corinthians 1:27-28; Ephesians 1:4; James 2:5.

Εκλογη occurs seven times in the New Testament. Once it signifies an election to the apostolic office.—Acts 9:15. Once it signifies those chosen to eternal life.—Romans 11:7. In every other case it signifies the purpose or the act of God in choosing his own people to salvation.—Romans 9:11; Romans 11:5; Romans 11:28; 1 Thessalonians 1:4; 2 Peter 1:10.

4. What other words are used by the Holy Ghost in the New Testament to set forth the truth on this subject?

Προοριξειν occurs six times in the New Testament.—Acts 4:28; Romans 8:29-30; 1 Corinthians 2:7, and Ephesians 1:5; Ephesians 1:11. In every case it signifies the absolute predestination of God.

Προτιθημι occurs three times in the New Testament. In Romans 1:13 it signifies a purpose of Paul, and in Romans 3:25 and Ephesians 1:9, a purpose of God.

Προετοιμαξειν occurs twice, Romans 9:23 and Ephesians 2:10, prepare or appoint beforehand.

5. To whom is election referred in the Scriptures? The eternal decree, as a whole, and in all its parts, is doubtless the concurrent act of all the three persons of the Trinity, in their perfect oneness of counsel and will. But in the economy of salvation, as revealed to us, the act of sovereign election is specially attributed to the Father, as his personal part, even as redemption is attributed to the Son, and sanctification to the Spirit.—John 17:6; John 17:9; John 6:64-65; 1 Thessalonians 5:9.

6. State that theory of Predestination designated by its advocates the "Theory of National Election." This is the theory that the only election spoken of in the Bible concerning the salvation of men consists of the divine predestination of communities and nations to the knowledge of the true religion and the external privileges of the gospel. This form of election, which undoubtedly represents a great gospel fact, is eminently illustrated in the case of the Jews.

7. State the theory styled by its advocates the "Theory of Ecclesiastical Individualism." The view advocated by Mr. Stanley Faber in his " Primitive Doctrine of Election," and by Archbishop Whately in his "Essays on some of the Difficulties in the Writings of the Apostle Paul," and others, is styled the doctrine of "Ecclesiastical Individualism," and it involves the affirmation that God predetermines the relation of individual men to the outward church and the means of grace. Thus by birth and subsequent providences he casts the lot of some men in the most favorable, and of others in the least favorable circumstances.

8. What is the Arminian doctrine of election? The Arminians admit the foreknowledge of God, but they deny his absolute foreordination as it relates to the salvation of individuals. Their distinguishing doctrine is that God did not eternally make choice of certain persons and ordain their salvation, but that he made choice of certain characters, as holiness and faith and perseverance; or of certain classes of men who possess those characters, e. g., believers who persevere unto the end.

Since they admit that God foreknows from eternity with absolute certainty precisely what individuals will repent and believe and persevere therein to the end, it follows that their doctrine admits of the statement that God eternally predestinated certain persons, who he foresaw would repent and believe and persevere to life and salvation, on the ground of that faith and perseverance thus foreseen.

9. Point out the severed principles in which the above–mentioned views agree and wherein they differ. The theories of “National Election” and of “Ecclesiastical Individualism,” both teach universally admitted facts, namely that God does predestinate individuals and communities and nations to the external privileges of the gospel and the use of the means of grace. This neither any Arminian nor any Calvinist will deny. But these theories are both vicious and both identical with the Arminian theory, in that they deny that God unconditionally predestinates either the free actions or the ultimate salvation of individuals. They admit that he gives certain men a better chance than others, but hold that each man’s ultimate fate is not determined by God’s decree, but left dependent upon the free wills of the men themselves. Nevertheless, while these theories are all consistently Arminian in fundamental principle, yet they differ in the manner in which they attempt to bring the Scriptures concerned into harmony with that system. These theories differ among themselves as to the objects, the ends, and the grounds of this election. As to the objects of the election spoken of in Scripture, the Arminian, the Calvinistic, and “Ecclesiastical Individualism” theories agree in making them individuals. The theory of “National Election ” makes them nations or communities. As to the end of this election the Calvinistic and Arminian theories make it the eternal salvation of the individuals elected. The theories of “National Election” and of “Ecclesiastical Individualism” make it admission to the privilege of the means of grace. As to the ground of this election spoken of in the Scripture, advocates of the Calvinistic, the “National Election,” and the “Ecclesiastical Individualism ” theories agree in making it the sovereign good pleasure of God, while the Arminians hold it is conditioned upon the faith, repentance, and perseverance certainly foreseen in each individual case.

It is obvious that the Calvinistic Doctrine of Decrees includes the absolute election of both individuals and of communities and nations to the use of the means of grace and the external advantages of the Church. It is also obvious that the admission of the principle of absolute election, as far as this, must be made by all Arminians as well as Calvinists, and hence this admission alone does not discriminate between the two great contesting systems. The only question which touches the true matter in debate is, What is the ground of the eternal predestination of individuals to salvation? Is it the foreseen faith and repentance of the individuals themselves, or the sovereign good pleasure of God? Every Christian must take one side or the other of this question. If he takes the side which makes foreseen faith the ground, he is an Arminian no matter what else he holds. If he takes the side which makes the good pleasure of God the ground, he is a Calvinist. This division among themselves, and this alternate agreement with and difference from the Calvinistic positions on this subject, is a very suggestive illustration of the extreme difficulty the advocates of Arminian principles have in accommodating the words of Scripture to their doctrine. In a controversial point of view the Calvinists have the capital advantage of being able to divide their opponents, and to refute them in detail.

10. State the three points in the Calvinistic doctrine on this subject.

Calvinists hold, as shown in the preceding chapter, that God's Decrees are absolute and relate to all classes of events whatsoever. They therefore maintain that while nations, communities, and individuals are predestined absolutely to all of every kind of good and bad that befalls them, nevertheless the Scriptures teach specifically an election (1) of individuals, (2) to grace and salvation, (3) founded not upon the foreseen faith of the persons elected, but upon the sovereign good pleasure of God alone.

11. State the Presumption of the truth of the above arising from the fact that impartial infidel and rationalistic interpreters admit that the letter of the Scriptures can be interpreted only in a Calvinistic sense.

Besides the presumption in favor of Calvinism arising from the fact above stated, that anti–Calvinistic interpreters of the Scripture are reduced to all kinds of various hypotheses in order to avoid the obvious force of the Scriptural testimony upon the subject, we now cite the additional presumption, arising from the fact that rationalists and infidels generally, who agree with Arminians in their intense opposition to Calvinistic Principles, yet not being restrained by faith in the inspiration of the Bible, are frank enough to confess that the Book can be fairly interpreted only in a Calvinistic sense. This is thus the impartial testimony of an enemy. Wegscheider in his "Institutiones Theologioe Christianoe Dogmaticoe," Pt. 3., Ch. 3., § 145,7 the highest authority as to the results of German Rationalists in Dogmatic theology, says that the passages in question do teach Calvinistic doctrine, but that Paul was misled by the crude and erroneous notions prevalent in that age, and especially by the narrow spirit of Jewish particularism. See also Gibbon's "Decline and fall of the Roman Empire," Chapter 33., Note 31.—"Perhaps a reasoner still more independent may smile in his turn, when he peruses an Arminian Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans."

12. Prove from Scripture that the subjects of election are individuals and that the end of election is eternal life.

1st. They are always spoken of as individuals, and the election of which they are the subjects is always set forth as having grace or glory as its end.—Acts 13:48; Ephesians 1:4; 2 Thessalonians 2:13.

2nd. The elect are in Scripture explicitly distinguished from the mass of the visible Church, and hence their election could not have been merely to the external privileges of that Church.—Romans 11:7.

3rd. The names of the elect are said "to be written in heaven" and to be in "the book of life."—Hebrews 12:23; Php 4:3.

4th. The blessings which it is explicitly declared are secured by this election are gracious and saving, they are the elements and results of salvation, inseparable from it, and pertain not to nations but to individuals as their subjects, e. g.,"adoption of sons,""to be conformed to the image of his Son," etc.—Romans 8:29; Ephesians 1:5; 2 Thessalonians 2:13; 1 Thessalonians 5:9; Romans 9:15-16.

13. Show that this election is not founded on works whether foreseen or not. This follows—

1st. From the general doctrine of Decrees which has been established in the last chapter. If God's decrees relate to and determine all events of every class, it follows that no undecreed events

remain to condition his decree or any element thereof; and also that he has decreed faith and repentance as well as the salvation which is conditioned upon them.

2nd. It is expressly declared in Scripture that this election is not conditioned upon works of any kind.—Romans 11:4-7; 2 Timothy 1:9; Romans 9:11.

14. Show that in Scripture it is habitually declared to be founded on “The good pleasure of God,” and “the counsel of his own will.”

Ephesians 1:5-11; 2 Timothy 1:9; John 15:16; John 15:19; Matthew 11:25-26; Romans 9:10-18.

15. State the argument derived from the fact that “faith”,“ repentance,” and “evangelical obedience,” are said to be the fruits of the Election.

It is self–evident that the same actions cannot be both the ground upon which election rests, and the fruits in which that election is designed to result. Since the Bible teaches that “faith,”“repentance,” and “evangelical obedience,” are the latter, they cannot be the former. The Scriptures do so teach in Ephesians 1:4. “According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world that we should be holy, and without blame before him in love.”—2 Thessalonians 2:13; 1 Peter 1:2; Ephesians 2:10.

16. The same from the fact that faith and repentance are said to be the gifts of God.

If faith and repentance are the “gifts of God,” then a man’s possessing them results from God’s act. If it results from God’s act it must result from his eternal purpose. If they be the results of his purpose, they cannot be the conditions upon which that purpose is suspended. They are affirmed to be the “gifts of God” in Ephesians 2:8; Acts 5:31; 1 Corinthians 4:7.

17. State the argument derived from what the Scriptures teach as to the nature and extent of innate depravity and inability. The teaching of Scripture on these heads will be found stated and established in Chapters 19. and 20. Now if men are born into the world with an antecedent prevailing tendency in their nature to sin, and they are ever, until regenerated by the Spirit of God, totally and inalienably averse to and incapable of all good, it follows that unregenerate human nature is incapable either of tending to or of perfecting faith and repentance as the conditions required. If election is conditioned upon faith and repentance, then the man must produce his own faith and repentance, or help to produce them. But if human nature can neither produce nor help to produce them, it follows either that no man can be elected, or that faith and repentance cannot be the condition of election.

18. State the same from what the Scriptures teach of the nature and necessity of regeneration. In Chapter 29. it will be proved that the Scriptures teach (1) that regeneration is an act of God; (2) that with respect to that act the soul is passive; (3) that it is absolutely necessary in the case of every living man. Hence it follows that if it be in no sense man’s work, but in every sense God’s act alone, it cannot be the condition upon which God’s purpose is suspended, but an event determined by that purpose.

19. Show that the Scriptures teach that ALL the elect believe, and that ONLY the elect believe.

All the elect believe.—John 10:16; John 10:27-29; John 6:37-39; John 17:2; John 17:9; John 17:24. And only the elect believe.—John 10:26. And those who believe do so because they are elect.—Acts 13:48, and g., 47.

20. What argument is to be drawn from the fact that all evangelical Christians of every theological school express the sentiments proper to the Calvinistic doctrine of unconditional election in all their prayers and hymns? That form of doctrine must be false which cannot be consistently embodied in personal religious experience and in devotion. That form of doctrine must be true which all Christians of all theoretical opinions always find themselves obliged to express when they come to commune with God. Now all the psalms and hymns and prayers, written and spontaneous, of all evangelical Christians, embody the principles and breathe the spirit of Calvinism. They all pray God to make men repent and believe, to come to and to receive the Savior. If God gives all men common and sufficient grace, and if the reason why one man repents, is that he makes good use of that grace, and the reason another does not believe, is that he does not use that grace, if the only cause of difference is in the men, it follows that we ought to pray men to convert themselves, i. e., to make themselves to differ. But all agree in asking God to save us, and in giving him all the thanks when it is done.

21. Show that Paul must have held our position on this subject from the nature of the objections made against his doctrine, and from the answers he gave them.

Paul's doctrine is identical with the Calvinistic view.

1st. Because he expressly teaches it.

2nd. Because the objections he notices as brought against his doctrine are the same as those brought against ours. The design of the whole passage is to prove God's sovereign right to cast off the Jews as a peculiar people, and to call all men indiscriminately by the gospel.

This, he argues,

1st., that God's ancient promises embraced not the natural descendants of Abraham as such, but the spiritual seed.

2nd. That "God is perfectly sovereign in the distribution of his favors." But against this doctrine of divine sovereignty two objections are introduced and answered by Paul.

1st. It is unjust for God thus of his mere good pleasure to show mercy to one and to reject another, 5:14. This precise objection is made against our doctrine at the present time also. " It represents the most holy God as worse than the devil, as more false, more cruel, and more unjust."—"Methodist Doctrinal Tracts," pp. 170, 171. This Paul answers by two arguments.

(1.) God claims the right, "I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy."—Romans 9:15-16.

(2.) God in his providence exercises the right, as in the case of Pharaoh, vs. 17,18.

2nd. The second objection is that this doctrine is inconsistent with the liberty and accountability of men. This would be an absurd objection to bring against Paul's doctrine if he were an Arminian, but it is brought every day by Arminians against our doctrine.

Paul answers this objection by condescending to no appeal to human reason, but simply (1) by asserting God's sovereignty as Creator, and man's dependence as creature, and (2) by asserting the just exposure of all men alike to wrath as sinners, vs. 20–24.—See Analysis of Romans 9:6-24, in Hodge's "Commentary On Romans."

22. Discriminate accurately the two elements involved in the doctrine of Reprobation.

Reprobation is the aspect which God's eternal decree presents in its relation to that portion of the human race which shall be finally condemned for their sins.

It is, 1st., negative, inasmuch as it consists in passing over these, and refusing to elect them to life; and, 2nd., positive, inasmuch as they are condemned to eternal misery. In respect to its negative element, reprobation is simply sovereign, since those passed over were no worse than those elected, and the simple reason both for the choosing and for the passing over was the sovereign good pleasure of God. In respect to its positive element, reprobation is not sovereign, but simply judicial, because God inflicts misery in any case only as the righteous punishment of sin. "The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sins".—"Confession faith," Chap. 3., Sec. 7.

23. Show that these positions are necessarily involved in the general doctrine of Decrees and in the special doctrine of the election of some men to eternal life. As above stated, this doctrine of reprobation is self–evidently an inseparable element of the doctrines of decrees and of election. If God unconditionally elects whom he pleases, he must unconditionally leave whom he pleases to themselves. He must foreordain the non–believing, as well as the believing, although the events themselves are brought to pass by very different causes.

24. Prove that it is taught in Scripture.

Romans 9:18; Romans 9:21;1 Peter 2:8; Jude 1:4; Revelation 13:8. "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes, even so, Father, for so it seemeth good in thy sight."—Matthew 11:25. " Ye believe not, because ye are not my sheep."—John 10:26.

25. Show that the same objection was made against Paul's doctrine that is made against ours.

"Why doth he yet find fault?" If he has not given gracious ability to obey, how can he command?—See also "Methodist Doctrinal Tracts," p. 171. The apostle answers by showing, 1st (verses 20,21), that God is under no obligation to extend his grace to all or to any; and,

2nd., that the "vessels of wrath" were condemned for their own sins, to manifest God's just wrath, while the "vessels of mercy," were chosen not for any good in them, but to manifest his glorious grace (verses 22,23).

26. Show the identity of Paul's doctrine ours from the illustrations he uses in the ninth chapter of Romans.

"Hath not the potter power εξουσια over the clay of the same lump to make one vessel to honor, and another to dishonor?" Romans 9:21. Here the whole point of the illustration lies in the fact that there is no difference in the clay—it is clay of the same lump—the sole difference is made by the

will of the potter. In the case of Esau and Jacob, the very point is that one is just as good as the other—that there is no difference in the children—but that the whole difference is made by the "purpose of God according to election"—"for the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth," Romans 9:11.

27. In what sense is God said to harden men?

See Romans 9:18, and John 12:40. This is doubtless a judicial act wherein God withdraws from sinful men, whom he has not elected to life, for the just punishment of their sins, all gracious influences, and leaves them to the unrestrained tendencies of their own hearts, and to the uncounteracted influences of the world and the devil.

28. State the objection brought against the Calvinistic doctrine of election on the ground that it is inconsistent with Justice.

It is maintained that if God by a sovereign unconditional decree determines to pass by some men, and to withhold from them the grace necessary to enable them to repent and believe in Christ, it is unjust in God to hold them accountable, and to punish them for their want of faith.

29. State the fundamental view which necessarily underlies all Arminianism as to the relation which the remedial work of Christ sustains to the justice of God, and as to the relation which the human race by nature sustains to the divine government. When the Arminian system is sifted to its fundamental principles, it is found to rest upon the claim that the gift of Christ is a necessary compensation to the human race for the evils brought upon it for the sin of Adam. It is admitted that the sin of Adam was the cause of his whole race becoming sinners, and that every one of his descendants comes into the world with a nature so far depraved as to be morally incapable of loving God and disposed to evil. But they maintain that men are by nature in the first instance not responsible for their moral condition, since it comes upon them each at his birth, antecedent to all personal action They hold, therefore, that man cannot be punished for original sin. nor could any man ever be held responsible for any act of disobedience springing as an inevitable consequence out of that original depravity, if God had not through Christ provided a remedy, giving to each man gracious ability to do all that is required of him as the condition of his salvation. This redemption and gracious ability to believe and obey God owes to all men, and they are necessary to render any man. responsible and punishable for his sins, since thus alone is he, as far as this class of exercises go, endowed with the power of contrary choice.

Dr. D. D. Whedon, in the "Bibliotheca Sacra," April, 1862, p. 257.—"1t is not then until there is redemptively conferred upon man what we call a gracious ability for the right, that man can be strictly responsible for the wrong." He says, p. 254, that after Adam sinned the only alternatives open to God in consistency with justice were either, 1st., to send Adam and Eve to perdition before they had children, or,

2nd., to allow him to propagate his kind under the antecedent disabilities of sin, and provide a redemptive system for all.

He distinguishes between guilt or moral responsibility for character and moral corruption of nature. Under the conditions of pure nature, he teaches that only Adam and Eve were responsible, as well

as corrupt, because they, having been created morally free, voluntarily made themselves vile by their own act. On the other hand their descendants are all morally polluted and spiritually dead, because they inherit corrupt natures from Adam; but they are not guilty, neither responsible for their birth sin nor for any of its consequences, because it was determined inevitably by an act not their own. In the actual state of things consequent to the gift of Christ every man is responsible because every man has sufficient grace.

Hence it follows—

1st. That the provision of redemption was not a work of infinite free grace, but a mere act of Justice in compensation for evils brought upon our nature by Adam.

2nd. That this is owed equally to each and every man without exception. “I reject,” says John Wesley, “Methodist Doc. Tracts,” pp. 25, 26, “the assertion that God might justly have passed by me and all men, as a bold, precarious assertion, utterly unsupported by Holy Scripture.”

3rd. It follows also that the gracious help of the Holy Ghost is just as necessary to render men responsible sinners as to bring them to salvation.

4th. It follows that grace sends men to hell, as well as takes them to heaven, and that it has done far more of the former than of the latter work.

30. Show that their position here is absolutely inconsistent with what the Scriptures and the entire Christian Church teach of the nature and necessity of the SATISFACTION made to divine justice by Christ.

It will be shown under Chap. 25. that the Scriptures teach, the entire Church being witness, that in order to the salvation of man, a full satisfaction to the inalienable principle of justice essential to the Divine nature was absolutely necessary. So that if God’s justice is not satisfied, grace cannot be shown to any man. This would be absurd if men were not antecedently responsible for the sins for which it is necessary that they should make satisfaction. What is the sense of a “Redemptively conferred gracious ability,” respecting parties who have forfeited nothing because they are responsible for nothing? In their case is not both “redemption” and “grace” an impertinence?

31. Prove from Scripture that salvation is of “grace.”

Grace is free undeserved favor shown to the undeserving. If redemption is a debt owed to all men, or if it be a compensation prerequisite to their accountability, then it cannot be a gratuity, and the gift of Christ cannot be an eminent expression of God’s free favor and love. It can only be an expression of his rectitude. But the Scriptures declare that the gift of Christ is an unparalleled expression of free love, and that salvation is of grace. Lamentations 3:22; John 3:16; Romans 3:24; Romans 11:5-6; 1 Corinthians 4:7; 1 Corinthians 15:10; Ephesians 1:5-6; Ephesians 2:4-10, etc. And every true Christian recognizes the essential graciousness of salvation as an inseparable element of his experience. Hence the doxologies of heaven.—1 Corinthians 6:19-20; 1 Peter 1:18-19; Revelation 5:8-14. But if salvation is of grace, then it is obviously consistent with God’s justice for him to save all, many, few, or none, justice as he pleases.

32. Show that the objection that unconditional election is inconsistent with the justice of God is absurd and antichristian.

Justice necessarily holds all sinners alike destitute of all claims upon God's favor. It is unjust to justify the unjust. It would be inconsistent with righteousness for a sinful man to claim, or for God to grant, salvation to any one as his due. Otherwise the condemning sentence of conscience is denied, and the cross of Christ made of none effect. On the very grounds of justice itself, therefore, salvation must be of grace, and it must rest upon the sovereign option of God himself whether he provides salvation for few, many, or for none. The salvation of none is consistent with justice, or the sacrifice of Christ was a payment of debt not a grace. And the salvation of one undeserving sinner obviously can lay no foundation upon which, the salvation of another can be demanded as a right.

33. State and refute the objection that our doctrine is inconsistent with the rectitude of God as an IMPARTIAL RULER.

Arminians often argue that reason teaches us to expect the great omnipotent Creator and Sovereign of all men to be impartial in his treatment of individuals—to extend the same essential advantages and conditions of salvation to all alike. They argue also that this fair presumption of reason is reaffirmed in the Scriptures, which declare that God is "no respecter of persons."—Acts 10:34, and 1 Peter 1:17. In the first named passage this applies simply to the application of the gospel to Gentiles as well as Jews. In the second passage it is affirmed that in the judgment of human works God is absolutely impartial. The question as to election, however, is as to grace not as to judgment pronounced on works, and the Scriptures nowhere say that God is impartial in the communication of his grace. On the other hand, the presumptions of reason and the texts of Scripture must be interpreted in a sense consistent with the tangible facts of human history and of God's daily providential dispensations. If it is unjust in principle for God to be partial in his distributions of spiritual good, it can be no less unjust for him to be partial in his distribution of temporal good. As a matter of fact, however, we find that God in the exercise of his absolute sovereignty makes the greatest possible distinctions among men from birth, and independently of their own merits in the allotments both of temporal good and of the essential means of salvation. One child is born to health, honor, wealth, to the possession of a susceptible heart and conscience, and to all the best means of grace as his secure inheritance. Many others are born to disease, shame, poverty, an obtuse conscience and hardened heart, and absolute heathenish darkness and ignorance of Christ. If God may not be partial to individuals, why may he be partial to nations, and how can his dealings with heathen nations and the children of the abandoned classes in the nominally Christian cities be accounted for?

Archbishop Whately gives this excellent word of warning to his Arminian friends:" I would suggest a caution relative to a class of objections frequently urged against Calvinists drawn from the moral attributes of God. We should be very cautious how we employ such weapons as may recoil upon ourselves. It is a frightful but undeniable truth that multitudes, even in Christian countries, are born and brought up in such circumstances as afford them no probable, even no possible chance of obtaining a knowledge of religious truths, or a habit of moral conduct, but are even trained from infancy in superstitious error and gross depravity. Why this should be permitted neither Calvinist nor Arminian can explain; nay, why the Almighty does not cause to die in the cradle every infant whose future wickedness and misery, if suffered to grow up, he foresees, is what no system of religion, natural or revealed, will enable us satisfactorily to account for."—"Essays on some of the Difficulties of St. Paul.," Essay 3rd., on Election.

34. Refute the objection drawn from such passages as1 Timothy 2:4.

“Who will θελει all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge, of the truth.” The word θελειν has two senses—(a) to be inclined to, to desire; (b) to purpose, to will. In such connections as the above it is evident that it cannot mean that God purposes the salvation of all, because (a) all are not saved, and none of God’s purposes fail, and (b) because it is affirmed that he wills all to “come to the knowledge of the truth” in the same sense that he wills all to be saved—yet he has left the vast majority of men to be born and to live and to die, irrespective of their own agency, in heathenish darkness.

Such passages simply assert the essential benevolence of God. He takes no pleasure in the death of the wicked. He does take great pleasure in the salvation of men. Yet as a matter of fact, in perfect consistency with his benevolence, for reasons sufficient, though not revealed to us, he has provided no redemption for lost angels, and no efficacious grace for the non–elect among mankind. These passages simply assert that, if it were not for these reasons, it would be agreeable to his benevolent nature that all men should be saved.

35. Show that our doctrine does not discourage the use of means.

It is objected that if God from eternity has determined that one man is to be converted and saved and another is to be left to perish in his sins, there is no room left for the use of means. As John Wesley, in “Methodist Doc. Tracts,” falsely represents the doctrine of Toplady, “There are suppose twenty men, ten are ordained to be saved do what they may, and ten are ordained to be damned do what they can.” This is an absurd as well as wicked caricature of the doctrine.

1st. The decree of election does not secure salvation without faith and holiness, but salvation through faith and holiness, the means being just as much decreed as the end. The Calvinist believes, as well as the Arminian, that every man who does evil will be damned, elect or non–elect.

2nd. The doctrine of election does not presume that God constrains men inconsistently with their freedom. The non–elect are simply let alone, to do as their own evil hearts prompt. The elect are made willing in the day of God’s power. God works in them to will as well as to do of his good pleasure. To be made willing takes away no man’s liberty.

3rd. The decree of election only makes the repentance and faith of the elect certain. But the antecedent certainty of a free act is not inconsistent with its freedom, otherwise the certain foreknowledge of a free act would be impossible. The decree of election does not cause the faith, and it does not interfere with the agent in acting, and certainly it does not supersede the absolute necessity of it.

36. To what extent is assurance of our election possible, and on what rounds does such assurance rest? An unwavering and certain assurance of the fact of our election is possible in this life, for whom God predestinates them he also calls, and whom he calls he justifies, and we know that whom he justifies, he also sanctifies. Thus the fruits of the Spirit prove sanctification, and sanctification proves effectual calling, and effectual calling election.—See 2 Peter 1:5-10; 1 John 2:3.

Besides this evidence of our own gracious states and acts, we have the Spirit of adoption, who witnesseth with our spirits and seals us.—Romans 8:16-17; Ephesians 4:30. In confirmation of this we have the example of the apostles (2 Timothy 1:12) and of many Christians.

37. How does this doctrine consist with the general benevolence of God? The only difficulty at this point is to reconcile the general benevolence of God with the fact that he, being infinitely wise and powerful, should have admitted a system involving the sin, final impenitence, and consequent damnation of any. But this difficulty presses equally upon both systems. The facts prove that God's general benevolence is not inconsistent with his allowing some to be damned for their sins. This is all that reprobation means. Gratuitous election, or the positive choice of some does not rest upon God's general benevolence, but upon his special love to his own.—John 17:6; John 17:23; Romans 9:11-13; 1 Thessalonians 5:9.

38. How does this doctrine consist with the general gospel offer? In the general offers of the gospel God exhibits a salvation sufficient for and exactly adapted to all, and sincerely offered to every one without exception, and he unfolds all the motives of duty, hope, fear, etc., which ought to induce every one to accept it, solemnly promising that whosoever comes in no wise shall be cast out. Nothing but a sinful unwillingness can prevent any one who hears the gospel from receiving and enjoying it The gospel is for all, election is a special grace in addition to that offer. The non–elect may come if they will. The elect will come. The decree of election puts no barrier before men preventing them from accepting the gospel offer. Any man, elect or non–elect, will be saved if he accept. The non–elect are left to act as they are freely determined by their own hearts.

There is just as great an apparent difficulty in reconciling God's certain foreknowledge of the final impenitence of the great majority of those to whom he offers and upon whom he presses, by every argument, his love with the fact of that offer; especially when we reflect that he foresees that his offers will certainly increase their guilt and misery.

39. How can the doctrine of reprobation be reconciled with the holiness of God?

Reprobation leaves men in sin, and thus leads to the increase of sin throughout eternity. How then can God, in consistency with his holiness, form a purpose the designed effect of which is to leave men in sin, and thus lead inevitably to the increase of sin? But it is acknowledged by Arminians as well as Calvinists, that God did create the human race in spite of his certain foreknowledge that sin would be largely occasioned thereby, and he did create individual men in spite of his certain foreknowledge that these very men would continue eternally to sin. The real difficulty lies in the insoluble problem of the permission of evil. Why is the existence of evil tolerated in the universe of an infinitely wise, righteous, merciful, and powerful God? The Arminians are as little able to answer that question as the Calvinist.

40. What is the practical bearing of this doctrine on Christian experience and conduct?

It must be remembered,

1st. That this truth is not inconsistent with, but is part of; the same gracious system with the equally certain principles of the moral liberty and responsibility of man, and the free offers of the gospel to all.

2nd. That the sole rule of our duty is the commands, threatenings, and promises of God clearly expressed in the gospel, and not this decree of election, which he never reveals except in its consequents of effectual calling, faith, and holy living. When thus held, the doctrine of predestination—

1st. Exalts the majesty and absolute sovereignty of God, while it illustrates the riches of his free grace and his just displeasure with sin.

2nd. It enforces upon us the essential truth that salvation is entirely of grace. That no one can either complain, if passed over, or boast himself, if saved.

3rd., It brings the inquirer to absolute self–despair, and the cordial embrace of the free offer of Christ.

4th. In the case of the believer, who has the witness in himself, this doctrine at once deepens his humility, and elevates his confidence to the full assurance of hope.

41. State the true nature of the question discussed by theologians concerning the ORDER OF THE DIVINE DECREES. As we believe that the Decree of God is one single, eternal intention, there cannot be an order of succession in his purposes either (a) in time, as if one purpose actually preceded the other, or (b) in distinct deliberation or option on the part of God. The whole is one choice. Yet in willing the entire system God, of course, comprehended all the parts of the system willed in their several successions and relations. In line manner as a man by one act of mind recognizes a complicated machine with which he is familiar, and in the same act discriminates accurately the several parts, and comprehends their unity and relation in the system, and the design of the whole.—Dr. Charles Hodge's "Lectures." The question, therefore, as to the Order of the Decrees is not a question as to the order of acts in God decreeing, but it is a question as to the true relation sustained by the several parts of the system which he decrees to one another. That is, What relation between Creation, Predestination, and Redemption did the one eternal purpose of God establish? What do the Scriptures teach as to the purpose of God in giving his Son, and as to the object and ground of election? The ground and object of election has been fully considered above. The design of God in the gift of Christ will. be fully considered under Division 4. of Chapter 25.

42. What is the Arminian theory as to the order of the decrees relating to the human race?

1st. The decree to create man.

2nd. Man, as a moral agent, being fallible, and his will being essentially contingent, and his sin therefore being impreventible, God, foreseeing that man would certainly fall into the condemnation and pollution of sin, decreed to provide a free salvation through Christ for all men, and to provide sufficient means for the effectual application of that salvation to the case of all.

3rd. He decreed absolutely that all believers in Christ should be saved, and all unbelievers reprobated for their sins.

4th. Foreseeing that certain individuals would repent and believe, and that certain other individuals would continue impenitent to the last, God from eternity elected to eternal life those whose faith he foresaw, on the condition of their faith, and reprobated those whom he foresaw would continue

impenitent on the condition of that impenitence.

43. What is the view of this subject entertained by the French Protestant theologians, Camero, Amyraut, and others?

These theological professors at Saumur, during the second quarter of the seventeenth century, taught that God—

1st. Decreed to create man.

2nd. To permit man to fall.

3rd. To provide, in the mediation of Christ, salvation for all men.

4th. But, foreseeing that if men were left to themselves none would repent and believe, therefore he sovereignly elected some to whom he decreed to give the necessary graces of repentance and faith.

44. What is the infralapsarian view of predestination? The infralapsarian (infra lapsum) theory of predestination, or the decree of predestination, viewed as subsequent in purpose to the decree permitting man to fall, represents man as created and fallen as the object of election. The order of the decrees then stand thus:

1st. The decree to create man.

2nd. To permit man to fall.

3rd., The decree to elect certain men, out of the mass of the fallen and justly condemned race, to eternal life, and to pass others by, leaving them to the just consequences of their sins.

4th. The decree to provide salvation for the elect. THIS IS THE COMMON VIEW OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES, CONFIRMED ALIKE BY THE SYNOD OF DORT AND THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY.

45. What is the supralapsarian theory of predestination? The term supralapsarian (supra lapsum) designates that view of the various provisions of the divine decree in their logical relations which supposes that the ultimate end which God proposed to himself was his own glory in the salvation of some men and in the damnation of others, and that, as a means to that end, he decreed to create man, and to permit him to fall. According to this view, man simply as creatible, and fallible, and not as actually created or fallen, is the object of election and reprobation. The order of the decrees would then be—

1st. Of all possible men, God first decreed the salvation of some and the damnation of others, for the end of his own glory.

2nd. He decreed, as a means to that end, to create those already elected or reprobated.

3rd., He decreed to permit them to fall.

4th. He decreed to provide a salvation for the elect. This view was held by Beza, the successor of Calvin in Geneva, and by Gomarus, the great opponent of Arminius.

46. State the respective points of agreement and of difference between these several schemes.

1st. The Arminian as compared with the Calvinistic scheme. With the Arminian the decree of redemption precedes the decree of election, which is conditioned upon the foreseen faith of the individual. With the Calvinist. on the other hand, the decree of election precedes the decree of redemption, and the decree of election is conditioned upon the simple good pleasure of God alone.

2nd. The French or Salmurian as compared with the legitimate view of the Reformed Churches and with the Arminian view. The French view agrees with the Reformed and differs from the Arminian view in making the sovereign good pleasure of God the sole ground of election; while it differs from the Reformed and agrees with the Arminian in making the decree of redemption precede the decree of election.

3rd. The supra–lapsarian scheme as compared with the infralapsarian view prevalent among the Reformed Churches. The supra–lapsarian scheme makes the decree to elect some and reprobate others, precede the decree to create and to permit to fall. The infra–lapsarian view makes the decree of election come after the decree to create and permit to fall. The supralapsarian view regards man not as created and fallen, but simply as creatible, the object of election and reprobation. The infra–lapsarian view makes man as already created and fallen the only object of those decrees.

47. State the arguments against the supra–lapsarian scheme. This scheme is unquestionably the most logical of all. It is postulated upon the principle, that what is last in execution is first in intention, which undoubtedly holds true in all spheres comprehended in human experience. Hence it is argued that if the final result of the whole matter is the glorification of God in the salvation of the elect and the perdition of the non–elect, it must have been the deliberate purpose of God from the beginning. But the case is too high and too vast for the a priori application and enforcement of the ordinary rules of human Judgment; we can here only know in virtue of and within the limits of a positive revelation. The objections against this scheme are—

1st. Man creatible is a nonentity. He could not have been loved or chosen unless considered as created.

2nd. The whole language of Scripture upon this subject implies that the “elect” are chosen as the objects of eternal love, not from the number of creatible, but from the mass of actually sinful men.—John 15:19; Romans 11:5; Romans 11:7.

3rd. The Scriptures declare that the elect are chosen to sanctification, and to the sprinkling of the blood of Christ. They must therefore have been regarded when chosen as guilty and defiled by sin.—1 Peter 1:2; Ephesians 1:4-6.

4th. Predestination includes reprobation. This view represents God as reprobating the non–elect by a sovereign act, without any respect to their sins, simply for his own glory. This appears to be inconsistent with the divine righteousness, as well as with the teaching of Scripture. The non–elect are “ordained to dishonor and wrath for their sins, to the praise of his glorious justice.”—“Confession Faith,” ch. 3, sec. 3–7, “Larger Catechism,” question 13; “Shorter Catechism” question 20.

48. Show that a correct exegesis of Ephesians 3:9-10, does not support the supra–lapsarian view. This passage is claimed as a direct affirmation of the supralapsarian theory. If the ινα introducing the tenth verse, refers to the immediately preceding clause, then the passage teaches that God created all things in order that his manifold wisdom might be displayed by the church to the angels. It is evident, however, that ινα refers to the preceding phrase, in which Paul declares that he was ordained to preach the gospel to the Gentiles, and to enlighten all men as to the mystery of redemption. All this he was commissioned to do, in order that God's glory might be displayed, etc.—See "Hodge on Ephesians."

49. State the arguments against the French scheme.

1st. It is not consistent with the fact that God's purposes are one. The scheme is that God in one eternal act determined to provide the objective conditions of salvation (redemption through the blood of Christ), for all, and to provide the subjective conditions of salvation (efficacious grace) only for some. This is in reality an attempt to weld together Arminianism and Calvinism.

2nd. The Scriptures declare that the purpose of Christ's coming was to execute the purpose of election. He came to give eternal life to as many as the Father has given him. John 17:2; John 17:9; John 10:15. Redemption therefore cannot precede election.

3rd. The true doctrine of the Atonement (see Chapter 25.) is that Christ did not come to make salvation possible, but to effect it for all for whom he died. The Atonement secures remission of sin, and faith, and repentance, and all the fruits of the Spirit. Therefore all who are redeemed repent and believe.

50. In what sense do the Lutherans teach that Christ is the ground of election?

They hold that God elected his own people to eternal life for Christ's sake. They appeal to Ephesians 1:4, "According as he hath chosen us in him [Christ] before the foundation of the world." This view may evidently be construed either with the Arminian or the French theory of the decrees above stated, i. e., we were chosen in Christ for his sake, either as we were foreseen to be in him through faith, or because God, having provided through Christ salvation for all men, would, by the election of certain individuals, secure at least in their case the successful effect of Christ's death. This view, of course, is rebutted by the same arguments which we urge against the theories above mentioned. We are said to be chosen "in him," not for Christ's sake, but because the eternal covenant of grace includes all the elect under the headship of Christ. The love of God is everywhere represented as the ground of the gift of Christ, not the work of Christ the ground of the love of God.—John 3:16; 1 John 4:10.

DIFFERENT VIEWS OF THE CHURCHES. THE LUTHERAN VIEW.—"That which first of all should be accurately observed, is the difference between foreknowledge and predestination or the eternal election of God. For the Foreknowledge of God, is nothing more than that God knew all things before they existed. . . . This foreknowledge of God pertains alike to good and to bad men, but it is not consequently the cause of evil, nor the cause of sin, which impels man to crime. For sin originates from the devil and from the depraved and wicked will of man. Neither is this foreknowledge of God the cause that men perish, for that they ought to charge upon themselves; but the foreknowledge of God disposes evil, and sets bounds to it, determining whither it shall go, and how long it shall last, so that, although it be in itself evil, it conspires to the salvation of God's

elect."

"On the other hand, 'Predestination,' or the eternal election of God, pertains only to the good and chosen sons of God, and it is the cause of their salvation. For it procures their salvation, and disposes to those things which pertain to it. Our salvation is so founded upon this predestination that the gates of hell shall never be able to overturn it. This predestination of God is not to be sought in the secret council of God, but in the word of God, in which it is revealed. For the word of God leads us to Christ, that is that book of life in which all are inscribed and elect who attain to eternal salvation. For so it is written (Ephesians 1:4) he chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world. . . . The word of God, the book of life, offers Christ to us, and this is opened and developed to us through the preaching of the gospel, as it is written (Romans 8:30) whom he chose, them he called. In Christ therefore the eternal election of the Father is to be sought. He in his eternal counsel has decreed that, except those who know his Son Jesus Christ and truly believe on him, none shall be saved."—"Formula Concordioe,"Hase Collect., pp. 617–619.

John Gerhard(1582–1637), Loci 2., 86 B.—"We say that all those, and those alone, are elected from eternity by God to salvation, whom he foresaw would believe in Christ the redeemer through the efficacy of the Holy Spirit, and the ministry of the gospel, and should persevere in faith until the end of life." THE DOCTRINE OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES.—"Thirty–Nine Articles of the Church of England." Article 17.—See above, Chap. 7.

"Westminster Confession of Faith," Chap. 3.—"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 SINS, and to the praise of his glorious JUSTICE."—"Confession Faith, " ch. 3., § 7.

"Canons of Synod of Dort," Cap. 1., § 7.—"But election is the immutable purpose of God, by which, before the foundations of the world were laid, he chose, out of the whole human race, fallen by their own fault from their primeval integrity into sin and destruction, according to the most free good pleasure of his own will, and of mere grace, a certain number of men, neither better nor worthier than others, but lying in the same misery with the rest, to salvation in Christ, whom he had ever from eternity constituted Mediator and Head of all the elect, and the foundation of salvation. . . . § 9. This same election is not made from any foreseen faith, obedience of faith, holiness, or any other good quality or disposition, as a prerequisite cause or condition in the man who should be elected, but unto faith, and unto obedience of faith, and holiness. And truly election is the fountain of every saving benefit; whence faith, holiness, and other salutary gifts, and, finally, eternal life itself flow as its fruit and effect. § 15. Moreover, holy Scripture doth illustrate and commend to us this eternal and free grace of our election, in this more especially, that it doth also testify all men not to be elected, but that some are non–elect, or passed by in the eternal election of God, whom truly God, from most free, just, irreprehensible and immutable good pleasure, decreed to live in the common misery, into which they had, by their own fault, cast themselves, and not to bestow upon them living faith and the grace of conversion."

REMONSTRANTS.—"Remonstrantia, " etc., five articles prepared by the Dutch advocates of universal redemption (1610), Art. 1.—"God by an immutable decree, before he laid the foundations of the world, ordained in Jesus Christ his Son, to save out of the fallen human race, exposed to

punishment on account of sin, those in Christ, on account of Christ, and through Christ, who by the grace of the Holy Spirit believe his Son, and who through the same grace persevere in the obedience of faith to the end. And on the other hand (he decreed) to leave in sin and exposed to wrath those who are not converted, and are unbelieving, and to condemn them as aliens from Christ, according to John 3:36."

7 Dr. Wm. Cunningham, " Hist. Theo., " Vol. 2., p. 463.

02.12. The Creation of the World

Chapter 12 The Creation of the World 1. What is the origin of the doctrine of Creationex nihilo (from nothing)? The prevalence, if not the conception, of the idea of absolute creation, or of creation ex nihilo, is to be referred to the influence of the inspired word of God. Anterior to revelation there were two prevalent causes which prevented the acceptance of this idea. (a.) The universally assumed truth of the axiom that ex nihilo nihil fit. Hence all theists and atheists alike failed to conceive of; or conceiving repudiated, the idea of absolute creation as absurd. (b.) The second cause influencing theists was the presumed interest of natural theology, in the impossibility, on that hypothesis, of reconciling the existence of evil with the perfections of God.

2. What views were respectively held by the great theists Plato and Aristotle?

Plato held that there are two eternal, self–existent principles, God and matter, υλη; which exist coordinately in an indivisible, unsuccessive eternity; that time and the actual phenomenal world which exists in time, are the work of God, who freely molds matter into forms which image his own infinitely perfect and eternal ideas. Aristotle also held that God and matter are coordinately self–existent and eternal; but he differed from Plato in regarding God as eternally self–active in organizing the world out of matter, and consequently in regarding the universe thus organized as eternal as well as the mere matter of which it is formed.—“Ancient Phil.,” W. Archer Butler, Series 3, Lectures 1 and 2.

3. What views on this point prevailed among the Gnostics?

Some of the Gnostics taught that the universe proceeds from God by way of emanation, which was explained as “a necessary and gradual unfolding ad extra of the germ of existence that lay in God,” as radiance proceeds from the sun, etc. Most of the Gnostics united with this theory of emanation the doctrine of dualism, i. e., of the coordinate self–existence of two independent principles, God and matter (υλη). From God by successive emanations proceeded the Eons, the Demimgods, Creator of the world, the Jehovah of the Old Testament, and finally Christ. The material universe springs from self–existent matter, intrinsically evil, organized by the Demimgods. All souls have emanated from the world of light, but have become entangled in matter, hence the historical contest between good and evil, which Christ came to settle by giving power to souls ultimately to escape from the toils of matter.

4. What is the view on this subject common to all schemes of Pantheism?

Pantheists identify God and the universe. God is the absolute being of which stings are the special and transient modes. God is the self–existent and persistent principle of all things, which by an inherent self–acting law of development is eternally running through ceaseless cycles of change.

5. State the true doctrine as to creation. The Christian doctrine as to Creation involves the following points:

1st. “In the beginning,” at some unknown point of definite commencement in time.

2nd. God called all things (that is, the original principles and causes of all things) into being out of nothing. Thus every thing which has or will or can exist, exterior to the Godhead, owes its being and substance as well as its form to God.

3rd. This creative act is an act of free, self–determined will. It was not a necessary constitutional act analogous to the immanent and eternal acts of the Generation of the Son or the Procession of the Holy Spirit.

4th. It was not necessary to complete the divine excellence or blessedness, which were eternal and complete and inseparable from the divine essence. But it was done in the exercise of absolute discretion for infinitely wise reasons.—Dr. Charles Hodge. This doctrine is essential to Theism. All opposing theories of the origin of the world, are essentially Pantheistic or Atheistic.

6. What distinction is signalized by the termsCreation prima seu immediata , andCreatio secunda seu mediate , and by whom was it introduced? The phrase Creation prima seu immediata signifies the originating act of the divine will whereby he brings, or has brought, into being, out of nothing, the principles and elementary essences of all things. The phrase Creation secunda seu mediata signifies the subsequent act of God in originating different forms of things, and especially different species of living beings out of the already created essences of things. The Christian Church holds both. These phrases originated in the writings of certain Lutheran theologians of the seventeenth century, e. g., Gerhard, Quenstedt, etc.

7. What is the primary signification, and what the biblical usage of the word ■■■■■■?

1st. Strictly, To hew, cut out.

2nd. To form, make, produce (whether out of nothing or not).—Genesis 1:1; Genesis 1:21; Genesis 1:27; Genesis 2:3-4; Isaiah 43:1; Isaiah 43:7; Isaiah 14:7; Isaiah 65:18; Psalms 51:12; Jeremiah 31:22; Amos 4:13. Niphal, 1st. To be created.—Genesis 2:4; Genesis 5:2.

2nd. To be born.—Psalms 102:19; Ezekiel 21:35. Piel, 1st. To hew, cut down, e. g., a wood. Joshua 17:15; Joshua 17:18.

2nd. To cut down (with the sword), to kill. Ezekiel 23:47.

3rd. To form, engrave, mark out.—Ezekiel 21:24.“ Gesenius”“Lex.”

8. State the direct proof of the truth of this doctrine afforded in Scripture.

1st. Since the idea itself is new, and foreign to all precedent modes of thought, it could be conveyed in Scripture only through the use of old terms, previously bearing a different sense, but so employed as to suggest a new meaning. The word “bara,” however, is the best one the Hebrew language afforded to express the idea of absolute making.

2nd. This new idea is inevitably suggested by the way in which the term is first used by Moses, when giving account from the very commencement of the genesis of the heavens and the earth. As a general introduction to the history of the formation of the world and its inhabitants, it is declared that “In the beginning—in the absolute beginning, God made the heavens and the earth.” There is not the slightest hint given of any previously existing material. In the beginning God made the heavens and the earth, after that Chaos existed, for then it is said “the earth was without form

and void," and the Spirit of God brooded over the abyss.

3rd. The same truth is also inevitably suggested in all the various modes of expression by which the agency of God in originating the world is set forth in Scripture. In no case is there the faintest trace of any reference to any pre–existing materials or precedent conditions of creation. In every case the whole causal agency to which the creation is referred is the "Word," the bare "fiat" of Jehovah.—Psalms 33:6; Psalms 148:5. By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen (τα βλεπομενα) were not made of things which do appear (μη εκ φαινομενων).—Hebrews 11:3. See Romans 4:17; 2 Corinthians 4:6.

9. In what manner is this doctrine of the absolute creation of the world by God implied in Scripture?

1st. In all those passages that teach that God is an absolute Sovereign, and that the creature is absolutely dependent on him, "in whom we live and move and have our being."—Acts 17:28; Nehemiah 9:6; Colossians 1:16; Revelation 4:11; Romans 11:36; 1 Corinthians 8:6.

Now it is evident that if the essences and primordial principles of all things are not immediately created by God out of nothing, but are eternally self–existent independently of him, then he, in his offices of Creator and Providential governor of all things, must be conditioned and limited by the pre–existing essential properties and powers of those primordial elements. In which case God would not be absolute Sovereign, nor the things made absolutely dependent upon his will.

2nd. In all those passages which teach that the kosmos, the "all things " had a beginning.—Psalms 90:2; John 17:5; John 17:24.

10. What arguments derived from reason and consciousness, and from the elementary constitution of matter, may be adduced in proof of absolute creation?

1st. This doctrine alone is consistent with the feeling of absolute dependence of the creature upon the Creator, which is inherent in every heart, and which is inculcated in all the teachings of the Scriptures. It could not be said that "he upholds all things by the word of his power," nor that "we live and move and have our being in him," unless he be absolutely the Creator as well as the Former of all things.

2nd. It is manifest from the testimony of consciousness:

(1.) That our souls are distinct individual entities, and not parts or particles of God;

(2.) that they are not eternal. It follows consequently that they were created. And if the creation of the spirits of men ex nihilo(out of nothing) be once admitted, there remains no special difficulty with respect to the absolute creation of matter.

3rd. Although the absolute origination of any new existence out of nothing is to us confessedly inconceivable, it is not one whit more so than the relation of the infinite foreknowledge, or foreordination, or providential control of God to the free agency of men, nor than many other truths which we are all forced to believe.

4th. After having admitted the necessary self–existence of an infinitely wise and powerful personal Spirit, whose existence, upon the hypothesis of his possessing the power of absolute Creation is sufficient to account for all the phenomena of the universe, it is unphilosophical gratuitously to

multiply causes by supposing the independent, eternal self–existence of matter also.

5th. When the physical philosopher has analyzed matter to its ultimate atoms, and determined their essential primary properties, he finds in them as strong evidence of a powerful antecedent cause, and of a wisely designing mind, as he does in the most complex organizations of nature; for what are the ultimate properties of matter but the elementary constituents of the universal laws of nature, and the ultimate conditions of all phenomena. If design discovered in the constitution of the universe as finished proves a divine Former, by equal right must the same design discovered in the elementary constitution of matter prove a divine Creator.

“Whether or not the conception of a multitude of beings existing from all eternity is in itself self–contradictory, the conception becomes palpably absurd when we attribute a relation of quantitative equality to all those beings. We are then forced to look beyond them to some common cause, or common origin, to explain why this singular relation of equality exists.

We have reached the utmost limit of our thinking faculties when we have admitted that because matter cannot be eternal and self–existent it must have been created.”—Prof. J. Clerk–Maxwell in Art. Atom, “Encyclo. Britannica,” 9th ed.

11. State and refute the objection to this doctrine based upon the axiom, “Ex nihilo nihilo fit(from nothing, nothing comes). ”

It is objected that it is an original and self–evident principle of reason, that only nothing can come from nothing. We answer that this statement is indefinite. If it is meant that no new thing, nor any change in a previously existing thing, can begin to be without an adequate cause, we answer that it is true, but does not apply to the case in hand. Our doctrine is not that the universe came into being without an adequate cause, but that the essences as well as the forms of all things had a beginning in time, and their cause exists only in the will of God. The infinite power inherent in a self–existent Spirit is precisely the Cause to which we refer the absolute origination of all things. But if it is meant by the above objection that this infinite God has not power to create new entities, then the principle is simply false and not self–evident; it bears not one of the marks of a valid intuition—neither self–evidence, necessity, nor universality.

12. State and refute the position of some who maintain on moral grounds the self–existence of matter.

Those among theistic thinkers who have been tempted to regard matter as eternal and self–existent, have been influenced by the vain hope of explaining thereby the existence of moral evil in consistency with the holiness of God. They would refer all the phenomena of sin to an essentially evil principle inherent in matter, and would justify God by maintaining that he has done all that in him lay to limit that evil. Now, besides the inconsistency of this theory’s attempt to vindicate the holiness of God at the expense of his independence, it proceeds upon absurd principles, as appears from the following considerations:

(1.) Moral evil is in its essence an attribute of spirit. To refer it to a material origin must logically lead to the grossest materialism.

(2.) The entire Christian system of religion, and the example of Christ, is in opposition to that asceticism and “neglecting of the body” (Colossians 2:23), which necessarily springs from the view

that matter is the ground of sin.

(3.) When God created the material universe he pronounced his works “very good.”

(4.) The second Person of the holy Trinity assumed a real material body into personal union with himself.

(5.) The material creation, now “made subject to vanity” through man’s sin, is to be renovated and made the temple in which the God–man shall dwell forever.—See below, Chap. 29., Question 17.

(6.) The work of Christ in delivering his people from their sin does not contemplate the renunciation of the material part of our natures, but our bodies, which are now “the members of Christ,” and the “temples of the Holy Ghost,” are at the resurrection to be transformed into the likeness of his glorified body.

(7.) If the cause of evil is essentially inherent in matter, and if its past developments have occurred in spite of God’s efforts to limit it, what certain ground of confidence can any of us have for the future.

13. Prove that the work of Creation is in Scripture attributed to God absolutely, i. e., to each of the three persons of the Trinity coordinately, and not to either as his special personal function.

1st. To the Godhead absolutely.—Genesis 1:1; Genesis 1:26.

2nd. To the Father, 1 Corinthians 8:6.

3rd. To the Son.—John 1:3; Colossians 1:16-17.

4th. To the Holy Spirit.—Genesis 1:2; Job 26:13; Psalms 104:30.

14. How can it be proved that no creature can create?

1st. From the nature of the work. It appears to us that the work of absolute creation ex nihilo is an infinite exercise of power. It is to us inconceivable because infinite, and it can belong, therefore, only to that Being who, for the same reason, is incomprehensible.

2nd. The Scriptures distinguish Jehovah from all creatures, and from false gods, and establish his sovereignty and rights as the true God by the fact that he is the Creator, Isaiah 37:16; Isaiah 40:12-13, Isaiah 54:5; Psalms 96:5; Jeremiah 10:11-12.

3rd. If it were admitted that a creature could create, then the works of creation would never avail to lead the creature to an infallible knowledge that his creator was the eternal and self–existent God.

15. Why is it important for us to know, if such knowledge be possible, what God’s chief end in creation was? This is not a question of vain curiosity. It is evident, since God is eternal, immutable, and of absolutely perfect intelligence, that the great end or ultimate purpose for which he at the beginning created all things must have been kept in view unchangeably in all his works, and so all his works must be more directly or remotely a means to that end. Now our minds are so constituted that we can understand a system only when we understand its ultimate purpose or end. Thus we can comprehend the parts of a watch or steam engine, and their relations and functions, only after we understand the end or purpose which the entire watch or engine was

intended to serve. And although God has hid from us many of his subordinate purposes, we believe that he has revealed to us that great ultimate design, without a glimpse of which the true character of his general administration never could be in any degree comprehended. None can deny that if he has revealed his ultimate purpose in creation, that it must be a matter to us of the very highest importance.

It is self–evident that we cannot rise to so high a generalization as this by any process of induction from what we know or can know of his works. Our conclusion on this subject must therefore be drawn, in the first instance at least, entirely from what we know of God's attributes and from the explicit teachings of his word.

16. What is the meaning of the term THEODICY, and by whom was this department of speculative theology in the first instance formally explored? The term Theodicy (θεος δικη) signifies a speculative justification of the ways of God towards the human race, especially as respects the origin of evil, and the moral government of the world.

17. What view as to the end of God in creation did Leibnitz advocate, and by whom has he been followed?

Leibnitz held that all moral excellence can be resolved into benevolence, and that the grand, all–comprehending purpose of God in the creation of the universe, and in his preservation and government thereof, is the promotion of the happiness of his creatures. Hence he concludes that God has chosen the best possible system to attain that end in the largest possible degree. This is the system of Optimism. This view has prevailed largely among the New England theologians, in connection with the prevalent theory which regards all virtue as consisting in disinterested benevolence. The objections to this view are—

1st. All virtue does not consist in disinterested benevolence.—See above, Chapter 8., Ques. 61. And happiness is not the highest good.

2nd. It subordinates the Creator to the creature, the greater to the less, as the means to an end. When God from eternity formed the purpose to create, no creatures existed to be made happy or miserable. The motive to create therefore could not have originated in the non–existent, and could have its origin and object only in the divine being himself.

3rd. The Scriptures (see next question) never either directly or indirectly intimate that anything in the creature is the chief end of God, nor do they ever propose any personal or public good of the creature as the chief end of the creature himself.

18. State the true view and quote the statements of the Confession of Faith? The true view is that the great end of God in creation was his own glory. Glory is manifested excellence. The excellencies of his attributes are manifested by their exercise. This end therefore was not the increase either of his excellence or blessedness, but their manifestation God ad extra.

"It pleased God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for the manifestation of the glory of his eternal power, wisdom, and goodness, in the beginning to create or make of nothing the world, and all things therein, whether visible or invisible, in the space of six days, and all very good."—"Confession Faith," Ch. 4., § 1. The same is affirmed to be the chief end of God in all his purposes and works of Providence and Redemption.—Ch. 3. §§ 3, 5, 7, and Ch. 5. § 1; Ch. 6. § 1;

Ch. 33. § 2; “Larger Cat.,” Qs. 12 and 18; “Shorter Catechism,” Qs. 7.

19. State from reason and Scripture the arguments which sustain this view.

1st. Since God formed the purpose to create before any creature existed, it is evident that the motive to create must have its source and object in the pre–existing Creator and not in the non–existing creature. The absolute Creator cannot be subordinated to nor conditioned upon the finite and dependent creature.

2nd. Since God himself is infinitely worthier than the sum of all creatures, it follows that the manifestation of his own excellence is infinitely a higher and worthier end than the happiness of the creatures, indeed the highest and worthiest end conceivable.

3rd. Nothing can so exalt and bless the creature as his being made thus the instrument and the witness of the infinite Creator’s glory, hence the proposing that glory as the “chief end” of the creation is the best security for the creature’s advance in excellence and blessedness.

4th. The Scriptures explicitly assert that this is the chief end of God in creation (Colossians 1:16; Proverbs 16:4), and of things as created.—Revelation 4:11; Romans 11:36.

5th. They teach that the same is the chief end of God in his eternal decrees.—Ephesians 1:5-6; Ephesians 1:12.

6th. Also of God’s providential and gracious governing and disposing of his creatures.—Romans 9:17; Romans 9:22-23; Ephesians 3:10.

7th. It is made the duty of all moral agents to adopt the same as their personal end in all things.—1 Corinthians 10:31; 1 Peter 4:11.

20. What is the present attitude of Geological science in relation to the Mosaic Record of creation? The results of modern geological science clearly establish the conclusions—(a.) That the elementary materials of which the world is composed existed an indefinitely great number of ages ago. (b.) That the world has been providentially brought to its present state by a gradual progression, through many widely contrasted physical conditions, and through long intervals of time. (c.) That it has successively been inhabited by many different orders of organized beings, each in turn adapted to the physical conditions of the globe in its successive stages, and generally marked in each stage by an advancing scale of organization, from the more elementary to the more complex and more perfect forms. (d.) That man completes the pyramid of creation, the most perfect, and the last formed of all the inhabitants of the world. The only difficulty in adjusting these results with the Mosaic Record of creation is found in matters of detail, in which the true sense of the inspired record is obscure, and the conclusions of the science are immature. Therefore all such detailed adjustments as that attempted by Hugh Miller in his “Testimony of the Rocks” have failed. As to the relation of the findings of science with respect to the antiquity of man to Biblical Chronology see below, Chapter 16. In general, however, there is a most remarkable agreement between the Mosaic Record and the results of Geology as to the following principal points. The Record agrees with the science in teaching—(a.) The creation of the elements in the remote past. (b.) The intermediate existence of chaos. (c.) The advance of the earth through various changes to its present physical condition. (d.) The successive creations of different genera and species of organized beings—the vegetable before the animal—the lower forms before the higher forms—in

adaptation to the improving condition of the earth—and man last of all.

If we remember when and where and for what purpose this Record was produced, and compare it with all other ancient or medieval cosmogonies, this wonderful agreement with the last results of modern science will be felt to contribute essentially to the evidences of its divine origin. It is certainly, even when read subject to the most searching modern criticism, seen to be amply sufficient for the end intended:as a general introduction to the history of Redemption, which although rooted in creation is henceforward carried on as a system of supernatural revelations and influences.

21. State the several principles which should always be borne in mind in considering questions involving an apparent conflict of science and revelation.

1st. God's works and God's word are equally revelations from him. They are consequently both alike true, and both alike sacred, and to be treated with reverence. It is absolutely impossible that when they are both adequately interpreted they can come into conflict. Jealousy on either part, is treason to the Author and Lord of both.

2nd. Science, or the interpretation of God's works, is therefore a legitimate and obligatory department of human study. It has its rights which must be respected, and its duties which it must observe. It is the right of every science to pursue the investigation of its own branch according to its own legitimate methods. We cannot require of the chemist that he should pursue the methods of the philologist, nor of the geologist that he should go to history, either profane or sacred, for his facts. It is the duty of the students of every science to keep within its province, to recognize the fact that it is only one department of the vast empire of truth, and to respect alike all orders of truth, historical and inspired as well as scientific; mental and spiritual, as well as material.

3rd. It follows as a practical consequence from the narrowness of the human faculties, that men confined to particular branches of inquiry acquire special habits of thought, and associations of ideas peculiar to their line, by which they are apt to measure and judge the whole world of truth. Thus the man of science misinterprets and then becomes jealous of the theologian, and the theologian misinterprets and becomes jealous of the man of science. This is narrowness, not superior knowledge; weakness, not strength.

4th. Science is only the human interpretation of God's works, it is always imperfect and makes many mistakes. Biblical interpreters are also liable to mistakes and should never assert the absolute identity of their interpretations of the Bible with the mind of God.

5th. All sciences in their crude condition have been thought to be in conflict with Scripture. But as they have approached perfection, they have been all found to be perfectly consistent with it. Sometimes it is the science which is amended into harmony with the views of the theologian. Sometimes it is the views of the theologian which are amended into harmony with perfected and demonstrated science.

6th. In the case of many sciences, as eminently of Geology, the time has not yet come to attempt an adjustment between their conclusions and revelation. Like contemporaneous history in its relation to prophecy, Geology in its relation to the Mosaic Record of creation is in transitu. Its conclusions are not yet mature. When geologists are all agreed among themselves, when all the

accessible facts of the science are observed, analyzed, and classified, and when Generalization has done its perfect work, and when all of its results are finished and finally fixed as part of the intellectual heritage of man forever, then the adjustment between science and revelation will stand self–revealed, and science will be seen to support and illustrate, instead of oppose, the written word of God.

7th. There are hence two opposite tendencies which equally damage the cause of religion, and manifest the weakness of the faith of its professed friends. The first is the weak acceptance of every hostile conclusion of scientific speculators as certainly true; the constant confession of the inferiority of the light of revelation to the light of nature, and of the certainty of the conclusions of Biblical exegesis and Christian theology to that of the results of modern science; the constant attempt to accommodate the interpretation of the Bible, like a nose of wax, to every new phase assumed by the current interpretations of nature. The second and opposite extreme is that of jealously suspecting all the findings of science as probable offenses against the dignity of revelation, and of impatiently attacking even those passing phases of imperfect science which for the time appear to be inconsistent with our own opinions. Standing upon the rock of divine truth, Christians need not fear, and can well afford to await the result. PERFECT FAITH, as well as perfect love, CASTETH OUT ALL FEAR. All things are ours, whether the natural or the supernatural, whether science or revelation.—See Isaac Taylor's "Restoration of Belief," pp. 9, 10.

02.13. Angels

Chapter 13

Angels

1. What are the different senses in which the wordαγγελο angel, or messenger, is used Scripture?

“Ordinary messengers, Job 1:14; Luke 7:24; Luke 9:52; prophets, Is. 13:19; Malachi 3:1; priests, Malachi 2:7; ministers of the New Testament, Revelation 1:20; also impersonal agents, as pillar of cloud, Exodus 14:19; pestilence, 2 Samuel 24:16-17; winds, Psalms 104:4; plagues, called, ‘evil angels,’Psalms 78:49; Paul’s thorn in the flesh, ‘angel of Satan,’2 Corinthians 12:7.” Also the second person of the Trinity, “Angel of his presence;”“Angel of the Covenant,”Isaiah 63:9; Malachi 3:1. But the term is chiefly applied to the heavenly intelligences, Matthew 25:31.—See Kitto’s “Bib. Ency.”

2. What are the Scriptural designations of angels, and how far are those designations expressive of their nature and offices?

Good angels (for evil spirits, see Question 15) are designated in Scripture as to their nature, dignity, and power, as “spirits,”Hebrews 1:14; “thrones, dominions, principalities, powers, mights,”Ephesians 1:21, and Colossians 1:16; “sons of God,”Luke 20:36; Job 1:6; “mighty angels,” and “powerful in strength,”2 Thessalonians 1:7; Psalms 103:20; “holy angels,”“elect angels,”Luke 9:26; 1 Timothy 5:21; and as to the offices they sustain in relation to God and man, they are designated as “angels or messengers,” and as “ministering spirits,”Hebrews 1:13-14.

3. What were the cherubim?

“They were ideal creatures, compounded of four parts, those namely, of a man, an ox, a lion, and an eagle.”“The predominant appearance was that of a man, but the number of faces, feet, and hands differed according to circumstances.”—Ezekiel 1:6, compare with Ezekiel 12:18-19, and Exodus 25:20. To the same ideal beings is applied the designation “living creatures” (Ezekiel 1:5-22; Ezekiel 10:15; Ezekiel 10:17; Revelation 4:6-9; Revelation 5:6-14; Revelation 6:1-7; Revelation 7:11; Revelation 14:3; Revelation 15:7; Revelation 19:4), rendered in our version “beasts,” they were symbolic of the highest properties of creature life, and of these as the outgoings and manifestation of the divine life; but they were typical of redeemed and glorified manhood, or prophetical representations of it, as that in which these properties were to be combined and exhibited.

“They were appointed immediately after the fall to man’s original place in the garden, and to his office in connection with the tree of life.”—Genesis 3:24.

“The other and more common connection in which the cherub appears is with the throne or peculiar dwelling place of God. In the holy of holies in the tabernacle, Exodus 25:22, he was called the God who dwelleth between and sitteth upon the cherubim, 1 Samuel 4:4; Psalms 80:1; Ezekiel

1:26; Ezekiel 1:28; whose glory is above the cherubim. In Revelation 4:6, we read of the living creatures who were in the midst of the throne and around about it."

"What does this bespeak but the wonderful fact brought out in the history of redemption, that man's nature is to be exalted to the dwelling place of the Godhead? In Christ it is taken, so to speak, into the very bosom of the Deity; and because it is so highly honored in him, it shall attain to more than angelic glory in his members."—Fairbairn's "Typology," Pt. 2., Chapter 1., Section 3. See also "Imperial Bible Dictionary," Art. Cherubim.

4. What is the etymology (linguistic development) of the word seraphim, and what is taught in Scripture concerning them? The word signifies burning, bright, dazzling. It occurs in the Bible only once.—Isaiah 6:2; Isaiah 6:6. It probably presents, under a different aspect, the ideal beings commonly designated cherubim and living creatures.

5. Is there any evidence that angels are of various orders a ranks? That such distinctions certainly exist appears evident—

1st. From the language of Scripture. Gabriel is distinguished as one that stands in the presence of God (Luke 1:19), evidently in some preeminent sense; and Michael as one of the chief princes.—Daniel 10:13. Observe also the epithets archangel, thrones, dominions, principalities, powers.—Jude 1:9; Ephesians 1:21.

2nd. From the analogy of the fallen angels.—See Ephesians 2:2; Matthew 9:34.

3rd. From the analogy of human society and of the universal creation. Throughout all God's works gradation of rank prevails.

6. Do the Scriptures speak of more than one archangel, and is he to be considered a creature? This term occurs but twice in the New Testament, and in both instances it is used in the singular number, and preceded by the definite article ο. —1 Thessalonians 4:16; Jude 1:9. Thus the term is evidently restricted to one person, called, Jude 1:9, Michael, who, in Daniel 10:13; Daniel 12:1, is called "one of the chief princes," and "the great prince," and in Revelation 12:7, is said to have fought with his angels against the dragon and his "angels."

Many suppose that the archangel is the Son of God. Others suppose that he is one of the highest class of creatures, since he is called "one of the chief princes,"Daniel 10:13; and since divine attributes are never ascribed to him.

7. What do the Scriptures teach concerning the number and power of angels?

1st. Concerning their number, revelation determines only that it is very great. "Thousand thousands, and ten thousand times ten thousand."—Daniel 7:10. "More than twelve legions of angels."—Matthew 26:53. "Multitude of the heavenly host."Luke 2:13; "Myriads of angels."—Hebrews 12:22.

2nd. Concerning their power, the Scriptures teach that it is very great when exercised both in the material and in the spiritual worlds. They are called "mighty angels," and are said to "excel in strength."—2 Thessalonians 1:7; Psalms 103:20; 2 Kings 19:35. Their power, however, is not creative, but, like that of man, it can be exercised only coordinately with the general laws of nature,

in the absolute sense of that word.

8. What are their employments?

1st. They behold the face of God in heaven, adore the divine perfections, study every revelation he makes of himself in providence and redemption, and are perfectly blessed in his presence and service.—Matthew 18:10; Revelation 5:11; 1 Peter 1:12.

2nd. God employs them as his instruments in administering the affairs of his providence.—Genesis 28:12; Daniel 10:13.

(1.) The law “was ordained by angels.”—Galatians 3:19; Acts 7:53; Hebrews 2:2.

(2.) They are instruments of good to God’s people.—Hebrews 1:14; Acts 12:7; Psalms 91:10-12.

(3.) They execute judgment upon God’s enemies.—Acts 2:23; 2 Kings 19:35; 1 Chronicles 21:16.

(4.) They will officiate in the final judgment in separating the good from the bad, in gathering the elect, and in bearing them up to meet the Lord in the air. Matthew 13:30; Matthew 13:39; Matthew 24:31; 1 Thessalonians 4:17.

9. Have angels bodies, and how are the apparitions of angels to be accounted for?

Angels are called in the Scriptures “spirits”πνευματα, Hebrews 1:14, a word which is also used to designate the souls of men when separate from the body.—1 Peter 3:19. There is however nothing in that word, nor in the opinions of the Jews at the time of Christ, nor in anything which is told us of the nature or the employments of angels in the Scriptures, which prove that angels are absolutely destitute of proper material bodies of any kind. Indeed as the Son of God is to have “a glorious body,”“a spiritual body” forever, and since all the redeemed are to have bodies like his, and since the angels are associated with redeemed men as members of the same infinitely exalted kingdom, it may appear probable that angels may have been created with physical organizations not altogether dissimilar to the “spiritual bodies” of the redeemed. They always appeared and spoke to men in Bible times in the bodily form of men, and as such they ate food and lodged in houses like common men.—Genesis 18:1-33 and Genesis 19:3.

It has hence been supposed by some that angels have bodies like the present “natural” or animal bodies of men σωμα ψυχικον, 1 Corinthians 15:44, of flesh, bones, and blood, of head and features, hands and feet, and that the apparition of an angel involved no change in him, but only a coming within the sphere of the sense perception of the observer, when the angel appeared just as he habitually is.

Now this is inconsistent with the facts of the inspired record. In certain situations the angels “appeared” precisely like common men, and in other situation) they acted very differently (Acts 12:7-10; Numbers 22:31), in passing through stone walls, appearing and disappearing at will, etc. Besides, one of the three men who appeared to Abraham at Mamre, and whose feet he washed, and who ate the meat he had prepared, was Jehovah, the second Person of the Trinity, who had no body till he acquired it many centuries afterwards in the womb of the Virgin. If the apparent human body of the one angels, was not a real, permanent human body, there is not ground to argue from the recorded phenomena that the others were.—Genesis 18:1-33.

Besides this, the theory in question indicates absurd confusion of thought. The animal human body, as we know it, is a physical organization in equilibrium with certain definite and nicely adjusted physical conditions, and it can exist only under those conditions. The vertebrate type, of which the human body is the highest form, has been continually changed as the physical conditions of the globe have changed, and it ceases always to exist whenever those conditions are changed in any decided degree. If it would be absurd to conceive of a human body existing in water, or in fire, how much more absurd is it to conceive of a warm–blooded, food–consuming animal existing indifferently on earth and in heaven; traversing at will the interstellar spaces, and as a true cosmopolite inhabiting alternately and indifferently all worlds, and all elements, ether, air and water, and all temperatures, from the molten sun to the absolute zero of the starless void. The bodily appearance of angels, therefore, must have been something new assumed, or something preexistent and permanent greatly modified for the purpose of enabling them to hold, upon occasion, profitable interaction with men.

10. What is the Romish doctrine and practice with regard to the worship of angels?

“Catechismus Romanus,” 3. 2, 9, 10.—“For the Holy Spirit who says, Honor and glory unto the only God (1 Timothy 1:17), commands us also to honor our parents and elders (Leviticus 19:32, etc.); and the holy men who worshipped one God only are also said in the sacred Scriptures to have adored (Genesis 23:7; Genesis 23:12, etc.), that is, to have suppliantly venerated, kings. If then kings, by whose agency God governs the world, are treated with so high an honor, shall we not give to the angelic spirits an honor greater in proportion as these blessed minds exceed kings in dignity; [to those angelic spirits] whom God has been pleased to constitute his ministers; whose services he makes use of, not only in the government of the Church, but also of the rest of the universe; by whose aid, although we see them not, we are daily delivered from the greatest dangers both of soul and body? Add to this the charity with which they love us, through which, as Scripture informs us, they pour out their prayers for those countries (Daniel 2:13) over which they are placed by Providence, and for those too, no doubt, whose guardians they are, for they present our prayers and tears before the throne of God (Job 3:25; Job 12:12; Revelation 8:3). Hence our Lord has taught us in the gospel not to scandalize the little ones, because in heaven their angels do always behold the face of his Father which is in heaven.”

“Their intercession, therefore, we must invoke, because they always behold God, and receive from him the most willing advocacy of our salvation. To this, their invocation, the sacred Scriptures bear testimony.—Genesis 48:15-16.”

11. What views have been entertained with respect to “Guardian Angels”?

“It was a favorite opinion of the Christian Fathers that every individual is under the care of a particular angel, who is assigned to him as a guardian. They spoke also of two angels—the one good, the other evil—whom they conceived to be attendant on each individual:the good angel prompting to all good, and averting ill; and the evil angel prompting to all ill, and averting good (Hermas 11. 6). The Jews (excepting the Sadducees) entertained this belief, as do the Moslems. The heathen held it in a modified form—the Greeks having their tutelary demon, and the Romans their genius. There is however nothing to support this notion in the Bible. The passages usually referred to for its support (Psalms 34:7, Matthew 18:10), have assuredly no such meaning. The former simply denotes that God employs the ministry of angels to deliver his people from affliction

and danger; and the celebrated passage in Matthew means that the infant children of believers, or the least among the disciples of Christ, whom the ministers of the church might be disposed to neglect, are in such estimation elsewhere, that angels do not think it below their dignity to minister unto them." Nothing is said of the personal assignment of angels to individual men.—Kitto's "Bib. Encyclo."

12. What are the names by which Satan is distinguished, a what is their import?

Satan, which signifies adversary, Luke 10:18. The Devil (διαβολος always occurs in the singular) signifying slanderer, Revelation 20:2; Apollyon, which means destroyer, and Abaddon, Revelation 9:11; Beelzebub, the prince of devils, from the god of the Ekronites, chief among the heathen divinities all of which the Jews regarded as devils, 2 Kings 1:2; Matthew 12:24; Angel of the Bottomless Pit, Revelation 9:11 Prince of the World, John 12:31; Prince of Darkness, Ephesians 6:12; A Roaring Lion, 1 Peter 5:8; a Sinner from the Beginning, 1 John 3:8; Accuser, Revelation 12:10; Belial, 2 Corinthians 6:15; Deceiver, Revelation 20:10; Dragon, Revelation 12:7; Liar and Murderer, John 8:44; Leviathan, Isaiah 27:1; Lucifer, Isaiah 14:12; Serpent, Isaiah 27:1; Tormentor; Matthew 18:34; God of this World, 2 Corinthians 4:4; he that hath the Power of Death, Hebrews 2:14.—See Cruden's "Concordance."

13. How may it be proved that Satan is a personal being, and not a mere personification of evil?

Throughout all the various books of Scripture Satan is always consistently spoken of as a person, and personal attributes are predicated of him. Such passages as Matthew 4:1-25, and John 8:44, are decisive.

14. What do the Scriptures teach concerning the relation of Satan to other evil spirits and to our world?

Other evil spirits are called "his angels,"Matthew 25:41; and he is called "Prince of Devils,"Matthew 9:34; and "Prince of the powers of the Air," and "Prince of Darkness,"Ephesians 6:12. This indicates that he is the master spirit of evil. His relation to this world is indicated by the history of the Fall, 2 Corinthians 11:3; Revelation 12:9, and by such expressions as "God of this World,"2 Corinthians 4:4; and "Spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience,"Ephesians 2:2; wicked men are said to be his children, 1 John 3:10; he blinds the minds of those that believe not and leads them captive at his will, 2 Timothy 2:26; he also pains, harasses, and tempts God's true people as far as is permitted for their ultimate good.—Luke 22:31; 2 Corinthians 12:7; 1 Thessalonians 2:18.

15. What are the terms by which fallen spirits are designated? The Greek word διαβολος, the devil, is in the original applied only to Beelzebub. Other evil spirits are called διαμονες, demons, Mark 5:12(translated devils); unclean spirits, Mark 5:13; angels of the devil, Matthew 25:41; principalities, powers, rulers of the darkness of this world, Ephesians 6:12; angels that sinned, 2 Peter 2:4; angels that kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, Jude 1:6 :; lying spirits, 2 Chronicles 18:22.

16. What power or agency over the bodies and souls of men is ascribed to them?

Satan, like all other finite beings, can only be in one place at a time; yet all that is done by his agents being attributed to him, he appears to be practically ubiquitous.

It is certain that at times at least they have exercised an inexplicable influence over the bodies of men, yet that influence is entirely subject to God's control.—Job 2:1; Luke 13:16; Acts 10:38. They have caused and aggravated diseases, and excited appetites and passions.—1 Corinthians 5:5. Satan, in some sense, has the power of death.—Hebrews 2:14. With respect to the souls of men, Satan and his angels are utterly destitute of any power either to change the heart or to coerce the will, their influence being simply moral, and exercised in the way of deception, suggestion, and persuasion. The descriptive phrases applied by the Scriptures to their working are such as—"the deceivableness of unrighteousness,""power, signs, lying wonders,"2 Thessalonians 2:9-10; he "transforms himself into an angel of light."—2 Corinthians 11:14. If he can deceive or persuade he uses "wiles,"Ephesians 6:11; "snares,"1 Timothy 3:7; "depths,"Revelation 2:24; he "blinds the mind,"2 Corinthians 4:4; "leads captive the will,"2 Timothy 2:26; and so "deceives the whole world."—Revelation 12:9. If he cannot persuade he uses "fiery darts,"Ephesians 6:16; and "buffetings."—2 Corinthians 12:7. As examples of his influence in tempting men to sin the Scriptures cite the case of Adam, Genesis 3:1-24 :; of David, 1 Chronicles 21:1; of Judas, Luke 22:3; Ananias and Sapphira, Acts 5:3, and the temptation of our blessed Lord, Matthew 4:1-25 :

17. What evidence is there that the heathen worship devils?

"The δαιμων is the object of their worship, δεισιδαιμωνια describes their worship itself, and δεισιδαιμων the worshipper." Paul (Acts 17:22) declared that the men of Athens were δεισιδαιμονεστερου, i. e., too much addicted to demon–worship. David says (Psalms 106:37), "The gods of the heathen are demons," and Paul (1 Corinthians 10:20), "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to God." Moses said of apostate Israelites (Deuteronomy 32:17), "They sacrificed to demons and not to God, to gods whom they knew not; to new gods that came newly up; whom your fathers feared not."—"The Imperial Bible Dictionary."

18. Where do they reside, and what is the true interpretation of Ephesians 2:2; Ephesians 6:12?

These passages simply declare that evil spirits belong to the unseen spiritual world, and not to our mundane system. Nothing is taught us in Scripture as to the place of their residence, further than that they originally dwelt in and fell from heaven, that they now have access to men on earth, and that they will be finally sealed up in the lake of fire prepared for them.—Revelation 20:10; Matthew 25:41.

19. By what terms were those possessed by evil spirits designated?

They are called "demoniacs,"translated possessed with devils,Matthew 4:24; "having the spirit of an unclean devil,"Luke 4:33; "oppressed of the devil,"Acts 3:8; "lunatics,"Matthew 17:15.

20. What arguments are urged by those who regard the "demoniacs," mentioned in the New Testament as simply diseased or deranged? That we cannot discriminate between the effects of demoniacal possession and disease. That precisely the same symptoms have, in other cases, been treated as disease and cured.

That, like witchcraft, the experience of such possessions has been confined to the most ignorant ages of the world.

They argue further that this doctrine is inconsistent with clearly revealed principles.

1st. That the souls of dead men go immediately either to heaven or hell.

2nd. That fallen angels are already shut up in chains and darkness in expectation of the final judgment.—2 Peter 2:4; Jude 1:6.

They attempt to explain away the language of Christ and his apostles upon this subject by affirming, that as it was no part of their design to instruct men in the true science of nature or disease, they conformed their language on such subjects to the prevalent opinions of the people they addressed, calling diseases by the popular name, without intending thereby to countenance the theory of the nature of the disease, out of which the name originated. Just as we now call crazed people “lunatics,” without believing in the influence of the moon upon them.—“Kitto’s Bib. Ency.”

21. How may it be proved that the demoniacs of the New Testament were really possessed of evil spirits? The simple narratives of all the evangelists put it beyond peradventure that Christ and his apostles did believe, and wished others to believe, that the “demoniacs,” were really possessed with devils.

They distinguish between possession and disease.—Mark 1:32; Luke 6:17-18. The “demons,” as distinct from the “possessed,” spoke (Mark 5:12), were addressed, commanded, and rebuked by Christ.—Mark 1:25; Mark 1:34; Mark 9:25; Matthew 8:32; Matthew 17:18. Their desires, requests, and passions are distinguished from those of the possessed.—Matthew 8:31; Mark 9:26, etc. The number of demons in one person is mentioned.—Mark 16:9. They went out of the “possessed” into the swine.—Luke 8:32. We never speak of the moon entering into, and sore vexing a man, or being cast out of a lunatic, or of the moon crying aloud, etc. The argument of those who would explain away the force of Christ’s language on this subject, therefore fails.

02.14. Providence

Chapter 14

Providence

1. What is the etymology (linguistic development) and technical usage of the term PROVIDENCE, and what is the relation which Providence sustains to God's eternal Decree?

Providence, from pro and video, literally means foresight, and then a careful arrangement prepared beforehand for the accomplishment of predetermined ends. Turretin defines this term as in its widest sense including (a) foreknowledge, (b) foreordination, and (c) the efficacious administration of the thing decreed. In the technical theological as well as in the common usage of the word, however, it is restricted to the last sense, namely the execution by God of his eternal decree in time, by means of the second causes he has originated in creation. Foreordination gives the plan and is eternal, all–comprehensive, and unchangeable. Creation gives the absolute commencement of things in time. Providence includes the two great departments (a) of the continued Preservation of all things as created, and (b) of the continued Government of all things thus preserved, so that all the ends for which they were created, are infallibly accomplished.—See "Confession:Faith," chap. 5., and "L Cat.," Q. 18, and "Shorter Catechism," Q. 11.

2. State the true doctrine of PRESERVATION.

Preservation is that continued exercise of the divine energy whereby the Creator upholds all his creatures in being, and in the possession of all those inherent properties and qualities with which he endowed them at their creation, and of those also which they may subsequently have acquired by habit or development. That is, both the being, the attributes of every species, and the form and faculties of every individual are constantly preserved in being by God.

3. State the arguments which establish the conclusion that a constant divine exercise of divine energy is essential for the preservation of all creatures.

1st. This truth appears to be involved in the very conception of a creature in his dependent relation to his Creator. The creature is one who has the whole ground of his being in the will of his Creator. Being thus absolutely dependent, he can no more continue than he can originate his own being.

2nd. This is implied in the sense of absolute dependence, which is an essential element of the religious sentiment which is an invariable characteristic of human nature.

3rd. It is taught in Scripture. "In him we live and move and have our being."—Acts 17:28. "By him all things consist."—Colossians 1:17. "Upholding all things by the word of his power."—Hebrews 1:3; Nehemiah 9:6; Psalms 63:8; Psalms 69:8-9.

4. State the Deistic and Rationalistic view as to the nature of Preservation.

They regard the action of God in the matter of the continued preservation of the creature as merely negative—a not willing to destroy. This view represents the Creator as exterior to his creation in the same manner in which a machinist is exterior to the machine he has made and set in motion. It regards the system of second causes as dependent upon the Great First Cause only at the beginning of the long line, in the indefinitely remote past. They maintain that in the beginning God created all things and endowed them severally with their active powers as second causes, and adjusted them in a balanced system, but then left them to act, independently of all support or direction from without, according to their nature, in their relations, as a man may leave a wound–up clock.

5. State the objections to that view.

1st. This view, as above shown, is inconsistent with the essential relation of the creature as an effect to the Creator as a cause. God is the only ens a seipso. The only cause of the creature's being is the will of the Creator. As long as he so wills that cause exists. If he should cease so to will the cause would be vacated and the effect consequently cease.

2nd. This view is to an unworthy degree anthropomorphic. It involves a deplorably unintellectual failure to apprehend the essential difference between the relation to the creation sustained by God, and that sustained by man to the work of his hand. A man is necessarily exterior to his work, and even when present capable of directing his attention only to one point at a time. But God is omnipresent, not as to his essence only, but as to his infinite knowledge, wisdom, love, righteousness, and power, with every atom of creation for every instant of duration. The creature is always interpenetrated as well as embraced in the divine thought and will, and ever is what it is and as it is because of God.

3rd. This view obviously removes God so far from the creation as to be irreligious in its practical effect. This also has been uniformly its influence as historically ascertained.

4th. It is obviously opposed to the entire spirit of the Scriptures, and to those special texts above quoted.

6. State the view as to the nature of the divine agency involved in PRESERVATION, which stands at the opposite extreme to the above. The extreme position opposite to the Deistic one above stated is that Preservation is a continued creation. That creatures or second causes have no real continuous existence, but are reproduced every successive moment out of nothing, in their respective successive states, conditions, and actions by the perpetual outflow of the "vis creatrix " (creating power) of God. Thus the state or action of any created thing in one moment of time has no causal relation to its state or action in another moment, but the sole, perpetual, and immediate cause of all that exists is God himself. The foundations of this doctrine were first laid by Descartes in his views of the relation of the creation to the Creator, viewing the former as sustained by the latter by a continued creation. These views were pushed to the furthest extreme consistent with Theism by Malebranche, in the doctrine of "Occasional Causes," and of "our seeing all things in God," and were carried to their legitimate, logical conclusion, in absolute pantheism by Spinoza.—Morell's "Hist. of Modern Philosophy," Part 1., ch. 2, § 1.

President Edwards teaches the same doctrine incidentally in his great work on "Original Sin," Part 4., ch. 3. He says that the existence either of the substance, or of the mode, or of the action of any

created thing in any one moment of time has no causal connection with its existence, state, or action the next moment. He says that what we call “course of nature is nothing separate from the agency of God.” He illustrates his doctrine thus:“The images of things in a glass, as we keep our eye upon them, seem to remain precisely the same, with a continuing perfect identity. But it is known to be otherwise. Philosophers well know that these images are constantly renewed, by the impression and reflection of new rays of light; so that the image impressed by former rays is constantly vanishing, and a new image impressed by new rays every moment, both on the glass and on the eye. . . . The image that exists this moment is not at all derived from the image which existed the last preceding moment . . . the past existence of the image has no influence to uphold it so much as for one moment . . . So it is with bodies as well as images their present existence is not, strictly speaking, the effect of their past existence, but it is wholly, every instant, the effect of a new agency, or exertion of the powerful cause of their existence.”

7. Show that this doctrine is false and dangerous.

1st. If God is continually creating anew every creature in every moment of time in its successive states and actions, and if the state or act of the creature in one moment has no causal relation to its state or act in the next moment, it is evident that second causes are only modifications of the First Cause, and that God is the only real Agent in the universe, and the immediate and sole cause of whatever comes to pass. This obviously logically involves Pantheism, and as a historical fact leads to its adoption.

2nd. It is inconsistent with our original and necessary intuitions of truth of all kinds, physical, intellectual, and moral. Our original intuitions assure us of the real and permanent existence of spiritual and material substances exercising powers, and of our own spirits as real, self–determining causes of action, and consequently as responsible moral agents. But if this doctrine is true these primary, constitutional intuitions of our nature deceive us, and if these deceive us, the whole universe is an illusion, our own natures a delusion, and absolute skepticism inevitable.

3rd. It immediately cuts up by the roots the foundations of free agency, moral accountability, moral government, and hence of religion.

8. State the several points in the true doctrine of Providential Preservation. The true view stands intermediate between the two extremes above stated. It involves the following propositions:

1st. Created substances, both spiritual and material, possess real and permanent existence, i. e., they are real entities.

2nd. They possess all such active or passive properties as they have been severally endowed with by God.

3rd. The properties or active powers have a real, and not merely apparent, efficiency as second causes in producing the effects proper to them; and the phenomena alike of consciousness and of the outward world are really produced by the efficient agency of second causes, as we are informed by our native and necessary intuitions.

4th. But these created substances are not self–existent, i. e., the ground of their continued existence is in God and not in themselves.

5th. They continue to exist not merely in virtue of a negative act of God, whereby he merely does not will their destruction, but in virtue of a positive, continued exercise of divine power, whereby they are sustained in being, and in the possession of all their properties and powers with which God has endowed them.

6th. The precise nature of the divine action concerned in upholding all things in being and action is, like every mode of the interaction of the infinite with the finite, inscrutable—but not more mysterious in this case than in every other.—Dr. Charles Hodge's "Lectures."

9. How may the Scriptural doctrine of Providential GOVERNMENT be stated?

God having from eternity absolutely decreed whatsoever comes to pass, and having in the beginning created all things out of nothing by the word of his power, and continuing subsequently constantly present to every atom of his creation, upholding all things in being and in the possession and exercise of all their properties, he ALSO continually controls and directs the actions of all his creatures thus preserved, so that while he never violates the law of their several natures, he yet infallibly causes all actions and events singular and universal to occur according to the eternal and immutable plan embraced in his decree. There is a design in providence. God has chosen his great end, the manifestation of his own glory, but in order to that end he has chosen innumerable subordinate ends; these are fixed; and he has appointed all actions and events in their several relations as means to those ends; and he continually so directs the actions of all creatures that all these general and special ends are brought to pass precisely at the time, by the means, and in the mode and under the conditions, which he from eternity proposed.

Turretin, 50. 6, Ques. 1, says, "The term Providence embraces three things προγνωσιν, προθεσιν et διοικησιν —the cognition of the mind, the decree of the will, and the efficacious administration of the things decreed—knowledge directing, will, commanding, and power executing. . . . Hence Providence may be regarded either in the antecedent decree, or in the subsequent execution; the first is the eternal destination of all things to their appointed ends; the second is the temporal government of all things according to that decree; the first is an act immanent within God; the second is an act transient out of God. We here treat for the most part of Providence in the second sense of the term."

"Confession of faith," Chap. 5.; "Larger Catechism," Q. 18; "Shorter Catechism," Q. 11.

10. State the proof of the fact of such a universal GOVERNMENT derived from a consideration of the divine perfections.

1st. The stupendous fact that God is infinite in his being, in his relation to time and space, and in his wisdom and power, makes it evident that a universal providence is possible to him, and that all the difficulties and apparent contradictions involved therein to the eye of man are to be referred to our very limited capacity of understanding.

2nd. God's infinite wisdom makes it certain that he had a definite object in view in the creation of the universe, and that he will not fail in the use of the best means to secure that object in all its parts.

3rd. His infinite goodness makes it certain that he would not leave his sensitive and intelligent creatures to the toils of a mechanical, soulless fate; nor his religious creatures to be divorced from

himself, in whose communion their highest life consists.

4th. His infinite righteousness makes it certain that he will continue to govern and reward and punish those creatures which he has made subject to moral obligations.

11. State the argument derived from the innate religious constitution of mankind. The religious sentiment when analyzed is found to embrace (a) a sense of absolute dependence, and (b) a sense of immediate moral accountability. The sense of absolute dependence naturally and actually leads all men of all nations and conditions to cling to the conviction of the immediate presence and providential control of God throughout the universe and in every event. To be without God in the world is to be in a condition in which the elementary demands of human nature are denied. The sense of moral accountability leads all men to believe in a universal and supreme moral government present in the world, protecting the good, and restraining and punishing the wicked. If God is not actually and immediately present in nature and in human history, then we cannot know him, and he neither controls nor protects us, and hence obedience is neither due nor possible, and morality, religion, and prayer are all alike vain delusions.

12. State the argument from the intelligence evinced the operations of nature. The great inductive argument for the being of God is based upon the evident traces of design in the universe. Now, just as the traces of design in the constitution of nature proves the existence of a designing mind in the relation of creator, so the traces of design in the operations of nature prove the existence of a designing mind in the relation of providential ruler. The material elements, with their active properties, are all incapable of design, yet we find all these elements so adjusted in at their proportions and relations as to work harmoniously in the order of certain general laws, and we find these general laws so adjusted in all their intricate coincidences and interferences, as, by movements simple and complex, fortuitous and regular, to work out harmoniously everywhere the most wisely and beneficently contrived results. The mechanical and chemical properties of material atoms; the laws of vegetable and animal life; the movements of the sun, moon, and stars in the heavens; the luminous, calorific, and chemical radiance of the sun; and the instinctive and voluntary movement of every living thing upon the face of the earth, are all mutually acting and reacting without concert or possible design of their own, yet everywhere bringing forth the most wise and beneficent results. As the designing mind cannot be found in any of the elements it, of course, cannot be found in the resultant of the whole together. It can be looked for only in a present personal God, all–wise and all–powerful, who directs all things by the present exercise of his intelligent power in and through the creature.

13. How may this doctrine be established by the evidence afforded by the general history of the world?

If the constitution of human nature (soul and body), in its elemental relations to human society, proves a designing mind in the relation of creator, exactly so must the wisely contrived results of human association, in general and in individual instances, prove the exercise of a designing mind in the relation of providential ruler.

Individual men and communities, it is true, differ in their action from the elements of the external world, inasmuch as they act, 1st., freely, self–moved; and

2nd., from design. Yet so narrow is the sphere both of the foresight and the design of every individual agent, so great is the multiplicity of agents, and the complications of interacting influences upon each community from within, from every other community, and from the powers of external nature, that the designs of either individuals or communities are never carried beyond a short distance, when they are lost in the general current, the result of which lies equally beyond the foreknowledge and the control of all. But the student of history, with the key of revelation, clearly discerns the traces of a general design running through all the grand procedures of human history, and at points even visibly linking itself with the actions of individual agents. God's providence, as a whole, therefore, comprehends and controls the little providences of men.

14. State the Scriptural argument from the prophecies, promises, and threatenings of God. In innumerable instances has God in the Scriptures prophesied with great particularity the certain occurrence of an event absolutely, and he has promised or threatened the occurrence of other events contingently upon certain conditions. This would be a mockery, if God did not use the means to fulfill his word.

It is not reasonable to object that God simply foresaw the event, and so prophesied, promised, or threatened it, because the event is frequently promised or threatened contingently, upon a condition which does not stand in the relation of a cause to that event. God could not foresee one event as contingent upon another which sustains no causal relation to it. The truth of the promise or threatening in such a case cannot depend upon the natural connection between the two events, but upon God's determination to cause one to follow the other.

15. Prove from Scripture that the providence of God extends over the natural world.

Psalms 104:14; Psalms 125:5-5; Psalms 147:8-18; Psalms 148:7-8; Job 9:5-6; Job 21:9-11; Job 37:6-13; Acts 14:17.

16. Prove from Scripture that it includes the brute creation.

Psalms 104:21-29; Psalms 147:9; Matthew 6:26; Matthew 10:29.

17. Prove from Scripture that it extends to the general affairs of men.

1 Chronicles 16:31; Psalms 47:7; Psalms 66:7; Proverbs 21:1; Job 12:23; Isaiah 10:12-15; Daniel 2:21; Daniel 4:26.

18. Show from Scripture that the circumstances of individuals are controlled by God.

1 Samuel 2:6; Psalms 18:30; Proverbs 16:9; Isaiah 14:5; Luke 1:53; James 4:13-15.

19. Prove that events considered by us fortuitous are subject to the control of God.

1st. A fortuitous event is one whose proximate causes, because either of their complexity or their subtlety, escape our observation. Every such event, however, as the falling of a leaf, is linked with the general system of things, both by its antecedents and its consequences.

2nd. Scripture affirms the fact.—Exodus 21:13; Psalms 75:6-7; Job 5:6; Proverbs 16:33.

20. What distinction has been made between a general and a special providence, and what is the true view of the subject?

Many men admit that God exercises a general superintending Providence over affairs, controlling the general current, and determining great and important events, while they regard it superstitious and derogatory to the sublime dignity and greatness of God to conceive of him as interesting himself in every trivial detail. Many who do not clearly understand themselves feel and practically judge of all events in their relation to divine Providence in like manner. But this whole mode of conception and feeling springs from a very low anthropomorphic view of God's attributes and manner of action, as if there could be with the absolute Cause and the infinite Ruler the same difference between little things and great things as there is with us; as if to him, as to us, a multitude of details were more burdensome, or less worthy of attention, than some grand result. 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 creature 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 in the universe. 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 as a chain which has no links.

21. Prove that the providential government of God extends to the free acts of men.

267. 1st. The free actions of men are potent causes influencing the general system of things precisely as all other classes of causes in the world, and consequently, on the principle indicated in the answer to the preceding question, they also must be subject to God, or every form of providence whatever would be impossible for him.

2nd. It is affirmed in Scripture.—Exodus 12:36; 1 Samuel 24:9-15; Psalms 33:14-15; Proverbs 16:1; Proverbs 19:21; Proverbs 20:24; Proverbs 21:1; Jeremiah 10:23; Php 2:13.

22. Show from Scripture that God's providence is exercised over the sinful acts of men.

2 Samuel 16:10; 2 Samuel 24:1; Psalms 76:10; Romans 11:32; Acts 4:27-28.

23. What do the Scriptures teach as to God's providential agency in the good acts of men? The Scriptures attribute all that is good in man to the free grace of God, operating both providentially and spiritually, and influencing alike the body and the soul, and the outward relations of the individual.—Php 2:13; Php 4:13; 2 Corinthians 12:9-10; Ephesians 2:10; Galatians 5:22-25.

It is to be remembered, however, that while a material cause may be analyzed into the mutual interaction of two or more bodies, a human soul acts spontaneously, i. e., originates action. The soul also, in all its voluntary acts, is determined by its own prevailing dispositions and desires. When all the good actions of men, therefore, are attributed to God, it is not meant, 1st., that he causes them, or,

2nd. that he determines man to cause them, irrespectively of man's free will; but it is meant that God so acts upon man from within spiritually, and from without by moral influences, as to induce the free disposition. He works in us first to will, and then to do his good pleasure.

24. What do the Scriptures teach as to the relation of Providence to the sinful acts of men? The Scriptures teach—

1st. The sinful acts of men are in such a sense under the divine control that they occur only by his permission and according to his purpose.—1 Chronicles 1:4-14; Genesis 45:5; Genesis 50:20. Compare 1 Samuel 6:6 and Exodus 7:13; Exodus 14:17; Is. 66:4; 2 Thessalonians 2:11; Acts 4:27-28; Acts 2:23; Acts 3:18.

2nd. He restrains and controls sin.—Psalms 76:10; Genesis 1:20; Is. 10:15.

3rd. He overrules it for good.—Genesis 1:20; Acts 3:13.

4th. God neither causes sin, nor approves it, he only permits, directs, restrains, limits, and overrules it. Man, the free agent, is the sole responsible and guilty cause of his own sin.

Turretin sets forth the testimony of Scripture upon this subject thus—

1st. As to the beginning of the sin,

(1.) God freely permits it. But this permission is neither moral, i. e., while permitting it physically, he never approves it; nor merely negative, i. e., he does not simply concur in the result, but he positively determines that bad men shall be permitted for wise and holy ends to act according to their bad natures.—Acts 14:16; Psalms 81:12.

(2.) He deserts those who sin, either by withdrawing grace abused, or by withholding additional grace. This desertion may be either (a) partial, to prove man's heart (2 Chronicles 32:31), or (b) for correction, or (c) penal (Jeremiah 7:29; Romans 1:24-26).

(3.) God so orders providential circumstances that the inherent wickedness of men takes the particular course of action he has determined to permit (Acts 2:23; Acts 3:18).

(4.) God delivers men to Satan, (a) as a tempter (2 Thessalonians 2:9-11), (b) as a torturer (1 Corinthians 5:5).

2nd. As to the progress of the sin, God restrains it as to its intensity and its duration, and as to its influence upon others. This he effects both by internal influences upon the heart, and by the control of external circumstances.—Psalms 76:10.

3rd. As to the end or result of the sin, God uniformly overrules it and directs it for good.—Genesis 50:20; Job 1:12; Job 2:6-10; Acts 3:13; Acts 4:27-28.

25. What are the THREE general classes in which all theories as to God's Providential Government may be embraced?

1st. Those views which remove God from all present active agency in the creation, and assert the entire independence of second causes.

2nd. Those theories which more or less explicitly deny the real agency of second causes and make God the only real agent in the universe.

3rd. The middle or Christian view, which maintains all the principles on this subject taught in the Scriptures as:The real efficiency of second causes, especially the moral freedom and

accountability of man in his acts, and at the same time the universal, efficient control of God, whereby in perfect consistency with the attributes of his own nature, and with the several properties of his creatures, he determines and disposes of all actions and events according to his sovereign purpose.

26. State the Mechanical Theory of Providence. This view supposes that when God created the universe he endowed all the various material and spiritual elements with their respective properties and powers, that he then grouped them in certain combinations and proportions, and so made them subject to certain general laws. The world is thus a machine, which the maker has so calculated that it works out of itself all his purposes. Having wound it up he leaves it to itself. God is the first cause in the sense of his being the first member in an endless series of causes always flowing on further and further from their source. Some of these philosophers confine this rigid mechanism to the physical world, and regard the free wills of men as an absolutely indeterminate element embraced in the general mechanism of the world. The majority, however, deny free agency, and regard man as one of the cosmic elements not essentially different from the rest.

All providential interferences and all miracles therefore would be impossible. To suppose any necessity for such interferences would be to suppose some radical defect in God's work—that either he must have been incapable of precalculating all necessary combinations, or that he was unable to execute a machine that would run of itself. Prof. Baden Powel says, "It is derogatory to the idea of infinite power and wisdom to suppose an order of things so imperfectly established that it must be occasionally interrupted and violated." And Theodore Parker says, "Men have Albeit precarious make–shifts; the Infinite has no tricks, no subterfuges—not a whim in God, and so not a miracle in nature."

27. Expose the fallacy of that view.

1st. It is opposed to the plain teaching of God's word as set forth under Questions 15–24.

2nd. It is essentially irreligious, and materialistic. It fails to recognize the education and discipline of free intelligent agents as the great end to which the universe as a system of means is adapted. It separates the souls of men from God, it makes prayer a mockery, revelation impossible, moral accountability a prejudice, and religion a delusion.

3rd. It is based on a miserably shallow anthropomorphic idea of God. It conceives of the universe simply as a mechanical system of causes, and as sustaining the same relation to God that a human work does to its maker, who is necessarily exterior to his work. It utterly fails—

1st. To apprehend the real indwelling of the Creator in the creation as an omnipresent, ever–active, and controlling spirit, a personal agent making law by working through law for the purpose of accomplishing elected ends.

2nd. To apprehend the true nature of the universe in relation to its highest ends as a moral system designed for the instruction and development of free, personal, moral agents, created in the image of God. A system involving an established order of nature, and proceeding in wise adaptation of means to ends, is necessary as a means of communication between the Creator and the intelligent creation, and to accomplish the intellectual and moral education of the latter. Thus only can the divine attributes of wisdom, righteousness, or goodness be exercised or manifested, and

thus only can angel or man understand the character, anticipate the will, or intelligently and voluntarily cooperate with the plan of God.

Occasional direct exercises of power, moreover, in connection with a general system of means and laws, appears to be necessary not only “in the beginning,” to create second causes and inaugurate their agency, but also subsequently, in order to make to the subjects of his moral government the revelation of his free personality, and of his immediate interest in their affairs. At any rate, such occasional direct action and revelation is necessary for the education of man in his present state. A miracle, although effected by divine power without means, is itself a means to an end and part of a plan. All natural law has its birth in the divine reason, and is an expression of will to effect a purpose.—“Reign of Law,” by Duke of Argyle. The “order of nature” is only an instrument of the divine will, and an instrument used subserviently to that higher moral government in the interests of which miracles are wrought. Thus the “order of nature,” the ordinary providence of God, and miracles, instead of being in conflict, are the intimately correlated elements of one comprehensive system.

28. What classes of philosophers have actually or virtually denied the real efficiency of second causes?

All Pantheists, of course, regard all second causes as modifications of the First Cause, and God the only real agent in the universe. Descartes, although a believer in God, and in the real objective existence of material as well as spiritual agents, nevertheless held that they were created anew every moment in all their successive states and actions, and so virtually made second causes only a modification of the First Cause. His disciples deduced therefrom the theory of occasional causes, making changes in the second cause merely the occasion upon which the First Cause exercises its efficient agency and accomplishes the effect. This led to the Pantheism of Spinoza. Dr. Emmons, of New England, held in connection with the “exercise scheme” the doctrine of divine efficiency. That we know nothing in the human soul but a series of exercises connected with an obscure thread of consciousness. God is the real cause creating each moment each of these exercises in their successions, the good and the bad alike, just as a musician blows the successive notes on a pipe at his will. To this class of speculations belongs the theory of “Concursus,” which prevailed so long in the Church.

29. What doctrine was represented by the phrase “general and indifferent concursus,” and who were its advocates?

Theologians were occupied during many centuries with debating the question as to the nature of the “concursus,” or in–dwelling with and co–working of God in second causes. The Jesuits, and with them the Socinians and Remonstrants, maintain that this “concursus,” is only “general” and “indifferent;” that is, that it is common alike to all causes, quickening them to action, but indifferently, i. e., the first cause is, as it were, a mere general stimulant to the second cause, leaving each one to determine its own particular mode of action. This they illustrate by the general quickening power of the sun, which sheds the same radiance universally and indifferently upon all earthly objects, which radiance is the common principle of all life and all movement. Where this radiance is absent there is no life. Yet it is indifferent to any particular form of life or movement—and every particular germ germinates after its own kind under the quickening power of the same sun. This theory obviously admits the preservation of the essences and active powers

of all things by God, but it virtually denies by omission all real providential government. According to this view, God created and preserves all things, and they in turn act spontaneously according to their nature and tendencies without his control.

30. What doctrine was expressed by the phrase “concursus simultaneous and immediate”? This phrase expresses an act of God whereby he cooperates with the creature in his act, as a concause, in the production of the act as an entity. In support of this view, and in opposition to the bare admission of the above–explained “concursus general and indifferent,” the disciples of Thomas Aquinas in the Roman Church and all the Lutheran and Reformed theologians agreed. The question however remained a point of difficulty and of difference as to which is the determining factor in this dual causality. Does God determine the creature in every case to act, and to act as he does and not otherwise, or does the creature determine himself?

31. What doctrine was expressed by the phrase “concursus, previous and determining,” and who were its advocates?

Hence the Reformed or Calvinistic theologians maintained in addition the doctrine of “Precursus,” or of a “Concursus, previous and determining.” This signified a divine energy upon the creature, and in every case determining it to act, and to act precisely as it does. Some applied this to such human actions as are good, others more logically applied it to all actions of every kind whatsoever.

32. How did the Reformed theologians attempt to reconcile this doctrine with the freedom of man and with the holiness of God? As to the freedom of man, they—

1st. Pleaded mystery.

2nd. They pleaded that the two facts, (a) that human action is free, and (b) that God efficiently governs that action, are both certainly revealed in Scripture and therefore must be mutually consistent whether we can reconcile them or not.

3rd. They argued that the modus operandi of this divine concursus in every case varied with the nature of the creature upon which it is exerted, and that it is always perfectly consistent with the nature of that creature, and its modes of action. “Therefore since Providence does not concur with the human will, either by the way of co–action, forcing an unwilling will, nor by the way of a physical determination, al; though it were a thing brutish and blind, devoid of all judgment, but rationally by turning the will in a manner congruous to itself that it may determine itself, it follows, that the proximate cause of each man’s action being in the judgment of his own understanding, and spontaneous election of his own will, it exerts no constraining force upon our liberty, but rather sustains it.”—Turretin, 50. 6, Q. 6. As to the holiness of God in relation to the sinful acts of his creatures they held:

1st. That sin originates in a defect or privative cause.

2nd. That there is a difference between the mere matter of the act as an entity and its moral quality. God is an efficient concause, of the former, but not of the latter, if it be evil. They illustrated this by the use of an poorly–tuned instrument in the hands of a skillful player. The player is the cause of each of the sounds in their order, but the derangement of the instrument alone is the cause of the discord.

3rd. Hence the relation of God's providence to the evil actions of man, is very different from its relation to their good actions. In the case of the latter he gives the grace which communicates the moral quality, as well as cooperates in the production of the action. In the case of the former his concursus is confined to the matter of the act, the sinful quality is derived from the creature only.

33. State the several objections which lie against this theory of concursus.

1st. It is an unsuccessful attempt to go beyond the mere facts taught by Scripture in the search of an explanation of the manner in which God acts upon the creature in effecting his ends.

2nd. This theory tends to the denial of the real efficiency of second causes, and therefore tends to Pantheism. This was a danger less appreciated by the Great Reformers and their successors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries than it has of necessity come to be in our day. It is of the highest importance that we hold both the correlated truths of the real efficiency of second causes, and of the controlling providence of God, of human freedom and of divine sovereignty, and then leave the question of their reconciliation to the future.

34. To what extent do the Scriptures teach anything as to the nature of God's providential government? The mode in which the divine agency is exerted is left entirely unexplained, but the fact that God does govern all his creatures and all their actions is expressly stated and everywhere assumed, and many of the characteristics of that government are set forth.

It is declared—

1st. To be universal.—Psalms 103:17-19; Daniel 4:34-35; Psalms 22:28-29.

2nd. Particular.—Matthew 10:29-31.

3rd. It embraces the thoughts and volitions of men and events apparently contingent. —Proverbs 21:1; Proverbs 16:9; Proverbs 16:33; Proverbs 19:21; 2 Chronicles 16:9.

4th. It is efficacious.—Lamentations 2:17; Psalms 33:11; Job 23:13.

5th. It is the execution of his eternal purpose, embracing all his works from the beginning in one entire system.—Acts 15:18; Ephesians 1:11; Psalms 104:24; Isaiah 28:29.

6th. Its chief end is his own glory, and subordinately thereto, the highest good of his redeemed church.—Romans 9:17; Romans 11:36; Romans 8:28.

7th. The Scriptures teach that the manner in which God executes his providential government must be consistent with his own perfections, since "God cannot deny himself,"2 Timothy 2:13.

8th. Also congruous with the nature of every creature effected thereby, since all free agents remain free and responsible.

9th. Also that God in the case of the good actions of men gives the grace and the motive, and cooperates in the act from first to last.—Php 2:13. But in the case of the sinful actions of men he simply permits the sinful action, restrains it, and then overrules is for his own glory and the highest good of his creation.

35. How can the existence of moral and physical evil be reconciled with the doctrine of God's providential government? The mystery of the origin and permission of moral evil we cannot solve. As to physical evil, we answer—

1st. That it is never provided for as an end in itself, but always a means to an overbalancing good.

2nd. That in its existing relations to moral evil as corrective and primitive, it is justified alike by reason and conscience as perfectly worthy of a wise, righteous, and merciful God.

36. Show that the apparently anomalous distribution of happiness and misery in this world is not inconsistent with the doctrine of providence.

1st. Every moral agent in this world receives more of good and less of evil than he deserves.

2nd. Happiness and misery are much more equally distributed in this world than appears upon the surface.

3rd. As a general rule, virtue is rewarded and vice punished even here.

4th. The present dispensation is a season of education, preparation, and trial, and not one of rewards and punishments.— See Psalms 72:1-20 :

EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCES AND MIRACLES.

37. How do Extraordinary Providences differ from ordinary events in their relation to God's providential control?

Events like that of the flight of quails, and the draught of fishes, mentioned in Numbers 11:31-32, and Luke 5:6, as far as we know, differ from events occurring under the ordinary providential control of God only in respect to the divinely prearranged conjunction of circumstances. The events are not supernatural, only unusual, and their peculiarity is only that they occur in eminently well–chosen conjunction with other events, such as the need of the Israelites, and of the apostles, with which they have no natural connection.

38. How are miracles designated in the New Testament?

They are called—(1) τερατα, wonders, Acts 2:19; (2) δυναμει, works of superhuman power, and (3) σημεια, signs, John 2:18, Matthew 12:38. The last designation expresses their true office. They are designed to be "signs" incapable of being counterfeited, of God's commission and authentication of a religious teacher and of his doctrine.

39. How then is a miracle, in the Scriptural sense of that word, to be defined, so as to signalize its specific distinction from supernatural events in general, and from extraordinary Providences, as above explained? A miracle is (1) an event occurring in the physical world, capable of being discerned and discriminated by the bodily senses of human witnesses, (2) of such a character that it can be rationally referred to no other cause than the immediate volition of God, (3) accompanying a religious teacher, and designed to authenticate his divine commission and the truth of his message.

40. State and answer the a priori objection to the possibility of miracles, that they essentially involve the violation of the laws of nature.

It is maintained that all experience, and the integrity of human reason, unite in guaranteeing the absolute inviolability of the law of continuity—that every possible event finds its full explanation in adequate causes which precede it, and that every event in its turn causes endless consequences to succeed it. No event can be isolated from its antecedents and consequences, nor from its conditions, and every cause acts according to an intelligible law of its nature. This is all true, and as true of miracles as of any other events.

If by “law of nature” we mean the physical forces which produce effects, then no miracle involves any suspension or violation of such law. It is a common experience that forces modify each other, and each added force combines with others in producing effects otherwise impossible. If by “law of nature” we mean the ordinary course of events observed in nature, then a miracle is, by definition, a signal suspension of that order. But the same thing is brought about every day by the intervention in nature of the intelligent wills of men. In every physical event there are a combination of concauses combining to effect it. The human will in acting violates no law, and annihilates no force, it simply combines natural forces under special conditions, and interpolates into the sum of concauses a new concause—the human volition. When the sons of the prophets “cut down a stick and cast it into the water and the iron of the axe–head did swim”2 Kings 6:6), neither the specific gravities of the iron nor of the water were altered, nor was the law of gravitation suspended. The miracle consisted only in a divine volition interpolating a new transient force, equal to the excess of the specific gravity of the iron over that of the water, and acting in a direction opposite to that of gravity. This is precisely analogous to the action of the human will upon physical objects—with this exception—man’s will acts upon outward objects only indirectly through the mechanism of his body, and directly only upon his voluntary muscles, while God’s will acts directly upon every element of the world he has created. And what is true in this simple miracle could be shown to be true in the most complex ones, such as the raising of Lazarus, if we knew enough of the chemistry and physiology of human life.

John Stuart Mill (“Essay on Theism,” Pt. 4.) says, “It may be argued that the power of volition over phenomena is itself a law, and one of the earliest known and acknowledged laws of nature. . . . The interference of human will with the course of nature is only not an exception to law, when we include among laws the relation of motive to volition; and by the same rule interference by the divine will would not be an exception either; since we cannot but suppose Deity, in every one of his acts, to be determined by motives., The alleged analogy holds good:but what it proves is only what I have from the first maintained—that divine interference with nature could be proved if we had the same sort of evidence for it which we have for human interferences.” That is, this greatest of all the philosophical rationalists maintains that there is no a priori ground to judge miracles impossible. It is purely a question as to the sufficiency of the evidence. Every Christian is perfectly satisfied that the evidence (historical, moral, and spiritual) for the resurrection of Christ, and the miracles historically associated with that event, is abundantly sufficient.

41. State and answer the objection to the occurrence of a moral drawn from the balance of the physical universe.

It is a fact that the whole physical universe forms one system, and that as at present adjusted it is in a state of such delicate equilibrium that the addition or subtraction of a single atom in any one portion of it would disturb that equilibrium throughout the entire system. A disturbance, however

slight, ab extra —the intrusion of an agent not belonging to the system of things, would be destructive of the whole.

It is obvious that this objection would have weight if the material universe were an exclusive whole by itself; and if it sustained no constitutional relation to God. But if God and the created world together constitute a whole—a complete universe of things—the objection is absurd. The sum of his activities of every kind is the necessary complement of the sum of the activities of all his creatures, and only thus the equilibrium is maintained.

It is plain that the will, of God is no more outside the sum of things constituting the universe than is the will of man. And man is constantly modifying nature over wide areas, and every moment bringing his will as a new concause, to act upon the physical laws of the universe ab extra, and giving them new directions and conditions. The equilibrium of the physical universe, moreover, is not a permanent one, but one constantly changing, especially through the diffusion of heat and the massing of matter at the centers of attraction.

42. State and answer the objection that the assumption of the necessity of miraculous interference is derogatory to the wisdom and power of the Creator.

It is argued that the skill of a human workman is always exhibited in proportion to the ability of his work to perform its designed function independently of his repair, or correction, or guidance. That the necessity of interference for any purpose all extra is a proof of defect or at least of limitation in the skill or power of the maker. Any occasion for a miracle therefore could only arise, they argue, from a change of purpose on the part of God, or a radical defect upon the part of his creation. Theodore Parker said, “There is no whim in God, and therefore no miracle in nature.” This would have force if miracles were designed to correct the defective working of the physical universe. But this no Christian has ever dreamed. The design of a miracle is simply to signify to God’s intelligent creatures his active intervention in the moral universe for the purpose of restoring the order disturbed by sin. The moral system is essentially different from the physical one. The one is mechanical, the other embraces the reason, conscience, FREE WILL, and the law, of motive. Free will makes sin possible, and sin makes direct divine intervention necessary, either to redeem or to damn.

All the miracles of Scripture are grouped around the great crises in the work of Redemption, or the restoration of the original natural law, disturbed by sin. Hence the miracles of Scripture, unlike all the miracles of the heathen, or of the Papal Church, or of modern spiritualism, instead of being mere wonders, exhibitions of power, wanton violations of natural order, are preeminently works of healing, acts the whole bearing and spirit of which imply, the restoration and confirmation, not the violation, of law. The highest meaning of the word LAW is order, arrangement, assignment of function, to the end of effecting a purpose. The supreme essence of all law, therefore, is the eternal purpose of God. Not a single miraculous intervention was an after–thought. One eternal act of absolutely intelligent volition embraced the whole scheme of being and events in all space and all duration, appointing all ends and all means and all methods at once, the necessary and the free, the physical and the moral, the acts of the creature obeying law, and the interventions of the Creator imposing law.

43. How can an event actually occurring be certainly recognized as coming under the category of miracles as above defined?

I. A miracle, according to the foregoing definition, is “an event occurring in the physical world capable of being discerned and certainly discriminated by the bodily senses.” The miracles of Scripture fulfill this condition, especially the most important of them. They were exhibited (1) in the clear light of day, (2) on several occasions, (3) under varying circumstances (4) to a number of witnesses, and (5) to the scrutiny of several senses, as of sight, hearing, and touch, mutually corroborating one another.

II. A miracle, by the same definition, must “accompany a religious teacher, and is designed to authenticate his divine commission and the truth of his message.” It hence follows that every such event, in order to be credible, must (1.) be itself of a character, rationally and morally, congruous with its professedly divine origin.

(2.) The character of the religious teacher whose commission it authenticates, and the character of his doctrine, must be such that it is credible that they represent the mind and will of God.

(3.) The messenger and his message must be found to be consistent, historically and doctrinally, with the entire organism of preceding revelations and divine interventions.

III. The miracle, in the third place, must be “of such a character that it can be rationally referred to no other cause than the immediate volition of God.”

It has been objected at this point that a miracle could not be certainly determined to be such, even if it occur, because—

1st. No man knows all the laws of nature, nor what is the true line between the natural and the supernatural. What is new or inexplicable is relatively supernatural, i. e., by us incapable of being reduced to the categories of nature.

2nd. Because evil spirits often have wrought supernatural works—and it is impossible for us, therefore, to determine in any case that the cause of the event can be only a direct volition of God.

WE ANSWER—

1st. As far as evil spirits are concerned, the kingdom of Satan can easily be recognized by its character. No isolated event is ever to be recognized as a miracle. The man, and the doctrine, and their relation to the whole system of past revelations and miraculous interventions, will in every case be sufficient to discriminate the identity of the supernatural cause of an event.

2nd. As far as the question of determining with certainty what effects transcend the powers of nature, we answer—

(1.) There are some classes of effects about which no man can possibly doubt, e. g., the raising of Lazarus, and the multiplying of the loaves and fishes, we may doubt about the exact boundaries of the supernatural—but no man can mistake that which so far transcends the boundaries.

(2.) These effects were accomplished two thousand years ago, in an unscientific age, by an unlearned people.

(3.) These effects were produced over and over again at the mere word of command, without the use of any sort of means, or fixed physical conditions.

(4.) The works were divine in character, and the occasions were worthy, the religious teachers and doctrines carried their own corroborative spiritual evidence, and the events fell into their place in the entire system of revelation.

02.15. The Moral Constitution of the Soul, Will, Liberty, Etc.

Chapter 15 The Moral Constitution of the Soul, Will, Liberty, Etc.

1. What general department of theology are we now entering, and what are the principal topics included in it? The general department of ANTHROPOLOGY, and the principal topics embraced in this department, are the moral constitution of man psychologically considered, the moral condition of man when created, and the providential relations into which man was introduced at his creation,—the nature of sin, the sin of Adam, the effects of his sin upon himself and upon his posterity, and the consequent moral condition and legal relations into which his descendants are introduced at birth.

It is obvious that an accurate understanding of the nature of sin, original or actual, of the influence of divine grace, and of the change wrought in the soul in regeneration, of course involves some previous knowledge of the constitutional faculties of the soul, and especially of those faculties which particularly distinguish man as a moral agent. Hence there are certain psychological and metaphysical questions inseparable from theological discussions.

2. What is the general principle which it is always necessary to bear in mind while treating of the various faculties of the human soul? The soul of man is one single indivisible agent, not an organized whole consisting of several parts; and, therefore, what we call its several faculties are rather the capacity of the one agent, for discharging successively or concurrently the several functions involved, and are never to be conceived of as separately existing parts or organs. These several functions exercised by the one soul are so various and complex, that a minute analysis is absolutely necessary, in order to lay open to us a definite view of their nature. Yet we must carefully remember that a large part of the errors into which philosophers have fallen in their interpretation of man's moral constitution, has resulted from the abuse of this very process of analysis. This is especially true with respect to the interpretation of the voluntary acts of the human soul. In prosecution of his analysis the philosopher comes to recognize separately the differences and the likenesses of these various functions of the soul, and too frequently forgets that these functions themselves are, in fact, never exercised in that isolated manner, but concurrently by the one soul, as an indivisible agent, and that thus they always qualify one another. Thus, it is not true, in fact, that the understanding reasons, and the heart feels, and the conscience approves or condemns, and the will decides, as different members of the body work together, or as the different persons constituting a council deliberate and decide in mutual parts; but it is true that the one indivisible, rational, feeling, moral, self–determining soul reasons, feels, approves, or condemns and decides. The self–determining power of the will as an abstract faculty is absurd as a doctrine, and would be disastrous as an experience; but the self–determining power of the human soul as a concrete, rational, feeling agent. is a fact of universal consciousness, and a fundamental doctrine of moral philosophy and of Christian theology. The real question is not as to the liberty of the will, but as to the liberty of the man in willing. It is obvious that we are free if we have liberty to will as we please, i. e., as upon the whole we judge best, and all things considered

desire.

3. How may the leading faculties of the human soul be classified? and which are the seat of our moral nature?

1st. The intellectual. This class includes all those faculties in different ways concerned in the general function of knowing, as the reason, the imagination, the bodily senses, and the moral sense (when considered as a mere source of knowledge informing the understanding).

2nd. The emotional. This class includes all those feelings which attend, in any manner, the exercise of the other faculties.

3rd. The will.

It will be observed that the functions of the conscience involve faculties belonging to both the first and second classes (see below, Question 5).

It is often asked, Which of our faculties is the seat of our moral nature? Now while there is a sense in which all moral questions concern the relation of the states or acts of the will, to the law of God revealed in the conscience, and therefore in which the will and the conscience are preeminently the foundation of man's moral nature, it is true, nevertheless, that every one of the faculties of the human soul, as above classified, is exercised in relation to all moral distinctions, e. g., the intellectual in the perception and judgment; the emotional in pleasant feeling or the reverse; the will, in choosing or refusing, and in acting. Every state or act of any one of the faculties of the human soul, therefore, which involves the judging, choosing, refusing, or desiring, upon a purely moral question, or the feeling corresponding thereto, is a moral state or act, and all the faculties, viewed in their relations to the distinction between good and evil, are moral faculties.

4. What is the Will? The term "will" is often used to express the mere faculty of volition, whereby the soul chooses, or refuses, or determines to act, and the exercise of that faculty. It is also used in a wider sense, and in this sense I use it here, to include the faculty of volition, together with all of the spontaneous states of the soul (designated by Sir William Hamilton, "Lectures on Metaphysics," Lect. 11., the faculties of conation, the excitive, striving faculties, possessing, as their common characteristic, "a tendency toward the realization of their end"), the dispositions, affections, desires, which determine a man in the exercise of his free power of volition. It must be remembered, however, that these two senses of the word "will" are essentially distinct. The will, as including all the faculties of conation (the dispositions and desires), is to be essentially distinguished from the single faculty of soul exercised in the resulting volition, i. e., the choosing or the acting according to its prevailing desire. The term "will" is used in the wider sense in this chapter. A man in willing is perfectly free, i. e, he always exercises volition according to the prevailing disposition or desire of his will at the time. This is the highest freedom, and the only one consistent with rationality or moral responsibility.

5. Define the term Volition. By the term "faculty of volition" we mean the executive faculty of the soul, the faculty of choice or self–decision; and by the term "volition" we mean the exercise of that faculty in any act of choice or self–decision.

6. What is Conscience?

Conscience, as a faculty, includes (a) a moral sense or intuition, a power of discerning right and wrong, which combining with the understanding, or faculty of comparing and judging, judges of the right or wrong of our own moral dispositions and voluntary actions, and of the dispositions and voluntary actions of other free agents. (b.) This faculty judges according to a divine law, of right and wrong, included within itself (it is a law to itself, the original law written upon the heart, Romans 2:14), and (c) it is accompanied with vivid emotions, pleasurable in view of that which is right, and painful in view of that which is wrong, especially when our conscience is engaged in reviewing the states or the actions of our own souls. This faculty in its own province is sovereign, and can have no other superior than the revealed word of God.—See M'Cosh, " Divine Government," Book 3., chap. 1. sec. 4.

7. What is the true test for determining the moral quality of any mental act or state? The only true tests of the moral quality of any state or act are—

1st. The inspired word of God, and 2nd. The spontaneous, practical, and universal judgments of men. The moral judgments of men, like all our intuitive judgments. are certainly reliable only when they respect concrete and individual judgments. The generalized and abstract propositions which being supposed to be formed by abstraction and generalization from these individual judgments may be true or not, but they cannot be received as a reliable foundation upon which to erect a system of evidence. Very absurd attempts have been often made to demonstrate the moral or non–moral character of any principle, by means of general formularies representing partial truths imperfectly stated, and by means of other—either false, senseless, or irrelevant—a priori considerations.

8. Into what classes are the spontaneous affections of the soul to be distributed, and what are the distinguishing characteristics of each class? The spontaneous desires and affections of the soul are of two distinct biases.

1st. The animal, or those which arise blindly without intelligence, e. g., the appetites and instinctive affections, these have no intrinsic moral quality in themselves, and become the occasion of moral action only when they are restrained or inordinately indulged.

2nd. The rational affections and desires called out by objects apprehended by the intellect.

9. What rational spontaneous affections possess a moral quality, and in what does that quality inherently attach?

Such rational spontaneous affections are intrinsically and essentially either good or bad or morally indifferent, and their quality is discriminated by the quality of the objects by which they are attracted. They are good when their objects are good, evil when their objects are evil, and morally indifferent when their objects are indifferent. Their moral quality, whatever it be, is intrinsic to them. When they are good, all men consider them worthy of approbation, and when they are evil, all men consider them worthy of condemnation and righteous indignation, because of their essential nature as good or as evil, and without any consideration of their origins. When good these spontaneous affections determine the volitions to good, when they are evil they determine the volitions to evil.

10. To what do we apply the designation “permanent principles, or dispositions” of soul? and when do they possess a general character, and what is the source of that character?

There are in the soul, underlying its passing states and affections, certain permanent habits or dispositions involving a tendency to or facility for certain kinds of exercises. Some of these habits or dispositions are innate and some are acquired. These constitute the character of the man, and lay the foundation for all his successive exercises of feeling, affection, desire, volition, or action. As far as these are morally good, the man and his action are good; as far as these are evil, the man and his action are evil; as far as these are morally indifferent, i. e., concern objects morally indifferent, the actions which spring from them are morally indifferent. The moral character of these inherent moral tendencies of the soul is intrinsic and essential. They are the ultimate tendencies of the soul itself, and their goodness or badness is an ultimate fact of consciousness.

11. Show that the state and action of the intellect may possess a moral character. The intellect is so implicated in its exercises with the moral affections and emotions, that its views and judgments on all moral subjects have a moral character also. A man is hence responsible for his moral judgments—and hence for his beliefs as well as for his moral feelings, because the one is as immediately as the other determined by the general moral state or character of the soul. A man who is blind to moral excellence, or to the deformity of sin, is condemned by every enlightened conscience. The Scriptures pronounce a woe upon those “who call evil good and good evil, who put light for darkness and darkness for light.”—Isaiah 5:20. Sin is called in Scripture “blindness,” and “folly.”—1 John 2:11; Ephesians 4:18; Revelation 3:17; Matthew 23:17; Luke 24:25.

12. What are the essential conditions of moral responsibility? To be morally responsible a man must be a free, rational, moral agent (see answer to preceding question).

1st. He must be in present possession of his reason to distinguish truth from falsehood.

2nd. He must also have in exercise a moral sense to distinguish right from wrong.

3rd. His will, in its volitions or executive acts, must be self–decided, i. e., determined by its own spontaneous affections and desires. If any of these are wanting, the man is insane, and neither free nor responsible.

13. Is the conscience indestructible and infallible? The conscience, the organ of God’s law in the soul, may virtually, i. e., as to its effects and phenomena, be both rendered latent and perverted for a time, and in this phenomenal sense, therefore, it is neither indestructible nor infallible. But if the moral sense be regarded simply in itself it is infallible, and if the total history of even the worst man is taken into the account, conscience is truly indestructible.

1st. As to its indestructibility. Conscience, like every other faculty of the soul, is undeveloped in the infant, and very imperfectly developed in the savage; and, moreover, after a long habit of inattention to its voice and violation of its law, the individual sinner is often judicially given up to carnal indifference; his conscience for a time lying latent. Yet it is certain that it is never destroyed—

(1.) From the fact that it is often aroused to the most fearful energy in the hearts of long–hardened reprobates in the agonies of remorse.

(2.) From the fact that this remorse or accusing conscience constitutes the essential torment of lost souls and devils. This is “the worm that never dieth.” Otherwise their punishment would lose its moral character.

2nd. As to its infallibility. Conscience, in the act of judging of moral states or actions, involves the concurrent action of the understanding and the moral sense. This understanding is always fallible, especially when it is prejudiced in its action by depraved affections an desires. Thus, in fact, conscience constantly delivers false decisions from a misjudgment of the facts and relations of the case; it may be through a selfish or sensual or a malignant bias. Hence we have virtually a deceiving as well as a latent conscience. Notwithstanding this, however, the normal sense of the distinction between right and wrong, as an eternal law to itself, lies indestructible even in the most depraved breasts, as it cannot be destroyed, so it cannot be changed; when aroused to action, and when not deceived as to the true state of the case, its language is eternally the same.—See M’Cosh, “Divine Government,” Book 3., chapter 2., section 6, and Dr. A. Alexander, “Moral Science,” chapters 4. and 5.

14. What is the essential nature of virtue?

“Virtue is a peculiar quality of” certain states of the will, i. e., either permanent dispositions or temporary affections of the will, and “of certain voluntary actions of a moral agent., which quality is perceived by the moral faculty with which every man is endowed, and the perception of which is accompanied by an emotion which is distinct from all other emotions, and is called moral.”—Dr. Alexander, “Moral Science,” ch. 26. The essence of virtue is, that it obliges the will. If a thing is morally right it ought to be done. The essence of moral evil is, that it intrinsically deserves disapprobation, and the agent punishment. This point is of great importance, because the truth here is often perverted by a false philosophy, and because this rewards view of moral good is the only one consistent with the Scriptural doctrine of sins, rewards, and punishments, and, above all, of Christ’s atonement. The idea of virtue is a simple and ultimate intuition; attempted analysis destroys it. Right is right because it is. It is its own highest reason. It has its norm in the immutable nature of God.

15. What constitutes a virtuous and what a vicious character?

Virtue, as defined in the answer to the last question, attaches only to the will of man (including all the conative faculties), 1st., to its permanent disposition;

2nd., to its temporary affections; and

3rd., to its volitions. Some of these states and actions of the will are not moral, i. e., they are neither approved nor condemned by the conscience as virtuous or vicious. But virtue or vice belong only to moral states of the soul, and to voluntary acts. A virtuous character, therefore, is one in which the permanent dispositions, the temporary affections and desires, and the volitions of the soul, are conformable to the divine law. A vicious character, on the other hand, is one in which these states and acts of the will are not conformable to the divine law. The acts of volition are virtuous or vicious as the affections, or desires by which they are determined are the one or the other. The affections and desires are as the permanent dispositions or the character. This last is the nature of the will itself, and its character is an ultimate unresolvable fact. Whether that character be innate or acquired by habit, the fact of its moral quality as virtuous or vicious remains

the same, and the consequent moral accountability of the agent for his character is unchanged.

It must be remembered that the mere possession of a conscience which approves the right and condemns the wrong, and which is accompanied with more or less lively emotion, painful or pleasurable as it condemns or approves, does not make a character virtuous, or else the devils and lost souls would be eminently virtuous. But the virtuous man is he whose heart and actions, in biblical language, or whose dispositions, affections, and volitions, in philosophical language, are conformed to the law of God.

16. State both branches of the Utilitarian theory of virtue. The first and lowest form is that which maintains that virtue consists in the intelligent desire for happiness. Dr. N. W. Taylor says—“Nothing is good but happiness and the means of happiness, and nothing evil but misery and the means of misery.” The second and higher form of the Utilitarian theory of virtue is that it consists in disinterested benevolence, and that all sin is a form of selfishness. This is shown, Chapters 8., 12., and 18., to be a defective and therefore a false view.

17. What as we mean when we say that a man is a free agent?

1st. That, being a spirit, he originates action. Matter acts only as it is acted upon. A man acts from the spring of his own active power.

2nd. That, although a man may be forced by fear to will and to do many things which he would neither will nor do if it were not for the fear, yet he never can be made to will what he does not himself desire to will, in full view of all the circumstances of the case.

3rd. That he is furnished with a reason to distinguish between the true and the false, and with a conscience, the organ of an innate moral law, to distinguish between right and wrong, in order that his desires may be both rational and righteous. And yet his desires are not necessarily either rational or righteous, but are formed under the light of reason and conscience, either conformable to or contrary to them, according to the permanent, habitual dispositions of the man; i. e., according to his own character.

18. Show that this attribute of human nature is inalienable. A man is said to be free in willing when he wills in conformity with his own prevailing dispositions and desires at the time. A man’s judgment may be deceived, or his actions may be coerced, but his will must be free, because, if it be truly his will, it must be as he desires it to be, in his present state of mind and under all the circumstances of the case at the time.

It hence follows that volition is of its very essence free, whether the agent willing or the act willed be wise or foolish, good or bad.

19. Do not the Scriptures, however, speak of man’s being under the bondage of corruption, and his liberty as lost? As above shown, a man is always free in every responsible volition, as much when he chooses, in violation of the law of God and conscience, as in conformity to it. In the case of unfallen creatures, and of perfectly sanctified men, however, the permanent state of the will, the voluntary affections and desires (in Scripture language, the heart), are conformed to the light of reason and the law, of conscience within, and to the law of God, in its objective revelation. There are no conflicting principles then within the soul, and the law of God, instead of coercing the will by its commands and threatenings, is spontaneously obeyed. This is “the liberty of the sons of God;”

and the law becomes the “royal law of liberty” when the law in the heart of the subject perfectly corresponds with the law of the moral Governor. In the case of fallen men and angels, on the other hand, the reason and conscience, and God’s law, are opposed by the governing dispositions of the will, and the agent, although free, because he wills as he chooses, is said to be in bondage to an evil nature, and “the servant of sin,” because he is impelled by his corrupt dispositions to choose that which he sees and feels to be wrong and injurious, and because the threatenings of God’s law tend to coerce his will through fear. The Scriptures do not teach that the unregenerate is not free in his sin, for then he would not be responsible. But the contrast between the liberty of the regenerate and the bondage of the unregenerate arises from the fact that in the regenerate the habitually controlling desires and tendencies are not in conflict with the voice of conscience and the law of God. The unregenerate, viewed psychologically, is free when he sins, because he wills as upon the whole he desires; but viewed theologically, in his relation to God’s law as enforced by reason and conscience and Scripture, he may be said to be in bondage to the evil dispositions and desires of his own heart, which he sees to be both wrong and foolish, but which, nevertheless, he is impotent to change.

20. What is the distinction between liberty and ability?

Liberty consists in the power of the agent to will he pleases, from the fact that the volition is determined only by the character of the agent willing. Ability consists in the power of the agent to change his own subjective state, to make himself prefer what he does not prefer, and to act in a given case in opposition to the coexistent desires and preferences of the agent’s own heart.

Thus man is as truly free since the fall as before it, because he wills as his evil heart pleases. But he has lost all ability to obey the law of God, because his evil heart is not subject to that law, neither can he change it.

21. Give Turretin’s and President Edwards’ definitions of Liberty.

Turretin, 50. 10, Ques. 1.—“As only three things are found in the soul besides its essence, namely, faculties, habits(habitue), acts, so will, (arbitrium) in the common opinion is regarded as an act of the mind; but here it properly signifies neither an act nor a habit which may be separated from an individual man, and which also determines him to one at least of two contraries; but it signifies a faculty, not one which is vegetative nor sensuous, common to us and the brutes, in which there can be no place for either virtue or vice, but a rational faculty, the possession of which does not indeed constitute us either good or bad, but through the states of which and actions, we are capable of becoming either good or bad.”

Ques. 3.—“Since, therefore, the essential nature of liberty does not consist in indifference, it cannot be found in any other principle than in (lubentia rationali) a rational willingness or desire, whereby a man does what he prefers or chooses from a previous judgment of the reason (facit quod lubet proevio rationis judicio). Hence two elements united are necessary to constitute this liberty.

(1.) το προαιρετικον(the purpose), so that what is done is not determined by a blind, and certain brutish impulse, but εκ προαιρεσεω, and from a previous illumination by the reason, and from a practical Judgment of the intellect.

(2.) το εκουσιον(the spontaneous), so that what is done is determined spontaneously and freely and without coaction."

President Edwards "On the Will," Section 5, defines Liberty as being "the power, opportunity, or advantage, that any one has to do as he pleases."

290. 22. What are the two senses in which the word motive, as influencing the will., is used? and in which sense is it true that the volition is always as the strongest motive?

1st. A motive to act may be something outside the soul itself, as the value of money, the wishes of a friend, the wisdom or folly, the right or the wrong, of any act in itself considered, or the appetites and impulses of the body. In this sense it is evident that the man does not always act according to the motive. What may attract one man may repel another, or a man may repel the attraction of an outward motive by the superior force of some consideration drawn from within the soul itself. so that the dictum is true, "The man makes the motive, and not the motive the man."

2nd. A motive to act may be the state of the man's own mind, as desire or aversion in view of the outward object, or motive in the first sense. This internal motive evidently must sway the volition, and as clearly it cannot in the least interfere with the perfect freedom of the man in willing, since the internal motive is only the man himself desiring, or the reverse, according to his own disposition or character.

23. May there not be several conflicting desires, or internal motives, in the mind at the same time, and in such a case how is the will decided?

There are often several conflicting desires, or impelling affections in the mind at the same time, in which case the strongest desire, or the strongest group of desires, drawing in one way, determine the volition. That which is strongest proves itself. to be such only by the result, and not by the intensity of the feeling it excites. Some of these internal motives are very vivid, like a thirst for vengeance, and others calm, as a sense of duty, yet often the calm motive proves itself the strangest, and draws the will its own way. This, of course, must depend upon the character of the agent. It is this inward contest of opposite principles which constitutes the warfare of the Christian life. It is the same experience which occasions a great part of that confusion of consciousness which prevails among men with respect to the problem of the will and the conditions of free agency. Man often acts against motives, but never without motive. And the motive which actually determines the choice in a given case may often be the least clearly defined in the intellect, and the least vividly experienced in the feelings. Especially in sudden surprises, and in cases of trivial concernment, the volition is constantly determined by vague impulses, or by force of habit almost automatically. Yet in every case, if the whole contents of the mind, at the time of the volition, be brought up into distinct consciousness, it will be found that the man chose, as upon the whole view of the case presented by the understanding at the instant he desired to choose.

24. If the immediately preceding state of the man's mind certainly determines the act of his will, how can that act be truly free if certainly determined? This objection rests solely upon the confusion of the two distinct ideas of liberty of the will as an abstract faculty, and liberty of the man who wills. The man is never determined to will, by anything without himself. He always himself freely gives, according to his own character, all the weight to the external influences which bear upon him that they ever possess. But, on the other hand, the mere act of volition, abstractly

considered, is determined by the present mental, moral, and emotional state of the man at the moment he acts. His rational freedom, indeed, consists, not in the uncertainty of his act, but in the very fact that his whole soul, as an indivisible, knowing, feeling, moral agent, determines his own action as it pleases.

25. Prove that the certainty of a volition is in no degree inconsistent with the liberty of the agent in that act.

1st. God, Christ, and saints in glory, are all eminently free in their holy choices and actions, yet nothing can be more certain than that, to all eternity, they shall always will according to righteousness.

2nd. Man is a free agent, yet of every infant, from his birth, it is absolutely certain that if he lives he will sin.

3rd. God, from eternity, foreknows all the free actions of men as certain, and he has foreordained them, or made them to be certain. In prophecy he has infallibly foretold many of them as certain. And in regeneration his people are made “his workmanship created unto good works, which God has before ordained that we should walk in them.”

4th. Even we, if we thoroughly understand a friend’s character, and all the present circumstances under which he acts, are often absolutely certain how he will freely act, though absent from us. This is the foundation of all human faith, and hence of all human society.

26. What is that theory of moral liberty, styled “Liberty of Indifference,”“Self–determining Power of the Will,”“Power of Contrary Choice,”“Liberty of Contingency,” etc., held by Arminians and others? This theory maintains that it is essentially involved in the idea of free agency—

1st. That the will of man in every volition may decide in opposition, not only to all outward inducements, but equally to all the inward judgments, desires, and to the whole coexistent inward state of the man himself.

2nd. That man is conscious in every free volition, that he might have willed precisely the opposite, his outward circumstances and his entire inward state remaining the same.

3rd. That every free volition is contingent, i. e., uncertain, until the event, since it is determined by nothing but the bare faculty of volition on the part of the agent.—Hamilton’s “Reid,” pp. 599–624. The true theory of moral certainty, on the other hand, is that the soul is a unit; that the will is not self–determined, but that man, when he wills, is self–determined; and that his volition is certainly determined by his own internal, rational, moral, emotional state at the time, viewed as a whole. In opposition to the former theory, and in favor of the latter, we argue—

1st. That the character of the agent does certainly determine the character of his free acts, and that the certainty of an act is not inconsistent with the liberty of the agent in his act.—See above, Question 12.

2nd. The Christian doctrines of divine foreknowledge, foreordination, providence, and regeneration. For the scriptural evidence of these, see their respective chapters. They all show that the volitions of men are neither uncertain nor indeterminate.

3rd. We agree with the advocates of the opposite theory in maintaining that in every free act we are conscious that we had power to perform it, or not to perform it, as we chose. “But we maintain that we are none the less conscious that this intimate conviction that we had power not to perform an act is conditional. That is, we are conscious that the act might have been otherwise, had other views or feelings been present to our minds, or been allowed their due weight. A man cannot prefer against his preference, or choose against his choice. A man may have one preference at one time, and another at another. He may have various conflicting feelings or principles in action at the same time, but he cannot have coexisting opposite preferences.”

4th. The theory of the self–determining power of the will, regards the will, or the mere faculty of volition, as isolated from the other faculties of the soul, as an independent agent within an agent. Now, the soul is a unit. Consciousness and Scripture alike teach us that the man is the free, responsible agent. By this dissociation of the volitional faculty from the moral dispositions and desires, the volitions can have no moral character. By its dissociation from the reason, the volitions can have no rational character. If they are not determined by the inward state of the man himself; they must be fortuitous, and beyond his control. He cannot be free if his will is independent alike of his head and his heart, and he ought not to be held responsible.—See “Bib. Rep.,” January, 1857, Article V.

27. What is a man responsible for his outward actions, why for his volitions; why for his affections and desires; and prove that he is responsible for his affections?

“A man is responsible for his outward acts, because they are determined by the will, he is responsible for his volitions, because they are determined by his own principles and feelings (desires); he is responsible for his principles and feelings, because of their inherent nature as good or bad, and because they are his own and constitute his character.”—“Bib. Rep.,” January. 1857, g., 130.

It is the teaching of Scripture and the universal judgment of men, that “a good man out of the good treasures of his heart bringeth forth that which is good,” and that a “wicked man out of the evil treasures of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil.” The act derives its moral character from the state of the heart from which it springs, and a man is responsible for the moral state of his heart, whether that state be innate, formed by regenerating grace, or acquired by himself, because—

1st. Of the obliging nature of moral right, and the ill–desert of sin;

2nd. Because a man’s affections and desires are himself loving or refusing that which is right. It is the judgment of all, that a profane or malignant man is to be reprobated, no matter how he became so.

28. How does Dr. D. D. Whedon state and contrast the position of Arminian and Calvinistic philosophy?

Dr. Whedon, in the “Bibliotheca Sacra,” April, 1862, says, “To this maxim, that it is no matter how we come by our evil volitions, dispositions, or nature in order to responsibility, provided that we really possess them, we (the Methodists) oppose the counter maxim that in order to responsibility for the given act or state, power in the agent for a contrary act or state is requisite. In other words power underlies responsibility.” The only limit which he admits to this principle is the case of an

inability induced by the free act of the agent himself. This, he says, is a fundamental maxim by which all the issues between Arminianism and Calvinism are determined.

29. Show that the Arminian view to consequences inconsistent with the gospel, and that the Calvinistic view is true.

Dr. Whedon admits that Adam after his fall lost all ability to obey the law of God, and was responsible for that inability and all its consequences, because, having been created with full ability, he lost it by his own free act. He also admits that every child of Adam is born into the world with a corrupt nature, and without any ability to obey the law of God. But no infant is responsible nor punishable for this want of ability nor for any sinful action which results from it, because it was entailed upon him, without any fault of his own by the sin of another. In the way of just compensation, however, for this their great misfortune of being innocent sinners, God gives to all men in Christ sufficient grace, and hence gracious ability to obey the gospel law. If a man uses this gracious ability he is saved, and faith and evangelical obedience is accounted for perfect righteousness; if he does not use this gracious ability he is condemned as responsible for that abuse of ability, and consequently responsible for all the sinful feelings, actions, and subsequent inability which result from that abuse of power.

We argue that it follows from this Arminian view—

1st. That salvation by Christ is not of free grace, but a tardy and incomplete compensation granted men for undeserved evils brought upon them at their birth in consequence of Adam's sin.

2nd. The "grace "given to all men is as necessary to render them punishable sinners, as it is to save their soul. In fact, according to this principle, grace sends more souls to hell by making them responsible through the possession of ability, than it sends to heaven through faith in Christ.

3rd. Those who die in infancy, not being punishable, because not responsible, for original sin, go to heaven as a matter of natural right. On the contrary we maintain that the responsibility of a man for his moral dispositions, affections, and desires, no matter how they may have originated, if he be a sane man, is an ultimate fact of consciousness, confirmed by Scripture, conscience, and the universal judgments of men. An act derives its moral character from the state of the heart from which it springs, but the state of the heart does not acquire its moral character from the action. But the moral quality of the state of the heart itself is inherent, and moral responsibility is inseparable from moral quality. This is so—

1st. Because of the essential nature of right and wrong. The essence of right is that it ought to be—that it obliges the will. The essence of wrong, is that it ought not to be—that the will is under obligation to the contrary.

2nd. Because a man's moral affections or desires are nothing other than the man himself loving or abhorring goodness. It is the judgment of all men that a profane and malignant man is to be reprobated no matter how he became so. It is the character, not the origin, of the moral disposition of the heart which is the real question. Christ says, "A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good, and a wicked man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil."—Luke 6:45

02.16. Creation and Original State of Man.

Chapter 16 Creation and Original State of Man.

1. State the evidence the human race was originated by immediate creation by God.

1st. This is explicitly taught in the Bible.—Genesis 1:26-27; Genesis 2:7.

2nd. It is implied by the immeasurable gulf which separates man in his lowest savage condition from the very nearest order of the lower creation; indicating an amazing superiority in respect to qualities in which the two are comparable, and an absolute difference of kind in respect to man's intellectual, moral, and religious nature, and capacity for indefinite progress. Even Prof. Huxley, who rashly maintains an extreme position with regard to the anatomical relations of man to the inferior animals, admits that when man's higher nature is taken into the account there exists between him and the nearest beast "an enormous gulf, a divergence immeasurable and practically infinite."—"Primeval Man," by the Duke of Argyle.

3rd. It is implied by the fact revealed in the Scriptures and realized in history, that man was destined to exercise universal dominion over all other creatures and over the system of nature. Therefore he could not be a mere product of nature. One of a series of coordinate beings.

4th. It is implied by the fact that men are called "sons of God," and in the whole scheme of Providence and Redemption are treated as such. It is universally testified to by man's moral and religious nature, all the more strongly the more these elements of his nature are enlightened and developed. And the fact is preeminently signalized by the assumption of our nature into personal union with the Godhead.

It is obvious that as the intellectual, moral, religious, and social natures and habits of men are transmitted by natural descent just as much as their anatomical structure, it is not only arbitrary but absurd to leave out of view the one set of elements, while retaining the other, in any scientific investigation of the question of his origin, or of his place and relations in the order of nature.

2. Give the present state of the question as to the antiquity of the human race.

1st. The Scriptures and the entire body of the results of modern science agree in teaching that man came into being on this earth the last of all its organized inhabitants. There has been no new species introduced since the advent of man.

2nd. From the prima facie(first founded) indications afforded in the incomplete historical and genealogical records of the pre–Abrahamic period found in the first chapters of Genesis, the generally received systems of biblical chronology have been constructed. The shorter system, constructed by Usher from the Hebrew Text, fixes the date of the creation of man about 4,000 years before the birth of Christ, or about 6,000 years ago. The longer system, constructed by Hales and others from the Septuagint and Josephus, makes the date of the creation of man about 5,500 years before Christ, or about 7,500 years ago. Of these biblical systems of chronology, Prof.

W. H. Green, D.D., of Princeton, says, ("Pentateuch Vindicated," n. p., 128)–" It must not be forgotten that there is an element of uncertainty in a computation of time which rests upon genealogies as the sacred chronology so largely does. Who is to certify us that the antediluvian and ante–Abrahamic genealogies have not been condensed in the same manner as the post–Abrahamic. If Matthew omitted names from the ancestry of our Lord in order to equalize the three great periods over which he passes, may not Moses have done the same in order to bring out seven generations from Adam to Enoch, and ten from Adam to Noah? Our current chronology is based upon the prima facie impression of these genealogies. This we shall adhere to until we shall see good reason for giving it up. But if these recently discovered indications of the antiquity of man, over which scientific circles are now so excited, stall, when carefully inspected and thoroughly weighed, demonstrate all that any have imagined they might demonstrate, what then? They will simply show that the popular chronology is based upon a wrong, interpretation, and that a select and partial register of ante–Abrahamic names has been mistaken far a complete one."

3rd. Modern research has developed a vast and constantly increasing amount of evidence that the human race has existed upon the earth many centuries longer than is allowed for even by the chronology of the Septuagint. The principal classes of evidence upon this point are as follows.

(1.) Etymological Pictures, showing that all the divergent peculiarities of the Caucasian and African types were fully developed as they now exist, nineteen hundred years before Christ, are found on the Egyptian Monuments. In all historic time no changes of climate or habit have produced appreciable changes in any variety of the race, therefore, we must conclude that many centuries as well as great changes were requisite to make such great permanent variations in the descendants of the same pair. The Duke of Argyle well says, "And precisely in proportion as we value our belief in the Unity of the Human Race ought we to be ready and willing to accept any evidence on the question of man's Antiquity. The older the human family can be proved to be, the more possible and probable it is that it has descended from a single pair."—"Primeval Man," p. 128.

(2.) The science of language, which proves that in very remote ages all the nations which speak cognate languages must have lived together, speaking the same language and branching from a common stock. And that unknown ages must have been consumed in the development of so many and so various dialects.

(3.) The science of Geology. The remains of human bodies and of human works of art have been found embedded in alluvial deposits in gravel pits, and in caves at such depth and in such association with the remains of extinct species of animals as to prove conclusively that since man existed on the earth whole groups of great quadrupeds have become totally extinct; the climate of the Northern Temperate Zone has been revolutionized, and very radical changes have been wrought in the physical Geography of the countries which have been examined.

3. How can the Unity of the Human Race as descended from a single pair be proved?

Agassiz is the only naturalist of the highest rank who teaches that all species and varieties of organized beings must have had an independent origin, and been propagated from different parents. He holds consequently that mankind is a genus, originally created in several specific varieties. The same view is ably advocated in a recent work which has attracted attention in

England, viz., “The Genesis of the Earth and of Man.” That man, although generically different from all other creatures, is nevertheless one single species is proved—

1st. From Scripture.—Acts 17:26; Romans 5:12; 1 Corinthians 15:21-22.

2nd. Because the absolute unity of the race by descent from one pair is essentially implied in the propagation by imputation and by descent of guilt and corruption from Adam, and of the representative Headship and vicarious obedience and suffering of Jesus Christ.

3rd. The higher moral and religious natures of all varieties of mankind are specifically identical.

4th. The same is generally indicated by history and the science of comparative philology.

5th. Greater differences have been generated in the processes of domestication between different branches of the same species of lower animals, as among pigeons or dogs for instance, than exists between the different varieties of mankind.

6th. It is a fact universally admitted by naturalists, that the union of different species are never freely fertile, and that the offspring of such union are seldom if ever fertile. But all the varieties of mankind freely intermix, and the offspring of all such unions propagate themselves indefinitely with perfect facility.

4. Show that the Scriptures teach that human nature is composed of two and only two distinct substances. The Scriptures teach that man is composed of two of elements, ■■■■■■■, σωμα, corpus, body, and ■■■■■, πνευμα, ψυκη, πνοη, ζωη, animus, soul, spirit. This is clearly revealed—

1st. In the account of creation.—Genesis 2:7. The body was formed of the earth, and then God breathed into man the breath of life and he became thenceforth a living soul.

2nd. In the account given of death, Ecclesiastes 12:7, and of the state of soul immediately after death, while the bodies are decaying in the ground.—2 Corinthians 5:1-8; Php 1:23-24; Acts 7:59.

3rd. In all the current language of Scripture these two elements are always assumed, and none other are mentioned.

5. State the view of those who maintain that our nature embraces three distinct elements, and its supposed Biblical basis.

Pythagoras, and after him Plato, and subsequently the mass of Greek and Roman philosophers, maintained that man consists of three constituent elements:the rational spirit, as νου, πνευμα, mens; the animal soul, ψυκη, anima; the body, σωμα, corpus. Hence this usage of the words became stamped upon the Greek popular speech. And consequently the apostle uses all three when intending to express exhaustively in popular language the totality of man and his belongings. “I pray God that your whole spirit, soul, and body be preserved blameless.”1 Thessalonians 5:23; Hebrews 4:12; 1 Corinthians 15:44. Hence some theologians conclude that it is a doctrine given by divine inspiration that human nature is constituted of three distinct elements.

6. Refute this position and show that the wordsψυκη andπνευμα are used in the New Testament interchangeably. The use made of these terms by the apostles proves nothing more than that they

were used as words in their current popular sense to express divine ideas. The word πνευμα designates the one soul emphasizing its quality as rational. The word ψυκη 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. That the πνευμα and ψυκη are distinct entities cannot be the doctrine of the New Testament, because they are habitually used interchangeably and often indifferently. Thus ψυκη as well as πνευμα is used to designate the soul as the seat of the higher intellectual faculties.—Matthew 16:26; 1 Peter 1:22; Matthew 10:28. Thus also πνευμα as well as ψυκη is used to designate the soul as the animating principle of the body.—James 2:26. Deceased persons are indifferently called ψυχαι, Acts 2:27; Acts 2:31; Revelation 6:9; Revelation 20:4; and πνευματα, Luke 24:37; Luke 24:39; Hebrews 12:23.

7. What do our standards teach as to the state of man at his creation? The “Confession Faith,” ch. 4, § 2, “Larger Catechism,” Q. 17, and “Shorter Catechism,” Q. 10, teach the following points—

1st. God created man in his own image.

2nd. A reasonable and immortal soul endued with knowledge, righteousness, and true holiness, and placed in dominion over the creatures.

3rd. Having God’s law written on his heart and power to fulfill it, and yet under possibility of transgressing, being left to the freedom of his own will, which was subject to change. The likeness of man to God respected—

1st. The kind of his nature; man was created like God a free, rational, personal Spirit.

2nd. He was created like God as to the perfection of his nature; in knowledge, Colossians 3:10; and righteousness and true holiness, Ephesians 4:24; and 3rd. In his dominion over nature. Genesis 1:28.

8. Give in psychological terms the true state of the question. In the preceding chapter it was shown that the volition is determined and derives its character from the desires and affections which prompt to it; and that the temporary affections and desires, which prompt the volitions in any given case, themselves spring from the permanent habit, disposition, or tendency of will which constitute the moral character of the man. It was also shown that the moral character of these permanent dispositions of will, and the responsibility of the man for them, is an ultimate fact, incapable of being referred back to any principle more fundamental or essential and confirmed by the unanimous judgment of the human race.

It hence follows that the original righteousness and holiness in which Adam was created consisted in the perfect conformity of all the moral dispositions and affections of his will (in Bible language, heart) to the law of God—of which his unclouded and faithful conscience was the organ. As a consequence there was no schism in man’s nature. The will, moving freely in conformity to the lights of reason and of conscience, held in harmonious subjection all the lower principles of body and soul. In perfect equilibrium a perfect soul dwelt in a perfect body. This original righteousness is natural in the sense (1) that it was the moral perfection of man’s nature as it came from the hands of the Creator. It belonged to that nature originally, and (2) is always essential to its perfection as to quality. (3) It would also have been propagated, if man had not fallen, just as native depravity is now propagated by natural descent. On the other hand, it is not natural in the sense that reason or

conscience or free agency are essential constituents of human nature, necessary to constitute any one a real man. As a quality it is essential to the perfection, but as a constituent it is not necessary to the reality of human nature.

9. Prove that Adam, was created holy in the above sense.

It belongs to the essence of man's nature that he is a moral responsible agent.

But, 1st. As a moral creature man was created in the image of God.—Genesis 1:27.

2nd. God pronounced all his works, man included, to be "very good."—Genesis 1:31. The goodness of a mechanical provision is essentially its fitness to attain its end. The "goodness "of a moral agent can be nothing other than his conformity of will to the moral law. Moral indifference in a moral agent is itself of the nature of sin.

3rd. This truth is asserted.—Ecclesiastes 7:29.

4th. In regeneration, man is renewed in the image of God; in creation, man was made in the image of God; the image, in both cases, must be the same, and includes holiness.—Ephesians 4:24.

5th. Christ is called, 1 Corinthians 15:45, as ο εσχατο Αδαμ, and in 1 Corinthians 15:47, δευτερο ανθρωπο. He is recognized by friend and foe as the only perfect man in all history, the exemplar of normal humanity. Yet his human nature was formed by the Holy Ghost, antecedently to all action of its own, absolutely holy. He was called in his mother's womb, "That Holy Thing."Luke 1:3 a.

10. What is the Pelagian doctrine with regard to the original state of man? The Pelagians hold—

1st. That a man can rightly be held responsible only for his unbiased volitions; and

2nd. Consequently amoral character as antecedent to moral action is an absurdity, since only that disposition is moral which has been formed as a habit by means of preceding unbiased action of the free will, i. e., man must choose his own character, or he cannot be responsible for it.

They hold, therefore, that man's will at his creation was not only free, but, moreover, in a state of moral equilibrium, equally disposed to virtue or vice.

11. State and contrast the positions of the Pelagians, of Dr. D. D. Whedon (Arminian), and of the Calvinists, as to innate righteousness and sin. The Pelagian holds—

1st. That Adam was created a moral agent, but with no positive moral character; that he was at first indifferent either to good or evil, and left free to form his own character by his own free, unbiased choice.

2nd. That all men are born into the world in all essential particulars in the same moral state in which Adam was created.

3rd. That man is naturally mortal, and that the mortality of the race is not in consequence of sin.

Dr. D. D. Whedon (Arminian), in "Bib. Sacra," April, 1862, p. 257, while agreeing with the Pelagian in the main as to the original moral state into which Adam was introduced by creation, differs from him as to the moral condition into which the descendants of Adam are introduced by birth. He admits that a "created" inclination may be either good and hence lovable, or bad and hence

hateful—but he denies that the agent can be in the first case rewardable, or in the second case punishable for his disposition, the character of which he did not determine for himself by previously unbiased volitions. If Adam had formed for himself a holy character he would have been both good and rewardable. Since he formed for himself a sinful character he was both bad and punishable. His descendants are propagated with corrupt natures without any fault of their own, therefore they are bad and corrupt, but not deserving of punishment. In opposition to these positions the orthodox hold—

1st. There are permanent dispositions and inclinations which determine the volitions.

2nd. Many of these inclinations are good, many are bad, and many others are morally indifferent in their essential nature.

3rd. These moral dispositions may be innate as well as acquired, in which case the agent is as responsible for them as he is for any other state or act of his will.

4th. Adam was created with holy dispositions prompting to holy action. He did not make himself holy, but was made so by God.

12. Why do we judge that men are morally responsible for innate and concreated dispositions?

1st. Children are born with moral dispositions and tendencies very various. Yet it is the spontaneous and universal judgment of men, that men naturally malicious and cruel and false are both to be abhorred and held morally responsible for their tempers and actions.

2nd. The Scriptures, as will be shown under Ch. 19., on “Original Sin,” teach that all men come into the world with an inherent tendency in their nature to sin, which tendency is itself sin and worthy of punishment.

3rd. President Edwards “On Will,” Pt. 4, § 1, says, “The essence of the virtue and vice of dispositions of the heart and acts of the will lie not in their cause but in their nature.” And even the Arminian, John Wesley, says, as quoted by Richard Watson, “Holiness is not the right use of our powers, it is the right state of our powers. It is the right disposition of our soul, the right temper of our mind. Take that with you and you will no more dream that God could not create man in righteousness and true holiness.”“What is holiness? Is it not essentially love? And cannot God shed abroad this love in any soul without his concurrence, and antecedent to his knowledge or consent. And supposing this to be done, will love change its nature? will it be no longer holiness? This argument can never be sustained.”

13. Prove that a state of moral indifference is itself sin, and that if it were not so no exercise of a volitional faculty so conditioned could possibly originate a moral act or character. That moral indifference on the part of a moral agent in view of a moral obligation is itself sin is self–evident. The essence of morality is that it obliges the will of a moral agent. A non–moral agent may be indifferent to moral things. A moral agent may be indifferent to indifferent things. But from the very nature of the case it is absurd to pretend that a moral agent can be indifferent with respect to a known moral obligation resting on himself, and yet that that indifference is non moral, but the prerequisite condition of all morality.

Besides a morally indifferent disposition cannot originate a holy act or habit. The goodness or badness of an act depends upon the goodness or badness of the disposition or affection which prompted it. It is the moral state of the will (or heart, see Matthew 7:17-20; Matthew 12:33) which makes the act of the will right or wrong, and not the act which makes the state wrong. A man's motives may be right, and yet his choice may be wrong through his mistake of its nature, because of ignorance or insanity; yet if all the prevalent dispositions and desires of the heart in any given case be night, the volition must be modally right; if wrong, the volition must be morally wrong; if indifferent, or neither right or wrong, the volition must be morally indifferent also. Hence appears the absurdity of their position. If Adam had been created, as they falsely believe, with a will equally disposed either to good or evil, his first act could have had no moral character whatever. And yet Pelagians assume that Adam's first act, which had no moral character itself, determined the moral character of the man himself; and of all his acts and destinies for all future time. This, if true, would have been unjust on God's part, since it involves the infliction of the most awful punishment upon an act in itself neither good nor bad. As a theory it is absurd, since it evolves all modality out of that which is morally indifferent.

Richard Watson, Vol. 2., p. 16, well says:"In Adam that rectitude of principle from which a right choice and right acts flowed, was either created with him, or flowed from his own volitions. If the latter be affirmed, then he must have willed right before he had a principle of rectitude, which is absurd; if the former then his creation in a state of moral rectitude, with an aptitude and disposition to good, is established."

14. Show that the Pelagian theory cannot be based upon experience. This whole theory is built upon certain a priori notions, and is contrary to universal experience. If Adam was created without positive moral character, and if infants are so born, then the conditions of free agency in these supposed cases must be different from the conditions of free agency in the case of every adult man or woman, from whose consciousness alone we can gather the facts from which to deduce any certain knowledge on the subject. Every man who ever thought or wrote upon this subject, was conscious of freedom only under the conditions of an already formed moral character. Even if the Pelagian view were true, we never could be assured of it, since we never have consciously experienced such a condition of indifference It is nothing more than an hypothesis, contrived to solve a difficulty; a difficulty resulting from the limits of our finite powers of thought.—See Sir William Hamilton's "Discussions," p. 587, etc.

15. What distinction did the Fathers make between the εικεν and the ομοιωσι of God in which man was created?—Genesis 1:26. By the εικων or "image" of God the Fathers understood the natural constitutional powers of man, intellectual and moral, as reason, conscience, and free will. By the "ομοιωσι " or "likeness" of God they understood the matured and developed moral perfection of human nature consequent upon man's holy exercise of his faculties.

Meander, "Hist. Christ. Dogmas," p. 180, says that this was the germ of the subsequent medieval and Roman doctrine as to the original state of man.

Bellarmin, "De Gratia," et Lib. Arbitrio 1., 100. 6.—"We are forced, by these many testimonies of the fathers, to conclude that the image and likeness are not in all respects the same, but that the image pertains to the nature and the likeness to the virtues (moral perfections); whence it follows that Adam by sinning lost not the image but the likeness of God."

16. What does the Catechism of The Council of Trent teach as to the state in which Adam was created?

See below the doctrines of the various churches at the end of this chapter.

17. What is the Romish doctrine with respect to thedona naturalia , and thedona supernaturalia ?

1st. They hold that God endowed man at his creation with thedona naturalia, that is, with all the natural constitutional powers and faculties of body and soul without sin, in perfect innocence. There was no vice or defect in either body or soul.

2nd. God duly attempered all these powers to one another, placing the lower in due subordination to the higher. This harmony of powers was called Justicia —natural righteousness.

3rd. There was, however, in the very nature of things, a natural tendency in the lower appetites and passions to rebel against the authority of the higher powers of reason and conscience. This tendency is not sin in itself; but becomes sin only when it is consented to by the will, and passes into voluntary action. This is concupiscence(a strong desire); not sin, but the fuel and occasion of sin.

4th. To prevent this natural tendency to disorder from the rebellion of the lower elements of the human constitution against the higher, God granted man the additional gift of the dona superanaturalia lost original or gifts extra constitutional. This is original righteousness, which was a foreign gift superadded to his constitution, by means of which his natural powers duly attempered are kept in due subjection and order. Some of their theologians held that these supernatural gifts were bestowed upon man immediately upon his creation, at the same time with his natural powers. The more prevalent and consistent view, however, is that it was given subsequently as a reward for the proper use of his natural powers see Moehler's "Symbolism," pp. 117, 118.

5th. Both the "justicia," and the "dona supernaturalia " were accidental or superadded properties of human nature, and were lost by the fall.

18. How does this doctrine modify their view as to original sin and the moral character of that concupiscence which remains in the regenerate?

They hold that man lost at the fall only the superadded gifts of "original righteousness" (dona supernaturalia), while the proper nature of man itself, the dona naturalia, comprising all his constitutional faculties of reason, conscience, free will (in which they include "moral ability"), remain intact. Thus they make the effect of the fall upon man's moral nature purely negative. The Reformers defined it "the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of the whole nature."

Hence, also, they hold that concupiscence, or the tendency to rebellion of the lower against the higher powers remaining in the regenerate, being natural and incidental to the very constitution of human nature, is not of the nature of sin. See below.

AUTHORITATIVE PUBLIC STATEMENTS OF THE:VARIOUS CHURCHES.

ROMISH DOCTRINE.—"Cat. Council of Trent," Pt. 2, Ch. 2., Q. 19.— "Lastly, He formed man from the slime of the earth, so created and qualified in body as to be immortal and impassable, not however, in virtue of the strength of nature, but of the divine gift. But as regards the soul of man,

he created it in his own image and likeness; gifted him with free will, and so tempered all his motions and appetites that they should at all times be subject to the control of the reason. He then added the admirable gift of original righteousness; and next gave him dominion over all other animals."—Ibid. Pt. 2, Ch. 2., Q. 42, and Pt. 4 Ch. 12., Q. 3.

BELLARMIN.—"Gratia Primi Hominis," 5.—"It is to be understood in the first place, that man naturally consists of flesh and spirit, and therefore his nature partly assimilates with the beasts and partly with the angels; and because of his flesh and his fellowship with the beasts he has a certain propensity to corporeal and sensible good, to which he is induced through the senses and appetites; and because of his spirit and his fellowship with the angels he has a propensity to spiritual and rational good, to which he is induced by his reason and will. But from these different and contrary propensities there exists in one and the same man a certain contest, and from these contests a great difficulty of acting, while the one propensity antagonizes the other. It is to be understood in the second place, that divine providence at the beginning of creation, that it might administer a remedy to this disease or languor of human nature arising from the condition of its "matter," added the excellent gift of original righteousness, by which as by a golden bridle the inferior part might be held in subjection to the superior part, and the superior part subject to God; although the flesh was so subject to the spirit, that it could not be moved the spirit forbidding, nor rebel against the spirit unless the spirit rebel against God; nevertheless it was in the power of the spirit to rebel or not to rebel." For the statement of Bellarmin's doctrine as to the present moral condition into which the descendants of Adam are born, see below, Ch. 19., on "Original Sin."

LUTHERAN DOCTRINE.—"Formula Concordioe " (Hase), p. 640. [Original Sin] "is the privation of that righteousness concreated in human nature in Paradise or of that image of God in which man was in the beginning created in truth, holiness, and righteousness."

REFORMED DOCTRINE.—"Canon. Dordt," 3. 1.—"Man, from the beginning, was created in the image of God, adorned in his mind, with the true and saving knowledge of his Creator, and of spiritual things, with righteousness in his will and heart, and purity in all his affections and thus was altogether holy."

"Confession Faith", Ch. 4., "Larger Catechism," Ques. 17; "Shorter Catechism," Ques. 10.

REMONSTRANT DOCTRINE.—Limborch, "Theol. Christ.," 2. 24, 5.— "They are wont to locate original righteousness in illumination and rectitude of the mind, in holiness and righteousness of the will, in harmony of the senses and affections, and in a promptitude for good. It is, indeed, most evident that the first of mankind were, in their primeval state, of a far more perfect condition than we are when we are born. For their mind was not like a blank paper, and void of all knowledge but had been endowed by God with actual knowledge, and instructed in the wisdom necessary for that state; and they possessed also the capacity for acquiring further knowledge by reasoning, experience, and revelation. . . . Their will was not neutral equally indifferent in respect to good and evil, but before that the Law was imposed upon it by God, it had a natural rectitude, so that it could neither desire nor act inordinately. For where there is no law, there the most free use of the will is clear of blame.—2. 24, 10. That the first man would not have died if he had not sinned, is beyond doubt, for death was the penalty of sin. But thence the immortality [natural] of man is not correctly inferred. . . . Nevertheless God would have preserved this mortality in perpetual immunity of actual death, if man had not sinned."

SOCINIAN DOCTRINE.—F. Socinus, “Proelectiones Theol.,” c. 3.—“We therefore conclude that Adam, even before he had transgressed that command of God, was not truly righteous, since he was neither impeccable, nor had he hitherto been subjected to any occasion of sinning; at least it is not possible to affirm that he was certainly righteous, since it in no manner appears that he for any consideration had abstained from sinning. But there are those who say that the original righteousness of the first man consisted in this, that he possessed a reason dominating over his appetite and senses and covering them, and that there was no variance between them. But they say this without reason, since it clearly appears from the sin Adam committed that his appetite and senses dominated over his reason, neither had these previously agreed well together. ”

“Cat. Racov.,” p. 18.—“From the beginning man was vented mortal, i. e., such an one as not only might consistently with his nature die, but also if left to his nature could not but die, although it was possible that he might he preserved always in life by a special divine blessing. ”

02.17. Covenant of Works.

Chapter 17 Covenant of Works.

1. In what different senses is the term covenant used in Scripture?

1st. For a natural ordinance.—Jeremiah 33:20.

2nd. For an unconditional promise.—Genesis 9:11-12.

3rd. For a conditional promise.—Isaiah 1:19-20.

4th. A dispensation or mode of administration.—Hebrews 8:6-9. For the usage with respect to the Greek term διαθηκη, usually translated in our version testament and covenant.—See Chapter 22., on “Covenant of Grace,” Question 1. In the theological phrases “covenant of works,” and “covenant of grace,” this term is used in the third sense of a promise suspended on conditions.

2. What are the several elements essential to a covenant?

1st. Contracting parties.

2nd. Conditions. These conditions in a covenant between equals are mutually imposed and mutually binding, but in a sovereign constitution, imposed by the Creator upon the creature, those “conditions” are better expressed as (1) promises on the part of the Creator suspended upon (2) conditions to be fulfilled by the creature. And (3) an alternative penalty to be inflicted in case the condition fails.

3. Show that the constitution under which Adam was placed by God at his creation may be rightly called a covenant. The inspired record of God’s transactions with Adam presents definitely all the essential elements of a covenant as coexisting in that constitution.

1st. “contracting parties.”—

(1.) God, the moral Governor, by necessity of nature and relation demanding perfect conformity to moral law.

(2.) Adam, the free moral agent, by necessity of nature and relation under the inalienable obligation of moral law.

2nd. The “promises,” life and favor.—Matthew 19:16-17; Galatians 3:12. The “conditions” upon which the promises were suspended, perfect obedience, in this instance subjected to a special test, that of abstaining from the fruit of the “tree of knowledge.”

3rd. The “alternative penalty.”“In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.”—Genesis 3:16-17. This constitution is called a covenant.—Hosea 6:1-11 4. How is it defined in our standards?

“Confession Faith,” Chap. 4., Sec. 2; Chap. 7., Sec. l and 2; Chap. 19., Sec. l; “Larger Catechism,” Q. 20; “Shorter Catechism,” Q. 12.

5. Why is it not absurd to apply the term “Covenant” to a sovereign constitution imposed by the Creator upon the creature without consulting his will?

1st. Although it was a sovereign constitution imposed by God, there is no reason to suppose that Adam did not enter upon it voluntarily. He was a holy being, and the arrangement was preeminently to his advantage.

2nd. We call it a Covenant because that is the proper word to express a conditional promise made to a free agent.

3rd. The term “Covenant” is constantly applied in Scripture to other sovereign constitutions of like character which the Creator has imposed upon men. If God could make covenants with fallen and guilty Noah, Genesis 9:11-12, and with Abraham. Genesis 17:1-21, why could he not make a covenant with unfallen Adam?

6. By what titles has this covenant been designated and why?

1st. It has been called the Covenant of Nature, because it expresses the relationship which man in his natural state as newly created and unfallen sustained to the Creator and Moral Governor of the universe. It is adjusted to the natural man, just as the Covenant of Grace is adjusted to unnatural or fallen man.

2nd. It has been called a legal covenant, because its “condition” is perfect conformity to the law of absolute moral perfection.

3rd. It has been called the Covenant of Works, because its demands terminate upon man’s own being and doing.

4th. It has been called a Covenant of Life, because the promise attached to well–doing was life.

It was also essentially a gracious covenant, because although every creature is, as such, bound to serve the Creator to the full extent of his powers, the Creator cannot be bound as a mere matter of justice to the natural justice to grant the creature fellowship with himself, or to raise him to an infallible standard of moral power, or to crown him with eternal and inalienable felicity.

7. Who were the parties to this covenant, and how may it be proved that Adam therein represented all his natural descendants? The “parties” were God and Adam, and in him representatively all natural posterity. That he did thus represent his descendants is evident—

1st. From the parallel which is drawn in Scripture between Adam in his relation to his descendants, and Christ in his relation to his elect.—Romans 5:12-19, and 1 Corinthians 15:22; 1 Corinthians 15:47.

2nd. From the matter of fact that the very penalty denounced upon Adam, in case of his disobedience, has taken effect in each individual descendant.—Genesis 2:17; Genesis 3:17-18.

3rd. From the Biblical declaration that sin, death, and all penal evil came into the world through Adam.—Romans 5:12; 1 Corinthians 15:22. See Chapter 21., on “Imputation of Adam’s Sin.”

8. What was the promise attached to the Covenant? The promise was “life”—

1st. Because necessarily implied in the penalty “death,” which is expressly denounced. If disobedience is linked to death, obedience is linked to life.

2nd. It is clearly taught in other passages of Scripture.—Leviticus 18:5; Nehemiah 9:29; Matthew 19:16-17; Galatians 3:12; Romans 10:5. This life was not a mere continuation of the existence with which man was endowed by creation as a fallible, moral agent, but it was an additional gift of infallible, moral excellence, and inalienable blessedness, conditioned upon obedience during a probationary period.—

1st. This is evident because the reward suspended on “conditions” must involve something more than had been already granted.

2nd. Because man was as created liable to sin, and there could be no permanent and secure bliss nor high excellence in that condition.

3rd. Because the granting of the reward necessarily closes the probation, supersedes the conditions, and secures inalienable blessedness.

4th. Because the angels who had not left their first estate had been rewarded with such a life.

5th. Because the life promised must correspond to the death threatened, and the death threatened involved eternal separation from God and irretrievable destruction.

6th. Because the life secured to us by the “Second Adam” is of this nature.

9. What is a “Probation”? and when and where did the human race have its probation under the Covenant of Works? A probation is a trial. The word is variously used to express the state, or the time, or the act of trial. The time of probation under such a constitution as the covenant of works must be a definitely limited one, because it is self–evident that either the infliction of the penalty or the granting of the reward would, ipso facto, close the probation forever, and the reward could not accrue until the period of probation was completed. The probation of the human race took place once for all in the trial of Adam in the garden of Eden. That trial resulted in loss, and since then the conditions of the covenant being impossible, and its penalty having been incurred, any probation is of course impossible. Men are now by nature children of wrath.

10. What was the condition of that covenant? and why was the command not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil selected as a test?

Perfect conformity of heart, and perfect obedience in act to the whole will of God as far as revealed.—Deuteronomy 27:26; Galatians 3:10; James 2:10. The command to abstain from eating the forbidden fruit was only made a special and decisive test of that general obedience. As the matter forbidden was morally indifferent in itself, the command was admirably adapted to be a clear and naked test of submission to God’s absolute will as such. The forbidden tree was doubtless called the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, because through the disobedient eating of it mankind came to the thorough experience of the value of goodness and of the infinite evil of sin. The obedience required by the law as a rule of duty is of. course perpetual. But the demand of the law for obedience as a covenant condition of life must be limited to the period of

probation. The term “perpetual” in “Confession F.,” Ch. 19., § 1, and “Larger Catechism,” Q. 20, was admitted doubtless by inadvertence.

11. What was the nature of the death threatened in case of disobedience? This word, “dying thou shalt die,” in this connection evidently includes all the penal consequences of sin. These are—

1st., death, natural, Ecclesiastes 12:7;

2nd., death, moral and spiritual, Matthew 8:22; Ephesians 2:1; 1 Timothy 5:6; Revelation 3:1;

3rd., death, eternal, Revelation 20:6-14. The instant the law was violated its penalty began to operate, although on account of the intervention of the dispensation of grace the full effect during the present life. The Spirit of God was withdrawn the instant man fell, and he at once became spiritually dead, physically mortal, and under sentence of death eternal. This appears—

1st. From the nature of man as a spiritual being. “This is life eternal to know the only true God,” etc.—John 17:3. The instant the soul is cut off from God it dies, and his wrath and curse is incurred, and the entire person, body and soul, involved in an endless series of evil conditions.

2nd. The Scriptures everywhere declare that the wages of sin is death.—Romans 6:23; Ezekiel 18:4. The nature of this death is to be determined.

(1.) By the is narrative of the effects produced in our first parents, e. g., shame of nakedness, fear, alienation from God, until after a time dissolution of body, etc.

(2.) By the experience of its effects in their descendants, e. g., corruption of nature, mortality, miseries of body, miseries in this life, the second death.

12. What do C. F. Hudson and others hold to be the penalty of the Covenant of Works? The annihilationists, of whom C. F. Hudson is one of the ablest, hold that the precise thing God said to Adam was “THOU, thyself, thine entire person art dust, and to dust thou shalt return.” They quote Numbers 23:10; Judges 16:30, etc. They hold that death means precisely and only cessation of being. They say Adam could have had no other idea associated with the word. Death in this sense had preexisted in the world for innumerable ages among the lower orders of creatures, and this was all Adam knew on the subject.

It is idle for us to speculate as to what the original language God spoke to Adam was, or what the word he used corresponding to our word, death, precisely signified and suggested. Adam probably simply understood God to say that if he sinned he should be utterly and irretrievably cut off from the divine favor. That is precisely what happened. But the facts are clear.

1st. The word death in Scripture is used to express not cessation of being but a certain godless condition of being.—Revelation 3:1; Ephesians 2:1-5; Ephesians 5:14; 1 Timothy 5:6, Romans 6:13; Romans 11:15; John 5:24; John 6:47.

2nd. It will be shown below, Chapters 37 and 40, that the Scriptures do not allow the notion either of the sleep of the soul during the intermediate state, or of the annihilation of the wicked after the judgment.

13. What is meant by the seal of a covenant, and what was the seal of the Covenant of Works? A seal of a covenant is an outward visible sign, appointed by God as a pledge of his faithfulness, and as an earnest of the blessings promised in the covenant

Thus the rainbow is the seal of the covenant made with Noah.—Genesis 9:12-13. Circumcision was the original seal of the covenant made with Abraham (Genesis 17:9-11; Romans 4:11), in the place of which baptism is now instituted.—Colossians 2:11-12; Galatians 3:26-27. The tree of life was the seal of the covenant of works, because it was the outward sign and seal of that life which was promised in the covenant, and from which man was excluded on account of sin, and to which he is restored through the second Adam in the Paradise regained.—Compare Genesis 2:9; Genesis 3:22; Genesis 3:24, with Revelation 2:7; Revelation 22:2-14.

14. What according to Witsius, his great work “on the Covenants,” are the seals or sacraments of the Covenant of Works? In Vol. 1., Ch. 6., Witsius enumerates four—

1st. Paradise.

2nd. The tree of life.

3rd. The tree of knowledge of good and evil.

4th. The Sabbath.

These were all doubtless symbolical institutions connected with the original divine dispensation of which the Covenant of Works was the foundation. But there appears to be no reason for designating them as belonging to that particular class of symbolical institutions called sacraments under the New Testament. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil sealed death, and therefore could not have been a seal of the Covenant of Works which offered life.

15. In what sense is the Covenant of Works abolished, and in what sense is it in force? This Covenant having been broken by Adam, not one of his natural descendants is ever able to fulfill its conditions, and Christ having fulfilled all of its conditions in behalf of all his own people, salvation is offered now on the condition of faith. In this sense the Covenant of Works having been fulfilled by the second Adam is henceforth abrogated under the gospel.

Nevertheless, since it is founded upon the principles of immutable justice, it still binds all men who have not fled to the refuge offered in the righteousness of Christ. It is true that “he that doeth these things shall live that them.” and “the soul that sinneth it shall die.” This law in this sense remains, and in consequence of the unrighteousness of men condemns them, and in consequence of their absolute inability to fulfill it, it acts as a schoolmaster to bring them to Christ. For he having fulfilled alike its condition wherein Adam failed, and its penalty which Adam incurred, he has become the end of this covenant for righteousness to every one who believes, who in him is regarded and treated as one who has fulfilled the covenant, and merited its promised reward.

02.18. The Nature of Sin and the Sin of Adam.

Chapter 18 The Nature of Sin and the Sin of Adam.

1. What are the only tests by which the answer to the question “What is sin?” can be determined?

1st. The word of God.

2nd. The intuitive judgments of men. The tests of the validity of these intuitions are (a) self–evidence, (b) universality, (c) necessity. The intuitive judgments of men are immediately passed not upon abstract notions nor upon general propositions, but upon concrete and individual instances. General maxims are generalized by the understanding from many individual intuitive convictions, and are true or false as this process of generalization has been well or badly done. The vast amount of confusion and error which prevails as to the nature of sin, and as to what comes under the category of sin, is due to crude generalization of general principles from individual intuitions, and the indiscriminate application of the maxim thus generated beyond the range to which they are guaranteed by the intuitions themselves. The maxims that all sin consists in voluntary action, and that ability is the measure of responsibility, are instances of this abuse. It is as absurd to attempt to make the bare understanding settle a question belonging only to the moral sense as it would be to make the nose decide a question of sound.—See M’Cosh, “Intuitions of the Mind,” Book 1., ch. 2., §§ 4 and 5, and Book 4., ch. 2., §§ 1–3.

2. What must a true definition of the nature of sin embrace? A definition of sin must—

1st. Include all that either the Word of God or an enlightened conscience decides to be sin.

2nd. It must include nothing else. Otherwise in either case it is false.

3. State the definitions of Sin given. Turretin, and our Standards, and by Vitringa.

Turretin, Locus 9, Ques. 1.—“Inclinatio, actio, vel omissio pugnans cum lege Dei, vel carens rectitudine legali debita in esse.”

“Confession Faith,” Ch. 6., § 6; “Larger Catechism,” Q. 24; “Shorter Catechism,” Q. 14. “Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of the law of God.”

Campejus Vitringa, Prof. Theo. in Franeker, died 1722.— “Forma peccati est disconvenientia, actus, habitue, ant status hominis cum divine lege.” This last excellent definition embraces two constituent propositions.—

1st. Sin is any and every want of conformity with the moral law of God, whether of excess or defect, whether of omission or commission.

2nd. Sin is any want of conformity of the moral states and habits as well of the actions of the human soul with the law of God?

4. What is Law? And what is the Law of God? The word law is used in a great many and in very different senses. It is used by natural philosophers often to express—

1st. A general fact, e. g., the general fact that all matter attracts all matter inversely as the square of the distance.

2nd. An established order of sequence in which certain events occur, as the order of the seasons, and any established order of nature.

3rd. The mode of acting of a specific force, as the law of electrical induction, etc.

4th. A spontaneous order of development, as the internal self–acting law of the growth of animals and plants from the seed. The moral law of God, however, is not an internal, self–regulating principle of man's moral nature, like the feigned inner light of the Quakers, but an imperial standard of moral excellence imposed upon mankind from without and from above them by the supreme authority of a personal moral Governor over personal moral subjects. It involves (a) a certain degree of enlightenment as to truth and duty, (b) a rule of action regulating the will and binding the conscience, (c) armed with sanctions, or imperative motives constraining to obedience.

5. Prove that sin is any want of conformity to "Law."

1st. Whenever we sin conscience condemns us for not coming up to a standard which we intuitively recognize as morally obligatory upon us. Conscience implies (a) moral accountability, and hence subjection to a moral Governor, and (b) a standard to which we ought to be conformed. The conscience itself; as the organ of God's law, contains the law written on the heart.

2nd. It is implied in all the language used by the Holy Ghost in Scripture to express the idea of sin ■■■■■■■ ■■■■ from ■■■■■■ to deviate from the way. ■■■■■ to miss the mark, αμαρτανω to err, to miss the mark, παραβασι(Galatians 3:19), a going aside from, a transgression.

3rd. It is explicitly asserted Scripture, "Every one that doeth sin, also doeth την ανομιαν and sin is ανομια."—1 John 3:4. "For where no law is there is no transgression."—Romans 4:15.

6. Prove that sin is any want of conformity to the moral Law Of God. As above shown this is implied in the action of conscience. It testifies to a law imposed upon us by an authority external to us, the supreme authority of God. In the absence of all supernatural revelation it has led all heathen nations to the recognition of the authority of God, or of gods exercising government, to a belief in rewards and punishments administered by God, and hence to expiatory and propitiatory rites.

It is also asserted by David that sin of any kind is disobedience and dishonor done to God.—See Psalms 51:1-19.

Hence sin is not a mere violation of the law of our own constitution, nor of the system of things, but an offense against a personal Lawgiver and moral Governor, who vindicates his law with penalties. The soul that sins is always conscious that his sin is (a) intrinsically vile and polluting, and (b) that it justly deserves punishment and calls down the righteous wrath of God. Hence sin carries with it two inalienable characters—(a) ill–desert, guilt, reatus, (b) pollution, macula.

7. Show that this Law, any want of conformity to which is sin, demands absolute moral perfection.8 This is necessarily involved in the very essence of moral obligation. The very essence of right is that it ought to be. The very essence of wrong is that it ought not to be. If anything be indifferent it is not moral, and if it be moral it is a matter of obligation. This being of the essence of right it is, of course, true of each consistent part as well as of the whole. Any degree short of full conformity with the highest right is therefore of the nature of sin. “For whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point is guilty of all.”—James 2:10. The old maxim is true, Omne minus bonum habet rationem mali(All lack goodness and are considered bad or sinful).

It evidently follows from this principle that the Romish doctrine of works of Supererogation is absurd as well as wicked, since if these works are obligatory they are not supererogatory, and if they are not obligatory they are not moral, and if not moral they can have no moral value. Hence also all those Perfectionists who admit that men are not now able to keep perfectly the law of absolute moral perfection, while they maintain that Christians may in this life live without sin, obviously use incorrect and misleading language.

8. Prove that any want of conformity with this Law in the states and permanent habit of soul, as well as in its acts, is sin.

1st. This is proved by the common judgments of all men. All judge that the moral state of the heart determines the moral character of the actions, and that the moral character of the actions discloses the moral state of the heart, and that a man whose acts are habitually profane, or malignant, or impure, is himself in the permanent state of his heart profane, or malignant, or impure.

2nd. The same is proved by the common religious experience of all Christians. This experience always involves conviction of sin, and conviction of sin involves as its most uniform and prominent element not merely a conviction that our actions fail to come up to the proper standard of excellence, but a sense that in the depths of our nature, below and beyond the reach of volition, we are spiritually dead and polluted, and impotent and insensible to divine things, and worthy of condemnation therefore. Every Christian has been brought with Paul to cry out, “O wretched man that I am:who shall deliver me from the body of this death?”—Romans 7:24. This finds expression, and this principle for which we are contending finds proof in all the prayers, supplications, confessions, and in all the hymns and devotional literature of Christians of all ages and denominations.

3rd. The Scriptures explicitly call the permanent states of the soul “sin” when they are not conformed to the law of God. Sin and its lusts are said to reign in the mortal body; the members are the instruments of sin; the unregenerate are the servants of sin.—Romans 6:12-17. The disposition or permanent “tendency” to sin is called “flesh” as opposed to “spirit,”Galatians 5:17; also “lust,”James 1:14-15; “old Adam,” and “body of sin,”“ignorance,”“blindness of heart,”“alienation from the life of God,” and “a condition of being past feeling,”Ephesians 4:18-19.

9. Show that the very first spontaneous motions of concupiscence are sin?

1st. The heart of the Christian often for the moment spontaneously lusts for evil when the conscience promptly condemns and the will forbids and restrains and diverts the attention. Although the man does not consent to the sin that is present in him, nevertheless the Christian

feels that such movements of concupiscence are unholy, and worthy of condemnation, and he not only resists them but condemns and loathes himself because of them, and seeks to be purged from them at once by the atoning blood, and the sanctifying spirit of Jesus.

2nd. Concupiscence is called “sin ”in Scripture. “I had not known sin, but by the law, for I had not known επιθυμιαν(concupiscence) except the law had said thou shalt not επιθυμησει.” Also τα παθηματα των αμαρτιων, “the motions of sin,” and “the law in the members,” and “sin that dwelleth in me,” that worketh without “my consent,” which “works all manner of concupiscence,” etc.—Romans 7:5-24.

10. What is the FIRST great mystery connected with the origin of sin?

How or why was the existence of sin tolerated in the creation of a God at once eternal, self–existent, and infinite in wisdom, power, holiness, and benevolence?

All the attempted solutions of this enigma which have been entertained in our day have been summed up by Prof. Haven of Chicago as follows:

Either God cannot prevent sin, i. e., either (a) in any system, (b) in a moral system involving free agency. Or for some reason God does not choose to prevent sin, (b) e. g., either because (a) its existence is of itself desirable, (b) or though not in itself desirable it is the necessary means of the greatest good, or (c) though not in itself tending to good it may be overruled to that result, or (d) because, in general terms, its permission will involve less evil than its absolute prevention.

It is obvious (a) that God has permitted sin, and (b) hence it was right for him to do so. But why it was right must ever remain a mystery demanding submission and defying solution.

11. What was the Manichoean doctrine as to the origin of sin?

They held the opinion that sin had its ground in some eternal, self–existent principle independent of God, either matter or self–existent devil. This doctrine is inconsistent (a) with the independence, infinitude, and sovereignty of God; (b) with the nature of sin as essentially the revolt of a created free will from God. Sin is an element of perverted moral agency. To consider it an attribute of matter is to deny it. All the Christian fathers united in opposing Manichaeism and in maintaining that sin is the product of the free will of man alone.

12. State the doctrine of St. Augustine with respect to the privative nature of sin.

St. Augustine held—

1st. That God is the creator of all entities and the absolutely sovereign Governor of all moral agents and of all their actions; and 2nd. That nevertheless God is in no sense either the author or the cause of sin. In order to reconcile these he held,

3rd. That sin is not an entity, but is in its essence simply a defect. His dictum, which hence has passed into general currency with all classes of theologians, was Nihil est malum nisi privatio boni(Nothing is evil unless it lacks good). They have property distinguished between “negation” and “privation.” Negation is the absence of that which does not belong to the nature of the subject, as sight to a stone. Privation is the absence of that which belonging to the nature of the subject is necessary to its perfection, as sight to a man.

Sin therefore is privative because it originates in the absence of those moral qualities which ought to be present in the states and actions of a free, responsible, moral agent.

It is to be remembered, however, that the inherent depravity which “comes from a defective or privative cause” instantly assumes a positive form, from the essentially active nature of the human soul. In a passive condition of being, a defect might remain purely negative. But in a ceaselessly active being, and one acting under ceaseless moral obligations, a moral defect must instantly become a positive vice. Not to love God is to hate him. Not to be in all things conformed to his will is to rebel against him, and to break his law at all points.—See Edwards, “Original Sin,” pt. 4. sec. 2.

13. What is the Pelagian doctrine as to the nature of sin? The Pelagian view of sin, which has been rejected by all branches of the Christian Church, is—

1st. That law can command only volitions.

2nd. That states of the soul can be commanded only in so far as they are the direct effect of previous volitions.

3rd. Hence that sin consists simply in acts of volition.

4th. That whatever a man has not plenary ability to do he is under no obligation to do.

5th. That there is no such thing, therefore, as innate depravity.

6th. That since a volition to be moral or the subject of approbation or of condemnation, must be a pure self–decision of the will, it follows that sin is beyond the absolute control of God.

14. In what sense is the dictum that “all sin is voluntary” true, and in what sense false?

It all turns upon the sense of the phrase “Voluntary.” If it be in the Pelagian sense restricted to “acts of volition;” then the dictum that “all sin is voluntary” is false. If, however, it is used so as to include the spontaneous dispositions, tendencies, and affections which constitute the permanent character of the soul, and which prompt to and decide the nature of the volitions, then all sin is voluntary, because all sin has its ground and spring in these spontaneous tendencies and dispositions, i. e., in the permanent moral states of the soul.

15. State the peculiarities of the Romish position upon this subject, and also that of the Arminian Perfectionists. The Roman Church agrees with all Protestants in holding that all the habits and permanent dispositions as well as the actions of the soul which are not conformed to the law of God are sinful. But it is a prominent characteristic of their doctrine that they hold that moral condition of soul which remains in the regenerate as the consequence of original sin, and the fomes or feel of actual sin, is not properly of the nature of sin. They maintain that the first spontaneous movement of this concupiscence is not sin in itself and not to be treated as such —but that it becomes the cause of sin as soon as its solicitations are entertained and translated into action by the will.—“Cat. of Council of Trent,” Pt. 2., ch. 2., Q. 42. The Arminians avail themselves of the same positions when defending their doctrine of Christian Perfection. Wesley (in “Meth. Doc. Tracts,” pp. 294–312) distinguishes between “sin properly so called, i. e., voluntary transgression of known law, and sin improperly so called, i. e., involuntary transgression of law,

known or unknown," and declares, "I believe there is no such perfection in this life as excludes these involuntary transgressions, which I apprehend to be naturally consequent upon the ignorance and mistakes inseparable from mortality." THE SIN OF ADAM 16. What is the SECOND great mystery connected with the origin of sin?

How could sin originate in the will of a creature created with a positively holy disposition? The difficulty is to reconcile understandingly the fact that sin did so originate—

1st. With the known constitution of the human will. If the volitions are as the prevalent affections and desires, and if the affections and desires excited by outward occasions are good or evil, according to the permanent moral state of the will, how could a sinful volition originate in a holy will? or how could the permanent state of his soul become spontaneously unholy?

2nd. With universal experience. As it is impossible that a sinful desire or volition should originate in the holy will of God, or in the holy will of saints and angels, or that a truly holy affection or volition should originate in the depraved wills of fallen men without supernatural regeneration (Luke 6:43-45), how could a sinful volition originate in the holy will of Adam? That Adam was created with a holy yet fallible will, and that he did fall, are facts established by divine testimony. We must believe them, although we cannot rationally explain them. This is for us impossible—

1st. Because there remains an inscrutable element in the human will, adopt whichever theory of it we may.

2nd. Because all our reasoning must be based upon consciousness, and no other man ever had in his consciousness the experience of Adam. The origin of our sinful volitions is plain enough. But we lack some of the data necessary to explain his case. In the way of approximation, however, we may observe—

1st. It is unsound to reason from the independent will of the infinite God to the dependent will of the creature.

2nd. The infallibility of saints and angels is not inherent, but is a superinduced confirming grace of God. They are not in a state of probation. Adam was—his will was free, but not confirmed.

3rd. The depraved will of man cannot originate holy affections and volitions, because the presence of:a positively holy principle is necessary to constitute them holy. But, on the other hand, there were already in the holy will of Adam many principles morally indifferent, in themselves neither good nor bad, and becoming sinful only when, in default of the control of reason and conscience, they prompt to their indulgence in ways forbidden by God; e. g., admiration and appetite for the fruit, and desire for knowledge. The sin commenced the moment that, under the powerful persuasion of Satan, these two motives were dwelt upon in spite of the prohibition, and thus allowed to become so prevalent in the soul as temporarily to neutralize reverence for God's authority, and fear of his threatening.

4th. Adam, although endowed with a holy disposition, was inexperienced in the assaults of temptation.

5th. He was assailed through the morally indifferent principles of his nature by a vastly superior intelligence and character, to whom, in the highest sense, the origin of all sin must be referred.

17. What appears from the history of the Fall to have been the precise nature of the first sin of Adam?

It appears from the record (Genesis 3:1-6) that the initial influences inducing our first parents, in their first transgression, were in themselves considered morally indifferent. These were—

1st. Natural appetite for the attractive fruit.

2nd. Natural desire for knowledge.

3rd. The persuasive power of Satan upon Eve, including the known influence of a superior mind and will.

4th. The persuasive power of both Satan and Eve upon Adam. Their dreadful sin appears to have been essentially—

1st. Unbelief, they virtually made God a liar.

2nd. Deliberate disobedience, they set up their will as a law in place of his.

18. What relation did God sustain to Adam's sin?

Concerning the relation sustained by God to the sin of Adam all we know is—

1st. God created Adam holy, with all natural powers necessary for accountable agency.

2nd. He rightfully withheld from him, during his probation, any higher supernatural influence necessary to render him infallible.

3rd. He neither caused nor approved Adam's sin.

4th. He sovereignly decreed to permit him to sin, thus determining that he should sin as he did.

19. What was the effect of Adam's sin upon himself?

1st. In the natural relation which Adam sustained to God as the subject of his moral government, his sin must have instantly had the effect of (1) displeasing and alienating God, and (2) of depraving his own soul.

2nd. In the covenant relation which Adam sustained to God the penalty of the covenant of works was incurred, (b) e., death, including, (1) mortality of body, (2) corruption of soul, (3) sentence of eternal death.

20. In what sense did he become totally depraved, and how could total depravity result from one sin? By the affirmation that total depravity was the immediate result of Adam's first sin, it is not meant that he became as bad as he could be, or even as corrupt as the best of his unregenerate descendants; but it is meant—

1st. His apostasy from God was complete. God demands perfect obedience; Adam was now a rebel in arms.

2nd. That the favor and communion of God, the sole condition of his spiritual life, was withdrawn.

3rd. A schism was introduced into the soul itself. The painful reproaches of conscience were excited, and could never be allayed without an atonement. This led to fear of God, distrust, prevarication, and, by necessary consequence, to innumerable other sins.

4th. Thus the whole nature became depraved. The will being at war with the conscience, the understanding became darkened; the conscience, in consequence of constant outrage and neglect, became seared; the appetites of the body inordinate, and its members instruments of unrighteousness.

5th. There remained in man's nature no recuperative principle; he must go on from worse to worse, unless God interpose.

Thus the soul of man being essentially active, although one sin did not establish a confirmed habit, it did alienate God and work confusion in the soul, and thus lead to an endless course of sin. THE CONSEQUENCES OF ADAM'S SIN TO HIS POSTERITY are—

1st. The judicial charging of the legal responsibility of that sin upon all at their creation whom he represented in the Covenant of Works.

2nd. The consequent birth of each of his descendants in a state of exclusion from the life–giving communion of the divine Spirit.

3rd. The consequent loss of original righteousness, and the inherent and prevailing tendency to sin which is the invariable moral condition of each of his descendants from birth.

4th. The absolute moral inability of men to change their natures or to fulfill their obligations. For reasons which will appear subsequently, the subjects connected with man's natural moral corruption and impotency, are discussed before the subject of Imputation, or the reason and method of the passing over of the consequences of Adam's sin from him to his descendants.

8 Dr. C. Hodge's Unpublished Lectures.

02.19. Original Sin (Peccatum Habituale)

Chapter 19 Original Sin.—(Peccatum Habituale.)

1. How is original sin to be defined?See “Confession of Faith,” Chapter 6.; “Larger Catechism,” Questions 25, 26; “Shorter Catechism,” Question 18. The phrase, original sin, is used sometimes to include the judicial imputation of the guilt of Adam’s sin, as well as the hereditary moral corruption, common to all his descendants, which is one of the consequences of that imputation. More strictly, however, the phrase original sin designates only the hereditary moral corruption common to all men from birth. In the definition of this doctrine WE DENY— That this corruption is in any sense physical, that it inheres in the essence of the soul, or in any of its natural faculties as such.

2nd. That it consists primarily in the mere supremacy of the sensual part of our nature. It is a depraved habit or bias of will.

3rd. That it consists solely in the absence of holy dispositions, because, from the inherent activity of the soul, sin exhibits itself from the beginning in the way of a positive proneness to evil. On the other hand, WE AFFIRM—

1st. That original sin is purely moral, being the innate proneness of the will to evil.

2nd. That having its seat in the will averse to the holy law of God, it biases the understanding, and thus deceives the conscience, leads to erroneous moral judgments, to blindness of mind, to deficient and perverted sensibility in relation to moral objects, to the inordinate action of the sensuous nature, and thus to corruption of the entire soul.

3rd. Thus it presents two aspects:

(l.) The loss of the original righteous habit of will.

(2.) The presence of a positively unrighteous habit.

4th. Yet from the fact that this innate depravity does embrace a positive disposition to evil, it does not follow that a positive evil quality has been infused into the soul. Because, from the essentially active nature of the soul, and from the essential nature of virtue, as that which obliges the will, it evidently follows that moral indifference is impossible; and so that depravity, which President Edwards says “comes from a defective or privative cause,” instantly assumes a positive form. Not to love God is to rebel against him, not to obey virtue is to trample it under foot. Self–love soon brings us to fear, then to hate the vindicator of righteousness.—Edwards on “Original Sin,” Part 4., sec. 2.

2. Why is this sin called original? Not because it belongs to the original constitution of our nature as it came forth from the hand of God, but because, 1st., it is derived by ordinary generation from Adam, the original root of the human race; and 2nd., it is the inward root or origin of all the actual sins that defile our lives. This sin is also technically styled Peccatum Habituale, or the sin which

consists in a morally corrupt habit or state of soul, in distinction from imputed sin and actual sin.

3. How may it be proved that the doctrine of original sin does not involve the corruption of the substance of the soul?

It is the universal judgment of men that there are in the soul, besides its essence and its natural faculties, certain habits, innate or acquired, which qualify the action of those faculties, and constitute the character of the man. Those habits, or inherent dispositions which determine the affections and desires of the will, govern a man's actions, and, when good, are the subjects of moral praise, and, when evil, the subjects of moral disapprobation on the part of all men. An innate moral habit of soul, e. g., original sin, is no more a physical corruption than any acquired habit, intellectual or moral, is a physical change.

Besides this, the Scriptures distinguish between the sin and the agent in a way which proves that the sinful habit is not something consubstantial with the sinner, Romans 7:17; "sin that dwelleth in me,"Hebrews 12:1, etc.

4. How can it be shown that original sin does not consist in disease, or merely in the supremacy of the sensuous part of our nature?

While it is true that many sins have their occasions in the inordinate appetites of the body, yet it is evident the original or root of sin cannot be in them—

1st. From the very nature of sin it must have its seat in the moral state of the voluntary principle. Disease, or any form of physical disorder, is not voluntary, and therefore not an element of moral responsibility. It is, moreover, the obligation of the will to regulate the lower sensuous nature, and sin must originate in the failure of those moral affections which would have been supreme if they still continued to reign in the will.

2nd. From the fact that the most heinous sins are destitute of any sensuous element, e. g., pride, anger, malice, and AVERSION FROM GOD.

5. How can it be proved that this innate disposition or habit of soul, which leads to sinful action, is itself sin?

1st. This innate habit of soul is a state of the will, and it is an ultimate principle that all the states as well as acts of the will related to the law of conscience are moral, i. e., either virtuous or vicious.—See above, Chapter 15., Questions 9 and 10.

2nd. These permanent habits or states of the will constitute the moral character of the agent, which all men regard as the proper subject of praise or blame.

3rd. This inherent disposition to sinful action is called "sin" in Scripture.—Romans 6:12; Romans 6:14; Romans 6:17; Romans 7:5-17. It is called "flesh" as opposed to "spiritual,"Galatians 5:17; Galatians 5:24; also "lust,"James 1:14-15; and "old Adam" and "body of sin,"Romans 6:6; also "ignorance,""blindness of heart,""alienation from the life of God," and a condition of "being past feeling,"Ephesians 4:18-19.

6. How can it be shown that original sin does not consist simply in the want of original righteousness?

1st. It follows from the inherent activity of the human soul, and from the inherently obliging power of moral right, that the absence of right dispositions immediately leads to the formation of positively sinful dispositions. Not to love God is to hate him, not to obey him is to disobey. Disobedience leads to fear, to falsehood, and to every form of sin.—See above, Question 1.

2nd. As a matter of fact, innate depravity exhibits its positive character by giving birth to sins, involving positive viciousness in the earliest stages of accountable agency, as pride, malice, etc.

3rd. The Scriptures assign it a positive character, when they apply to it such terms as “flesh,”“concupiscence,”“old man,”“law in the members,”“body of sin,”“body of death,”“sin taking occasion,”“deceived me,” and “wrought all manner of concupiscence.”—Romans 7:1-25.

7. How may it be shown that it affects the entire man?

Original sin has its seat in the will, and primarily consists in that proneness to unlawful dispositions and affections which is the innate habit of the human soul. But the several faculties of the human soul are not separate agents. The one soul acts in each function as an indivisible agent, its several faculties or powers after their kind mutually qualifying one another. When the soul is engaged in understanding an object, or an aspect of any object, e. g., mathematics, with which its affections are not concerned, then its action has no moral element. But when it is engaged in understanding an object with respect to which its depraved affections are perversely interested, its action must be biased. The consequence, therefore, of the sinful bias of the will, in its controlling influence over the exercises of the soul, in all its functions, will be—

1st. The understanding, biased by the perverted affections, acting concurrently with the moral sense in forming moral judgments, will lead to erroneous judgments, to a deceiving conscience, and to general “blindness of mind” as to moral subjects.

2nd. The emotions and sensibilities which accompany the judgments of conscience in approving the good and in condemning the wrong, by repeated outrage and neglect, will be rendered less lively, and thus lead to a seared conscience, and general moral insensibility.

3rd. In a continued course of sinful action the memory will become defiled with its stores of corrupt experiences, from which the imagination also must draw its materials.

4th. The body in its turn will be corrupted.

(1.) Its natural appetites will become inordinate in the absence of proper control.

(2.) Its active powers will be used as “instruments of unrighteousness unto sin.”

5th. The Scriptures teach—

(1.) That the understanding of the “natural man” is depraved as well as his affections.—1 Corinthians 2:14; 2 Corinthians 4:4; Ephesians 4:18; Colossians 1:21.

(2.) That regeneration involves illumination as well as renewal of the heart.—Acts 26:18; Ephesians 1:18; Ephesians 5:8; 1 Peter 2:9.

(3.) That truth addressed to the understanding is the great instrument of the Spirit in regeneration and sanctification.—John 17:17; James 1:18.

8. What is meant by the affirmation that man by nature is totally depraved? By this orthodox phrase IT IS NOT TO BE UNDERSTOOD,

1st. that the depraved man has not a conscience. The virtuousness of an agent does not consist in his, having a conscience, but in the conformity of the dispositions and affections of his will to the law of which conscience is the organ. Even the devils and lost souls retain their sense of right and wrong and those vindicatory emotions with which conscience is armed.

Or,

2nd., that unregenerate men, possessing a natural conscience, do not often admire virtuous character and actions in others.

Or, 3rd., that they are incapable of disinterested affections and actions in their various relations with their fellow men.

Or, 4th, that any man is as thoroughly depraved as it is possible for him to become, or that each man has a disposition inclined to every form of sin. But IT IS MEANT—

1st. That virtue consisting in the conformity of the dispositions of the will, with the law of God, and the very soul of virtue consisting in the allegiance of the soul to God, every man by nature is totally alienated in his governing disposition from God, and consequently his every act, whether morally indifferent, or conformed to subordinate principles of right, is vitiated by the condition of the agent as a rebel.

2nd. That this state of will, leads to a schism in the soul, and to the moral perversion of all the faculties of soul and body (see preceding question).

3rd. The tendency of this condition is to further corruption in endless progression in every department of our nature, and this deterioration would, in every case, be incalculably more rapid than it is, if it were not for the supernatural restraints of the Holy Ghost.

4th. There remains no recuperative element in the soul. Man can only and forever become worse, without a miraculous recreation.

9. What proof of the doctrine of original sin may be derived from the history of the Fall?

God created man in his own image, and pronounced him as a moral agent to be very good. He threatened him with death in the very day that he should eat the forbidden fruit, and only in the sense of spiritual death was that threat literally fulfilled. The spiritual life of man depends upon communion with God; but God drove him at once forth in anger from his presence. Consequently the present spiritual state of man is declared to be “death,” the very penalty threatened.—Ephesians 2:1; 1 John 3:14.

10. What is the account which the Scriptures give of human nature, and how can the existence of an innate hereditary depravity be thence inferred? The Scriptures represent all men as totally alienated from God, and morally depraved in their understandings, hearts, wills, consciences, bodies, and actions.—Romans 3:10-23; Romans 8:7; Job 14:4; Job 15:14; Genesis 6:5; Genesis 8:21; Matthew 15:19; Jeremiah 7:9; Is. 1:5,6. This depravity of man is declared to be, 1st., of the act, 2nd., of the heart,

3rd., from birth and by nature, 4th, of all men without exception.—Psalms 51:5; John 3:6; Ephesians 2:3; Psalms 58:3.

11. State the evidence for the truth of this doctrine afforded by Romans 5:12-21.

Paul here proves that the guilt—legal obligation to suffer the penalty—of Adam's sin is imputed to us, by the unquestionable fact that the penalty of the law which Adam broke has been inflicted upon all. But that penalty was all penal evil, death physical, spiritual, eternal. Original sin, therefore, together with natural death, is in this passage assumed as an undeniable fact, upon which the apostle constructs his argument for the imputation of Adam's sin.

12. How is the truth of this doctrine established by the fact of the general prevalence of sin?

All men, under all circumstances, in every age of the world, and under whatever educational influences they may be brought up, begin to sin uniformly as soon as they enter upon moral agency. A universal effect must have a universal cause. Just as we judge that a man is by nature an intelligence, because the actions of all men involve an element of intelligence, so we as certainly judge that man is by nature depraved, because all men act sinfully.

13. If Adam sinned, though free from any corruption of nature, how does the fact that his posterity sin prove that their nature is corrupt? The fact that Adam sinned proves that a moral agent may be at once sinless and fallible, and that such a being, left to himself, may sin, but with respect to his posterity the question is, what is the universal and uniform cause that every individual always certainly begins to sin as soon as he begins to act as a moral agent? The question in the one case is, How could such an one sin? but in the other, Why do all certainly sin from the beginning?

14. By what other objections do Pelagians and others attempt to avoid the force of the argument from the universality of sin?

1st. Those who maintain that the liberty of indifference its essential to responsible agency, and that volitions are not determined by the precedent moral state of the mind, attribute all sinful actions to the fact that the will of man is unconditioned, and insist that his acting as he acts is an ultimate fact. In answer, we acknowledge that a man always wills as he pleases, but the question is, Why he always certainly please to will wrong? An indifferent cause cannot account of a uniform fact. The doctrine of original sin merely assigns the depraved character of the will itself as the uniform cause of the uniform fact.

2nd. Others attempt to explain the facts by the universal influence of sinful example.

We answer:

(1.) Children uniformly manifest depraved dispositions at too early a period to admit of that sin being rationally attributed to the influence of example.

(2.) Children manifest depraved dispositions who have been brought up from birth in contact with such influences only as would incline them to holiness.

3rd. Others, again, attempt to explain the facts by referring to the natural order in the development of our faculties, e. g., first the animal, then the intellectual, then the moral:thus the lower, by anticipating, subverts the higher. For answer, see above, Question 4. Besides, while this is an

imperfect explanation, it is yet a virtual admission of the fact of innate hereditary depravity. Such an order of development, leading to such uniform consequences, is itself a total corruption of nature.

15. What argument for the doctrine of original sin may be derived from the universality of death? The penalty of the law was death, including death spiritual physical, and moral. Physical death is universal; eternal death, temporarily suspended for Christ's sake, is denounced upon all the impenitent. As one part of the penalty has taken effect, even upon infants, who have never been guilty of actual transgression, we must believe the other part to have taken effect likewise. Brutes, who also suffer and die, are not moral agents, nor were they ever embraced in a covenant of life, and therefore their case, although it has its own peculiar difficulties, is not analogous to that of man. Geology affirms that brutes suffered and died in successive generations before the creation and apostasy of man. This is at present one of the unsolved questions of God's providence.—See Hugh Miller's "Testimonies of the Rocks."

16. How may it be proved by what the Scriptures say concerning regeneration? The Scriptures declare—

1st. That regeneration is a radical change of the moral character, wrought by the Holy Ghost in the exercise of supernatural power. It is called "a new creation;" the regenerated are called "God's workmanship, created unto good works," etc. Ezekiel 36:26; Ephesians 1:19; Ephesians 2:5; Ephesians 2:10; Ephesians 4:24; 1 Peter 1:23; James 1:18.

2nd. Regeneration is declared to be necessary absolutely and universally.—John 3:3; 2 Corinthians 5:17.

17. How may it be proved from what the Scriptures say of redemption? The Scriptures assert of redemption—

1st. As to its nature, that the design and effect of Christ's sacrifice is to deliver, by means of an atonement, all his people from the power as well as from the guilt of sin.—Ephesians 5:25-27; Titus 2:14; Hebrews 9:12-14; Hebrews 13:12.

2nd. As to its necessity, that it was absolutely necessary for all—for infants who never have committed actual sin, as well as for adults.—Acts 4:12; Romans 3:25-26; Galatians 2:21; Galatians 3:21-22; Matthew 19:14; Revelation 1:5; Revelation 5:9.

Some have essayed to answer, that Christ only redeemed infants from the "liability to sin." But redemption being an atonement by blood, the "just for the unjust," if infants be not sinners they cannot be redeemed. A sinless liability to sin is only a misfortune, and can admit of no redemption.

18. State the evidence afforded by infant baptism.

Baptism, as circumcision, is an outward rite, signifying the inward grace of spiritual regeneration and purification.—Mark 1:4; John 3:5; Titus 3:5; Deuteronomy 10:16; Romans 2:28-29. Both of these rites were designed to be applied to infants. The application of the sign would be both senseless and profane if infants did not need, and were not capable of the thing signified.

19. If God is the author of our nature, and our nature is sinful, how can we avoid the conclusion that God is the author of sin? That conclusion would be unavoidable if, 1st., sin was an essential element of our nature, or if;

2nd., it inhered in that nature originally, as it came from God. But we know, 1st., that sin originated in the free act of man, created holy, yet fallible;

2nd., that entire corruption of nature sprang from that sin; and,

3rd., that in consequence of sin God has justly withdrawn the conservative influences of his Holy Spirit, and left men to the natural and penal consequences of their sin.—See Calvin's "Institutes," Lib. 2., Chap. 1., secs. 6 and 11.

20. How can this doctrine be reconciled with the liberty of man and his responsibility of his acts?

1st. Consciousness affirms that a man is always responsible for his free actions, and that his act is always free when he wills as, upon the whole, he prefers to will.

2nd. Original sin consists in corrupt dispositions, and, therefore, in every sin a man acts freely, because he acts precisely as he is disposed to act.

3rd. Consciousness affirms that inability is not inconsistent with responsibility. The inherent habit or disposition of the will determines his action, but no man, by a mere choice or volition, can change his disposition.—See Chap. 18., Questions 4 and 25.

21. How is this corruption of nature propagated?

See below, under Chapter 21.

22. In what sense may sin be the punishment of sin?

1st. In the way of natural consequence (1) in the interior working of the soul itself; in the derangement of its powers; (2) in the entangled relations of the sinner with God and his fellowmen.

2nd. In the way of judicial abandonment Because of sin God withdraws his Holy Spirit, and further sin is the consequence.—Romans 1:24-28.

23. What do the Scriptures teach concerning the sin against the Holy Ghost?

See Matthew 12:31-32; Mark 3:29-30; Hebrews 6:4-6; Hebrews 10:26-27; 1 John 5:16.

These passages appear to teach that this sin consists in the malicious rejection of the blood of Christ, and of the testimony of the Holy Ghost against evidence and conviction. It is called the sin against the Holy Ghost because he is immediately present in the heart of the sinner, and his testimony and influence is directly rejected and contemptuously resisted. It is unpardonable, not because its guilt transcends the merit of Christ, or the state of the sinner transcends the renewing power of the Holy Ghost, but because it consists in the final rejection of these, and because at this limit God has sovereignly staid his grace.

24. What are the main positions involved in the Pelagian doctrine of original sin? The system called Pelagian originated with Pelagius in his controversies with St. Augustine in the beginning of the fifth century, and was afterwards completely developed by the disciples of Faustus and Laelius

Socinus in the sixteenth century, is embodied in the Racovian Catechism, and prevails among the English and American Unitarians of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

It embraces the following points:

1st. Adam's sin affected himself alone.

2nd. Infants are born in the same moral state in which Adam was created.

3rd. Every man possesses ability to sin or to repent and obey whenever he will.

4th. Responsibility is in exact proportion to ability; and God's demands are adjusted to the various capacities (moral as well as constitutional) and circumstances of men.

25. What are the main positions involved in the Semipelagian doctrine?

According to the critical estimate of Wiggers in his "Hist. Present. of Augustinianism and Pelagianism," Pelagianism regards man as morally and spiritually well. Semipelagianism regards him as sick. Augustinianism regards him as dead. The current positions of Semipelagianism during the middle ages were—

1st. Denial of the imputation of the guilt of Adam's sin.

2nd. Acknowledgment of a morbid condition of man's moral nature from birth by inheritance from Adam.

3rd. Which morbid condition is not itself sin but the certain cause of sin.

4th. It involves the moral powers of the soul to such an extent that no man can fulfill the requirements either of the law or of the gospel without divine assistance. Man, however, has the power to begin to act aright, when God seeing his effort, and knowing that otherwise it would be fruitless, gives him the gracious help he needs. The doctrine of the Arminians, and the "Synergism" of Melanchthon amount practically to very much the same thing with the statements just made. The main difference is that the Semipelagians held that man can and must begin the work of repentance and obedience when God instantly cooperates with him. While the Arminians and Synergists held that man is so far depraved that he needs grace to dispose and enable him to begin as well as to continue and to succeed in the work, but that all men as a matter of fact have the same common grace acting upon them, which grace effects nothing until the man voluntarily cooperates with it, when it becomes efficacious through that cooperation. The Greek Church, which occupies the same general position as to original sin and grace, holds—

1st. Original sin is not voluntary and therefore not true sin.

2nd. The influence of Adam extends only to the sensuous, and not to the rational nor moral nature of his descendants, and hence it extends to their will only through the sensuous nature.

3rd. Infants are guiltless because they possess only a physical propagated nature.

4th. The human will takes the initiative in regeneration but needs divine assistance. This is Semipelagianism. While the corresponding Arminian position is that grace takes the initiative in regeneration but depends for its effect upon human cooperation.

26. What is the New Haven view on this subject?

Dr. Nathaniel W. Taylor, of New Haven, the prince of American new school theology, taught that sin consists solely in acts of the will; that “original sin is man’s own act, consisting in a free choice of some object rather than God as his chief good.” He includes in this definition the permanent governing preference of the will, which determines special and transient acts of choice; which preference is formed by each human being as soon as he becomes a moral agent, and is uniformly a preference of some lesser good in place of God. He maintains also that the nature of man, in the condition in which it comes into being, in consequence of Adam’s fall, is the occasion, not the cause, of all men invariably making a wrong moral preference, and consequently original sin is by nature in the sense that the will enacts it freely though uniformly as occasioned by nature, yet that the nature itself; or its inherent tendency to occasion sin, is not itself sin, or illdeserving.—See “Concio ad Clerum,” New Haven, 1828, and Harvey’s Review thereof 27. What is the Romish doctrine as to the change effected In the moral nature of man by the fall?

See below the public statements of the various churches.

28. What distinction do the Romanists make between mortal and venial sins? By mortal sins they mean those that turn away the soul from God, and forfeit baptismal grace. By venial sins they mean those which only impede the course of the soul to God. See below Bellarmin, quoted under “Authoritative Statement of Church Doctrine,” etc. The objections are—

1st. This distinction is never made in the Scriptures.

2nd. Except for the sacrifice of Christ, every sin is mortal.—James 2:10; Galatians 3:10. THE AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS OF CHURCH DOCTRINE.

ROMISH DOCTRINE.—“Council of Trent,” Sess. 5. Song of Solomon 2:1-17.—“If any one shall assert that the apostasy of Adam injured himself alone and not his posterity; and that he lost the sanctity and righteousness received from God, for himself alone and not also for us, his posterity, or that the stain which results from the sin of disobedience, death, and physical evils only have overflowed over the whole human race, and not also sin which is the disease of the soul—anathema sit.”Ib., Sess. and Cap. 1. “The Holy Synod declares that in order properly to understand the doctrine of justification it is necessary that every one should acknowledge and confess that since all men lost their innocence in the apostasy of Adam, so that . . . . they are servants of sin, under the power of the devil and of death . . . nevertheless in them free will is by no means extinct although it is weakened as to its strength and biased.”Ib., Sess. 6., Song of Solomon 5:1-16.—“If any one shall say that the free will of man has been lost and extinguished in consequence of the sin of Adam. . . . anathema sit.” Song of Solomon 7:1-13.—“If any one shall say that all works performed by a man anterior to justification (regeneration), from whatever reason performed, are true sins which merit the hatred of God, or that the more vehemently one may strive to dispose himself to grace, only the more grievously he sins— anathema sit.”

Bellarmin, “Amiss. Gratia,” 3. 1.—“The penalty which properly stands over against the first sin, is the loss of original righteousness and of the supernatural gifts with which God had furnished our nature. ”De Gratia primi hom., 1.—“They (the Catholics) teach that, through the sin of Adam the whole man was truly deteriorated, but that he has not lost free will nor any other of the dona naturalia, but only the dona supernaturalia.” Ib., e. 5.—“Wherefore the state of man since the fall of

Adam does not differ more from his state in purls naturalibus (i. e., as created and antecedent to his endowment with the dona supernaturalia, see Statement of Romish Doctrine end of Ch. 16.) than a man robbed of his clothes differs from one originally naked, neither is human nature any worse (if you subtract original guilt) nor does it labor under greater ignorance and infirmity, than it was and did as created in puris natural ibus. Whence it follows that corruption of nature does not result from the loss of any gift, nor from the accession of any evil quality, but only from the loss of the supernatural gift because of the sin of Adam. ”

“Amiss. Gra.,” 5. 5.—“The question between us and our adversaries is not whether human nature has been grievously depraved through the sin of Adam. For that we freely confess. Neither is the question whether this depravity pertains in any manner to original sin, so that it may be spoken of as the material of that sin. But the whole controversy is whether that corruption of nature and especially concupiscence per se and of its own nature, as it is found in the baptized and justified, is properly original sin. This the Catholics deny.”

LUTHERAN DOCTRINE.—“Formula Concordioe,” p. 640.—“(It is to be believed)—

1st. That this hereditary evil is fault or guilt (ill–desert) by which on account of the disobedience of Adam and Eve, we all are made subject to the wrath of God, and are by nature children of wrath as the Apostle testified (Romans 5:12 ff, Ephesians 2:3).

2nd. That there is through all a total want, defect, and privation of that original righteousness concreated in Paradise, or of that image of God in which man in the beginning was created in truth, holiness, and righteousness; and there is at the same time that impotency and incapacity, that weakness and stupidity, by which man is rendered utterly incapable of all things divine or spiritual. . . .

3rd. Moreover that original sin in human nature does not only involve the total loss and absence of all good in matters spiritual and pertaining to God; but that also in the place of the lost likeness to God there is in man an inward, most evil, profound (like an abyss), inscrutable, and ineffable corruption of the whole nature and of all the powers, and primarily in the principle and superior faculties of the soul, in the mind, intellect, heart, and will.”

Ib., p. 645.—“But although this original sin infects and corrupts the whole nature of man, as a kind of spiritual poison and leprosy (as Dr. Luther says), so that now in our corrupted nature it is not possible to show to the eye these two apart, the nature alone, or the original sin alone; nevertheless that corrupt nature, or substance of the corrupt man, the body and soul, or the man himself as created by God in whom the original sin dwells, is not one and the same with that original sin which dwells in the nature or essence of man and corrupts it, just as in the body of a leper, the leprous body and the leprosy itself which is in the body, are not one and the same.”

REFORMED DOCTRINE.—“Belgic Confession,” Art. 15.—“(Peccatum originis) is that corruption of the whole nature and that hereditary vice, by which even themselves in their mothers’ wombs are polluted, and which, as a root, produces every kind of sin in man, and is therefore so base and execrable in the sight of God, that it suffices to the condemnation of the human race.”

“Gallic Confession,” Art. 11.—“We believe that this vice (originis) is true sin, which makes all and every man, not even excepting little infants, hitherto hiding in the womb of their mothers, deserving

(reos) before God, of eternal death. ”

“Thirty–Nine Articles of Ch. of Eng.,” Art. 9.—“(Original or birth sin) is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God’s wrath and damnation.”

REMONSTRANT DOCTRINE.—“Apol. Confession Remonstrant., p. 84.—”They (the Remonstrants) do not regard original sin as sin properly so called, nor as an evil which as a penalty, in the strict sense of that word, passes over from Adam upon his posterity, but as an evil, infirmity, or vice, or whatever name it may be designated by, which is propagated from Adam, deprived of original righteousness, to his posterity.

Limborch“Theol. Christ.,” 3. 3, 4.—“We confess also that infants are born less pure than Adam was created, and with & certain propensity to sinning, but this they receive not so much from Adam, as from their immediate parents, since if it were from Adam, it ought to be equal in all men. But now it is in the highest degree unequal, and ordinarily children are inclined to the sins of their parents.”

SOCINIAN DOCTRINE.—“Racovian Catechism,” p. 294.—“And the fall of Adam, since it was one act, could not have had the power of corrupting the nature of Adam himself, much less that of his posterity. We do not deny, however, that from the constant habit of sinning, the nature of man has become infected with a certain fall and excessive proclivity to sinning. But we deny that this is per se sin, or of that nature.”

02.20. Inability.

Chapter 20

Inability.

1. State the three main elements involved in the consequences entailed by the sin of Adam upon his posterity.

These are—

1st. The guilt, or just penal responsibility of Adam's first sin or apostatizing act, which is imputed or judicially charged upon his descendants, whereby every child is born into the world in a state of antenatal forfeiture or condemnation.

2nd. The entire depravity of our nature, involving a sinful innate disposition inevitably leading to actual transgression.

3rd. The entire inability of the soul to change its own nature, or to do anything spiritually good in obedience to the divine law.

2. What three great types of doctrine on the subject of human ability to fulfill the law of God have always coexisted in the church?

1st. Pelagian.—(a.) Moral character can be predicated only of volitions. (b.) Ability is always the measure of responsibility. (c.) Hence every man has always plenary power to do all that it is his duty to do. (d.) Hence the human will alone, to the exclusion of the interference of any internal influence from God, must decide human character and destiny. The only divine influence needed by man or consistent with his character as a self–determined agent is an external, providential, and educational one.

2nd. Semipelagian.—(a.) Man's nature has been so far weakened by the fall that it cannot act aright in spiritual matters without divine assistance. (b.) This weakened moral state which infants inherit from their parents is the cause of sin, but not itself sin in the sense of deserving the wrath of God. (c.) Man must strive to do his whole duty, when God meets him with cooperative grace, and renders his efforts successful. (d.) Man is not responsible for the sins he commits until after he has enjoyed and abused the influences of grace.

3rd. Augustinian.—Which was adopted by all the original Protestant Churches, Lutheran and Reformed. (a.) Man is by nature so entirely depraved in his moral nature as to be totally unable to do anything spiritually good, or in any degree to begin or to dispose himself thereto. (b.) That even under the exciting and suasory influences of divine grace the will of man is totally unable to act aright in cooperation with grace, until after the will itself is by the energy of grace radically and permanently renewed. (c.) Even after the renewal of the will it ever continues dependent upon divine grace, to prompt, direct, and enable it in the performance of every good work.

3. How does theusus loquendi of the words “Liberty” and “Ability” in this connection, among the early differ from that of the later Protestant writers? The early writers often use the term “liberty ”in the sense in which we now use the term “ability,” and deny that man since the fall possesses any “liberty ”of will with respect to divine things.

While modern theologians hold precisely the same doctrine entertained by these early writers they now think it more judicious to distinguish between the two terms in their constant use. By “liberty” is meant the inalienable property of a free agent, good or bad, to exercise volitions as he pleases; that is, according to the prevailing dispositions and tendencies of his soul. By “ability,” on the other hand, is meant the power of a depraved human soul, naturally indisposed to spiritual good, to change its governing tendencies or dispositions by means of any volition, however strenuous, or to obey the requirements of the law in the absence of all holy dispositions. The permanent affections of the soul govern the volitions, but the volitions cannot alter the affections. And when we say that no man since the fall has any ability to render that spiritual obedience which the law demands, we mean (a) that the radical moral dispositions of every man is opposed to that obedience, and (b) man has absolutely no ability to change them or (c) to exercise volitions contrary to them.

4. State the orthodox doctrine both negatively and positively. The orthodox doctrine does not teach—

1st. That man by the fall has lost any of his constitutional faculties necessary to constitute him a responsible moral agent. These are (a) reason, (b) conscience, (c) free will. Man possesses all of these in exercise. He has power to know the truth; he recognizes and feels moral distinctions and obligations; his affections and tendencies and habits of action are spontaneous; in all his volitions he chooses and refuses freely as he pleases. Therefore he is responsible. Nor,

2nd., that man has not power to feel and to do many things which are good and amiable, benevolent and just, in the relations he sustains to his fellow–men. This is often admitted in the Protestant confessions and Theological Classics, where it is conceded that man since the fall has a capacity for humana justicia(man’s justice), and “civil good,” etc. But the Orthodox doctrine does teach—

1st. That the inability of man since the fall concerns things which involve our relation as spiritual beings to God—the apprehension and love of spiritual excellence and action in conformity therewith. These matters are designated in the Confessions “things of God,”“things of the Spirit,”“things which pertain to salvation.”

2nd. That man since the fall is utterly unable to know, or to feel, or to act in correspondence with these things. A natural man may be intellectually illuminated but he is spiritually blind. He may possess natural affections, but his heart is dead toward God, and invincibly averse to his person and law. He may obey the letter, but he cannot obey in spirit and in truth.

5. In what sense is this inability absolute, and in what sense natural, and in what sense moral?

1st. It is absolute in the proper sense of that term. No unregenerate man has power either directly or indirectly to do what is required of him in this respect; nor to change his own nature so as to increase his power; nor to prepare himself for grace, nor in the first instance to cooperate with grace, until in the act of regeneration God changes his nature and gives him through grace

gracious ability to act graciously in constant dependence upon grace.

2nd. It is natural in the sense that it is not accidental or adventitious but innate, and that it belongs to our fallen nature as propagated by natural law from parent to child since the fall.

3rd. It is not natural in one sense, because it does not belong to the nature of man as created. Man was created with plenary ability to do all that was in any way required of him, and the possession of such ability is always requisite to the moral perfection of his nature. He may he a real man without it, but can be a perfect man only with it. The ability graciously bestowed upon man in regeneration is not an endowment extra–natural, but consists in the restoration of his nature, in part, to its condition of primitive integrity.

4th. It is not natural in another sense, because it does not result in the least from any constitutional deficiency in human nature as it now exists as to its rational and moral faculties of soul.

5th. This inability is purely moral, because while every responsible man possesses all moral as well as intellectual faculties requisite for right action, the moral state of his faculties is such that right action is impossible. Its essence is in the inability of the soul to know, love, or choose spiritual good, and its ground exists in that moral corruption of soul whereby it is blind, insensible, and totally averse to all that is spiritually good.

6. What is the history and value of the famous distinction between natural and moral ability?

President Edwards in his great work “On the Will,” Pt. 1., Sec. 4, adopts the same terms, affirming that men since the fall have natural ability to do all that is required of them, but are destitute of moral ability to do so. By natural ability he meant the possession by every responsible free agent, as the condition of his responsibility, of all the constitutional faculties necessary to enable him to obey God’s law. By moral ability he meant that inherent moral state of those faculties, that righteous disposition of heart, requisite to the performance of those duties. As thus stated, and as President Edwards held and used it, there is no question as to the validity and importance of this distinction. The same principle is explicitly recognized in the statement of the orthodox doctrine given above, Questions 4 and 5. Nevertheless we seriously object to the phraseology used, for the following reasons:

1st. This phraseology has no warrant in the analogy of the Scriptures. They never say that man has one kind of ability but has not another. They everywhere consistently teach that man is not able to do what is required of him. They never teach that he is able in any sense.

2nd. It has never been adopted in the Creed Statements of any one of the Reformed Churches.

3rd. It is essentially ambiguous. It has been often used to express, sometimes to cover, Semipelagian error. It is naturally misleading and confusing when addressed to the struggling sinner. his language assures him that he is able in a certain sense, when it is only true that he possesses some of the essential prerequisites of ability. Ability begins only after all its essential conditions are present. To say that a dead bird has muscular ability to fly, and only lacks vital ability, is trifling with words. The truth is, the sinner is absolutely unable because of a moral deficiency. It is right enough to say that his inability is purely and simply moral. But it is simply untrue and misleading to tell him he has natural ability, when the fact is precisely that he is unable. The work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration is not a mere moral suasion but a new moral creation.

4th. Natural is not the proper antithesis of moral. A thing may be at the same time natural and moral. This inability of man as shown above, is certainly wholly moral, and it is yet in an important sense natural, i. e., incident to his nature in its present state as naturally propagated.

5th. The language does not accurately express the important distinction intended. The inability is moral and is not either physical or constitutional. It has its ground not in the want of any faculty, but in the corrupt moral state of the faculties, in the inveterate disinclination of the affections. and dispositions of the voluntary nature.

7. Prove the fact of this inability from Scripture.

Jeremiah 13:23; John 6:44; John 6:65; John 15:5; Romans 9:16; 1 Corinthians 2:14.

8. Prove the same from what Scriptures teach of the moral condition of man by nature.

It is a state of spiritual blindness and darkness, Ephesians 4:18, of spiritual death.—Colossians 2:13. The unregenerate are the “servants of sin.”—Romans 6:20. They are “without strength.”—Romans 5:6. Men are said to be subjects of Satan and led about by him at his will.—2 Timothy 2:26. The only way to change the character of our actions is declared to be to change the character of our hearts.—Matthew 12:33-35.

9. Prove the same from what the Scriptures teach as to the nature and necessity of regeneration. As to its nature it is taught that regeneration is a “new birth,” a “new creation,” a “begetting anew,” a “giving a new heart”—the subjects of it are “new creatures,”“God’s workmanship,” etc. It is accomplished by the “exceeding greatness of the mighty power of God.”—Ephesians 1:18-20. All Christian graces, as love, Joy, faith, peace, etc., are declared to be “fruits of the Spirit.”—Galatians 5:22-23. God “worketh in you to will and to do of his good pleasure.”—Php 2:13. As to its necessity this radical change of the governing states and proclivities of the will itself is declared to be absolutely necessary in the case of every child of Adam, without exception, in order to salvation.

It is plain, therefore, that man must be absolutely spiritually impotent antecedent to this change wrought in him by divine power, and that all ability he may ever have even to cooperate with the grace that saves him, must be consequent upon that change.

10. Prove the same from experience.

1st. From the experience of every convinced sinner. All genuine conviction of sin embraces these two elements:(a.) A thorough conviction of responsibility and guilt, justifying God and prostrating self before him in confession and absolute self emptying. (b.) A thorough conviction of our own moral impotence and dependence as much upon divine grace to enable us, as upon Christ’s merits to justify us. A sinner must in both senses, i. e., as to guilt and as to helplessness, be brought into a state of utter self–despair, or he cannot be brought to Christ.

2nd. From the experience of every true Christian. His most intimate conviction is (a.) that he was absolutely helpless and that he was saved by a divine intervention, ab extra. (b.) That his present degree of spiritual strength is sustained solely by the constant communications of the Holy Ghost, and that he lives spiritually only as he clings close to Christ.

3rd. From the universal experience of the human family. We argue that man is absolutely destitute of spiritual ability, because there has never been discovered a single example of a mere man who has exercised it since the foundation of the earth.

11. State and refute the objection brought against our doctrine on the alleged ground that “ability is the measure of responsibility.” The maxim that “ability is the measure of responsibility” is undoubtedly true under some conditions and false under others. The mistake which utterly vitiates the above cited objection to the Scriptural doctrine of inability, consists in a failure to discriminate between the conditions under which the maxim is true, and the conditions under which it is false.

It is a self–evident truth, and one not denied by any party, that an inability which consists either (a) in the absence of the faculties absolutely necessary for the performance of a duty, or (b) in the absence of an opportunity to use them, is entirely inconsistent with moral responsibility in the case. If a man has not eyes, or if having them he is unavoidably destitute of light, he cannot be morally bound to see. So, likewise, if a man is destitute of intellect, or of natural conscience, or of any of the constitutional faculties essential to moral agency, he cannot be responsible for acting as a moral agent. And it is further evident that this irresponsibility arises solely from the bare fact of the inability. It matters not at all in this respect whether the inability be self–induced or not, if only it be a real incapacity. A man, for instance, who has put out his own eyes in order to avoid the draft, may be justly held responsible for that act, but he can never more be held responsible for seeing, i. e., for using eyes that he does not possess. On the other hand it is no less evident that when the inability consists solely in the want of the proper dispositions and affections, instead of being inconsistent with responsibility it is the very ground and reason of just condemnation. Nothing is more certain nor more universally confessed, than that the affections and dispositions are (1.) not under the control of the will. They can no more be changed than our stature by a mere volition.

(2.) Yet we are responsible for them.

Those who maintain that responsibility is necessarily limited by ability must consequently hold either (1) that every man, however degraded, is able by a volition at once to conform himself to the highest standard of virtue, which is absurd; or (2) that the standard of moral obligation is lowered more and more in proportion as a man sins, and by sin loses the capacity for obedience, i. e., that moral obligation decreases as guilt increases, or in other words that God’s rights decrease as our rebellion against him increases. Which is also absurd, for the principle obviously vacates law altogether, making both its precept and penalty void, since the sinner carries the law down with himself:It takes the law out of God’s hands, and puts it in the hands of the sinner, who always determines the extent of its requirements by the extent of his own apostasy.

12. Prove that men are responsible for their affections.9

1st. The whole volume of Scripture testifies to the fact that God requires men to possess right affections. and that he judges and treats men according to their affections. Christ declares (Matthew 22:37-40) that the whole moral law. is summarily comprehended in these two commandments, to Love God with the whole heart, and our neighbor as ourselves. “On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.” But “love ”is an affection not a volition, nor is it under the immediate control of the volitions.

2nd. It is the instinctive judgment of all men that moral dispositions and affections are intrinsically either good or evil, and worthy in every case according to their character, and irrespective of their origin of praise or blame. Some affections indeed are in themselves morally indifferent and become right or wrong only when adopted by the will as a principle of action in preference to other competing principles, e. g., the affection of self–love. But there are other affections which are intrinsically good, like love to God and disinterested benevolence towards our fellow–creatures, and others which are intrinsically evil, like malice or distrust of God, without any consideration of their origin.—Romans 7:14-23. Every volition derives all its moral quality from the quality of the affection that prompts it; while, on the other hand, the moral quality of the affection is original, and independent, and absolute.

3rd. The Scriptures and universal Christian experience teach that the common condition of man is one at once morally impotent and responsible. Hence the two cannot be inconsistent.

13. How can man's inability be reconciled with the commands, promises, and threatenings of God?

God righteously deals with the sinner according to the measure of his responsibility, and not according to the measure of his sinful inability. It would have been a compromise altogether unworthy of God to have lowered his demands in proportion to man's sin. Besides, under the gospel dispensation God makes use of his commands, promises, and threatenings, as gracious means, under the influence of his Spirit, to enlighten the minds, quicken the consciences, and to sanctify the hearts of men.

14. How can man's inability be shown to be consistent with the rational use of means? The efficiency of all means lies in the power of God, and not in the ability of man. God has established a connection between certain means and the ends desired; he has commanded us to use them, and has promised to bless them; and human experience has proved God's faithfulness to his engagements, and the instrumental connection between the means and the end.

15. Show that the legitimate practical effect of this doctrine is not to lead sinners to procrastinate.

It obviously and rightly tends to extinguish the false hopes of every sinner, and to paralyze their efforts to extricate themselves in the exercise of their own strength, or in reliance upon their own resources. But both reason and experience assure us that the natural and actual effect of this great truth is—

1st. To humble the soul and fill it with self–despair.

2nd. To shut it up to immediate and unreserved reliance upon the sovereign grace of God in Christ, the only ground of possible hope remaining.

3rd. Subsequent to conversion this truth leads the soul of the Christian to habitual self–distrust, diligence, and watchfulness, and to habitual confidence in and gratitude towards God. THE AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS OF THE VARIOUS CHURCHES.

ROMISH DOCTRINE.—"Council of Trent,"Sess. 6, Song of Solomon 7:1-13.—"If any one shall say, that all the works performed before justification, on whatsoever principle they are done, are truly sins, and merit the wrath of God. . . . anathema sit." See further under the heads of "Original

Sin” and “Effectual Calling.”

LUTHERAN DOCTRINE.—“Aug. Confession, p. 15.”—“Human will possesses a certain ability (libertatem) for effecting civil righteousness, and for choosing things apparent to the senses. But, without the Holy Spirit, it has not the power of effecting the righteousness of God, or spiritual righteousness, because the animal man does not perceive those things which are of the Spirit of God.”

“Formula Concordioe,” p. 579.—“Therefore we believe that as much as the power is wanting to a corpse to revive itself and restore to itself corporeal life, by so much is all and every faculty wanting to a man who by reason of sin is spiritually dead, of recalling himself to spiritual life.”Ib., p. 656.—“We believe that the intellect, heart, and will of an unrenewed man are altogether unable, in spiritual and divine things, and of their own proper natural vigor, to understand, to believe, to embrace, to think, to will, to commence, to perfect, to transact, to operate, or to cooperate anything. ”

REFORMED DOCTRINE.—“Thirty–Nine Articles of the Church of England,” Art. 10.—“The condition of man after the fall of Adam, is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God:wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good–will, and working with us when we have that good–will.”

“Confession Helvetica Posterior.”—“In the unrenewed man there is no free will for good, and no strength for performing that which is good. No one denies that in external things the renewed and the unrenewed alike have free–will; for man has this constitution in common with the other animals, that some things he wills, and some things he wills not. . . . We condemn on this subject the Manicheans, who deny that evil originated in the exercise of a free–will by a good man. We also condemn the Pelagians, who say that even the bad man possesses sufficient free–will for performing the good commanded.”

“Formula Consensus Helvetica,” Can. 22.—“We hold therefore that they speak with too little accuracy and not without danger, who call this inability to believe moral inability, and do not hold it to be natural, adding that man in whatever condition he may be placed is able to believe if he will, and that faith in some way or other, indeed, is self–originated; and yet the Apostle most distinctly calls it the gift of God ”(Ephesians 2:8).

“Articles of Synod of Dort,” Chap. 3. Art. 3.—“All men are conceived in sin, and born children of wrath, indisposed to all saving good, prepense to evil, dead in sins and the slaves of sin, and without the grace of the regenerating Holy Spirit they are neither willing nor able to return to God, to correct their depraved nature, or to dispose themselves to the correction of it.”

“Confession of Faith,” Chap. 9. § 3. – “Man, by his fall and state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good, and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself or to prepare himself thereunto.”

REMONSTRANT DOCTRINE.—Limborch,“Theol. Christ.,” Lib. 4, ch. 14. § 21.—“The grace of God is the primary cause of faith, without which a man is not able rightly to use his free–will. . . .

Therefore free will cooperates with grace, otherwise the obedience or the disobedience of man would have no place. Grace is not the sole cause, although it is the primary cause of salvation, . . . for the cooperation itself of the free–will with grace is of grace as a primary cause:for unless the free–will had been excited by prevenient grace it would not have been able to cooperate with grace. ”

SOCINIAN DOCTRINE—“Racovian Catechism,” Ques. 422.—“Is not free–will placed in our power so that we may obey God? Surely, because it is certain that the first man was so constituted by God that he was endowed with free–will. Nor truly has any cause supervened why God should have deprived man of that free–will subsequently to his fall.”

9 Dr. Charles Hodge’s “Lectures.”

Chapter 21 - Imputation of Adams First Sin.

02.21. Imputation of Adam’s First Sin.

Chapter 21 Imputation of Adam’s First Sin.

1. Give a summary of the facts already proved from Scripture, consciousness, and observation, and generally acknowledged in all Creeds of the Protestant Churches, as to man’s moral and spiritual condition from birth and by nature.

1st. All men, without exception, begin to sin as soon as they enter upon moral agency.

2nd. They are all born with an antecedent and prevailing tendency in their nature to sin.

3rd. This innate tendency is itself sin in the strictest sense. It is inherently ill–deserving as well as polluting and destructive, and without any reference to its origin in Adam, it fully deserves God’s wrath and curse, and except when expiated by the blood of Christ is always visited with that curse. President Edwards, “Freedom of the Will,” pt. 4, sec. 1, says, “The essence of the virtue and vice of dispositions of the heart lies not in their cause but their nature.”

4th. Men are, therefore, by nature, totally averse to all good and unable of themselves to reverse the evil tendency inherent in their nature and to choose good in preference to evil.

5th. Consequently they are by nature children of wrath, their character formed and their evil destiny fixed antecedent to any personal action of their own.

2. Show that the real difficulty in reconciling the ways of God to man lies in these unquestionable facts; and further, that recognition of these facts in their integrity is of far more doctrinal importance than any account of their origin can possibly be. That we begin to exist, antecedent to possible personal agency, with a nature which justly condemns us and infallibly predisposes us to actual sin, is an amazing mystery, an indescribable curse, and yet a certain and universal fact. No possible theory as to its origin can aggravate its mystery or its terrible significance. We do not claim that the doctrine of our responsibility for Adam’s apostatizing act is without grave difficulties. But we do maintain by that it is taught in Scripture, and (b) that it is more satisfactory to reason and to our moral feelings than any other solution ever given.

It is no less evident that the full recognition of these facts is of far more doctrinal and practical importance than any explanation of their origin or occasion can be. Our views as to these facts must at once determine our relation to God, the entire character of our religious experience, and our views as to the nature of sin and grace, the necessity and nature of redemption, regeneration, and sanctification, while any rationale of these facts will only clear and enlarge our views as to the consistency of God’s dealings with the human race with his own perfections, and as to the relations of the several parts of the divine plan with each other.

Hence we find—

(1.) That these facts as to man’s innate sinfulness are much more prominently and frequently set forth in the Scriptures than is the assertion of our responsibility for Adam’s act of apostasy.

(2.) That these have been clearly defined and uniformly agreed upon by all parties and in all ages of the Christian Church, while with respect to our connection with Adam there has prevailed a great deal of vagueness and contrariety of view.—Principal Cunningham's "Theo. of the Ref.," Essay 7., 1.

3. State the self–evident moral principles which must be certainly presupposed in every inquiry into the dealings of God with his responsible creatures.

(1.) God cannot be the author of sin.

(2.) We must not believe that he could consistently with his own perfections create a creature de novo(new) with a sinful nature.

(3.) The perfection of righteousness, not bare sovereignty, is the grand distinction of all God's dealings. The error that the volition of God determines moral distinctions, was for opposite reasons maintained by the Supralapsarians Twisse, Gomar, etc., and by such Arminians as Grotius, the one to show that God might condemn whom he pleased irrespective of real guilt, and the other to show that he could save whom he pleased irrespective of a real atonement. The fundamental truth, however, now admitted by all Christians, is that the immutable moral perfections of God's nature constitute the absolute standard of right, and in every action determine his will, and are manifested in all his works.

(4.) It is a heathen notion, adopted by naturalistic rationalists, that the "order of nature," or the "nature of things," or "natural law," is a real agent independent of God. "Nature" is simply God's creature and instrument. What is generated by nature is made by God.

(5.) We cannot believe that God would inflict either moral or physical evil upon any creature whose natural rights had not been previously justly forfeited.

(6.) Every moral agent must in justice enjoy a fair probation, i. e., a trial so conditioned as to afford at least as much opportunity of success as liability to failure.

4. State the two distinct questions thence arising, which though frequently confused, it is essential to keep separate.

1st. How does an innate sinful nature originate in each human being at the commencement of his existence, so that the Maker of the man is not the cause of his sin? If this corruption of nature originated in Adam, How is it transmitted to us?

2nd. WHY, on what ground of justice, does God indict this terrible evil, the root and ground of all other evils, at the very commencement of personal existence? WHAT fair probation have infants born in sin enjoyed? WHEN, and WHY, were their rights as new created beings forfeited?

It is self–evident that these questions are distinct, and should be treated as such. The first may possibly be answered on physiological grounds. The second question however concerns the moral government of God, and inquires concerning the justice of his dispensations. In the history of theology of all ages and in all schools very much confusion has resulted from the failure to emphasize and preserve prominent this distinction.

I. HOW DOES IT COME TO PASS THAT HUMAN SOULS ARE CORRUPT FROM BIRTH? IF THIS CORRUPTION IS TRANSMITTED FROM ADAM, HOW IS IT TRANSMITTED?

5. What answers have been given to this question which deny or ignore the Adamic origin of sin?

1st. The Manichaean theory, (adopted by Manes, A. D. 240) containing two principles:1) good identified with the absolute God, 2) evil identified with matter (evil is a manifestation of sin with matter). This system obviously destroys the moral character of sin, and was earnestly opposed by all the early fathers of the Christian church.

2nd. The Pantheistic theory that sin is the necessary incident of a finite nature (limitation). Some writers, not absolute Pantheists, regard it as incident to a certain stage of development and the appointed means of higher perfection.

3rd. Pelagians and Rationalists, denying innate corruption, refer the general fact that actual sin occurs as soon as man emerges into free agency to the freedom of the will, or to the influence of example, etc.

4th. Others refer this guilty corruption of nature, which inheres in every human soul from birth, to an actual apostasy of each soul committed before birth, either in a state of individual preexistence, as Origen and Dr. Edward Beecher in his “Conflict of Ages” teach; or as transcendental and timeless, as Dr. Julius Muller teaches in his “Christian Doctrine of Sin,” Vol. 2., p. 157. This is evidently a pure speculation, unsupported by any facts of consciousness or of observation, contradicted by the testimony of Scripture, Romans 5:12, and Genesis 3:1-24 :, and one which has never been accepted by the Church.

6. What different views have been held by Christian theologians who admit the Adamic origin of human sin, as to the mode of its propagation from Adam to his descendants? This is obviously a question of very inferior importance to the moral question which remains to be discussed. By what grounds, through right and justice, does God directly or indirectly bring this curse upon all men at birth? Hence it is a point neither explicitly explained in Scripture, nor answered in any uniform way even by a majority of theologians. From the beginning, orthodox theologians have been distinguished as Traducianists and Creationists. Tertullian advocated the doctrine that the souls of children are derived from the souls of their parents by natural generation. Jerome held that each soul is independently created by God at birth. Augustine hesitated between the two views. The majority of Romish theologians have been Creationists, the majority of Lutheran theologians, and New England theologians since Dr. Hopkins, have been Traducianists. Nearly all the theologians of the Reformed church have been Creationists

1st. The common view of the Traducianists is not “that soul is begotten from soul, nor body from body, but the whole man from the whole man.”—D. Pareus, Heidelberg (1548–1622), on Romans 5:12. In this view it is plain that the corrupted moral nature of our first parents would be inevitably transmitted to all their descendants by natural generation.

2nd. The doctrine of pure Realism is that humanity is a single generic spiritual substance which corrupted itself by its own voluntary apostatizing act in Adam. The souls of individual men are not separate substances, but manifestations of this single generic substance through their several bodily organizations. The universal soul being corrupt, its several manifestations from birth are

corrupt also.

3rd. Those who hold that God creates each soul separately, have generally held that he withholds from them from the first those influences of the Holy Spirit upon which all spiritual life in the creature depends, as the just punishment of Adam's sin, as he restores this life–giving influence in consideration of the righteousness of Christ, to the elect in the act of regeneration. Dr. T. Ridgely, London (1667–1734), says Vol. 50., pp. 413, 414, "God creates the souls of men destitute of heavenly gifts, and supernatural light, and that justly, because Adam lost those gifts for himself and his posterity." A few Creationists have, like Lampé, Utrecht (1683–1729), Tom. 1., p. 572, taught that the body derived from the parents "is corrupted by inordinate and perverse emotions through sin," which thus communicates like inordinate affections to the soul placed in it by God. This latter view has never prevailed, since sin is not an affection of matter, and can belong to the body only as an organ of the soul. Many Creationists, however, refer the propagation of habitual sin to natural generation, in a general sense, as a law whereby God ordains that children shall be like their parents, without inquiring at all as to the method. So De Moor, Cap. 15., § 33, and "Canons of Synod of Dort."

II. WHY, ON WHAT GROUND OF JUSTICE AND RIGHT, HAS GOD ENTAILED THIS CURSE OF ANTENATAL FORFEITURE UPON AIL HUMAN BEINGS ANTECEDENT TO PERSONAL AGENCY?

7. What is the Arminian explanation of this fact?

1st. They admit that all men inherit from Adam a corrupt nature predisposing them to sin, but they deny that this innate condition is itself properly sin, or involves guilt or desert of punishment.

2nd. They affirm that it was consistent with the justice of God to allow this great evil to come upon all men at birth, only in view of the fact that he had determined to introduce an adequate compensation in the redemption of Christ, impartially intended for all men, and the sufficient influences of his grace which all men experience, and which restores to all ability to do right, and therefore full personal responsibility. Hence, infants are not under condemnation. Condemnation attaches to no man until he has abused his gracious ability. In the gift of Christ, God redresses the wrong done us by allowing Adam to use his fallen nature as the medium for the propagation of sinful children.—Dr. D. D. Whedon, "Bibliotheca Sacra," April, 1862, "Confession Rem.," 7. 3, Limborch, "Theol. Christ," 3., 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.

WE OBJECT to this doctrine.—

(l.) That our condemnation in Adam is of justice, and our redemption in Christ of GRACE.

(2.) The remedy of the compensatory system is not applied to many heathen, etc.

(3.) The view is inconsistent with Scriptural doctrines as to sin, inability, regeneration, etc., etc.

8. What has been the prevalent answer given by New England Theologians since the days of Dr. Hopkins?

Dr. Hopkins taught the doctrine of divine efficiency in the production of sin. This, of course, dissolves the question as to the justice of God in bringing Adam's descendants into the world as

sinners, since he is the ultimate cause of all sin. Later New England divines discard the doctrine of divine efficiency, but they agree with Hopkins in denying imputation, and in referring the law which entails the corruption of Adam upon each of his descendants to a sovereign divine constitution.

If this view, while acknowledging that this divine constitution is infinitely just and righteous, simply disclaims clear knowledge of its grounds and reasons, we have only to answer, that while in part we sympathize with it, we dare not refuse the partial light thrown upon the problem in Scripture, and exhibited below. But if the design of these theologians be to assert, either (1) that this constitution is not just, or (2) that God's bare will makes it to be just, and that its being sovereign is the ground of its being righteous, we protest against it as a grievous heresy.

9. What is the orthodox answer to the above question in which the Romish Lutheran and Reformed Theologians as a body concur?

It is certain that while there has been difference of opinion and looseness of statement as to the grounds of our just accountability for Adam's first sin, the whole Church has always regarded our loss of original righteousness and innate moral corruption to be a just; and righteous, not sovereign, penal consequence of Adam's apostatizing act. This is the DOCTRINE, agreement with which is alike accordant with Scripture, honoring to the moral attributes of God and the equity of his moral government, and conformable to historical orthodoxy. In the explanation of this doctrine the orthodox have often differed. It is a simple fact that God as a just judge condemned the hole race on account of Adam's sin, and condemnation by God, the source of life, involves and is justly followed by spiritual and moral death.

10. Where is the fact asserted in Scripture that God condemned the whole race because of Adam's apostasy?

Romans 5:17-19.— "For if by one man's offence death reigned by one;""Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation;""For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners."

11. Show that in this doctrine the whole Church has concurred. The sin of Adam was an act of apostasy. The spiritual desertion and consequent spiritual corruption which immediately occurred in his personal experience (the very penalty threatened) was, of course, a just penal consequence of that act. Augustine said (" De Nupt. et Concup." 2. 34.)—"Nothing remains but to conclude that in that first man all are understood to have sinned, because all were in him when he sinned; whereby sin is brought in with birth, and not removed save by the new birth."

Dr. G. F. Wiggers, the learned expounder of "Augustinianism and Pelagianism, from the Original Sources," says in his statement of Augustine's view of original sin, ch. 5, division 2, § 2. "The propagation of Adam's sin among his posterity is a punishment of the same sin. The corruption of human nature, in the whole race, was the righteous punishment of the transgression of the first man, in whom all men already existed." The "Council of Trent," Sess. 5., 1 and 2, says that "sin which is the death of the soul was part of that penalty which Adam incurred by his transgression, and which is therefore transmitted to his descendants as well as inflicted on himself."

Bellarmin, "Amiss. Grat.," 3. 1, says, "The penalty which properly corresponds with the first sin is the forfeiture of original righteousness and of those supernatural gifts with which God had

furnished our nature."

Luther (in Genes. 1, p. 98, cap. 5) says, that the image of Adam in which Seth was begotten "included original sin, and the penalty of eternal death inflicted because of the sin of Adam."

Melanchthon ("Explicatio Symboli Niceni. Corp. Refor.," 23. 403 and 583) says, "Adam and Eve merited guilt and depravity for their descendants."

"Formula Concordiae," p. 639 and p. 643, Hase ed.—"Especially since by the seduction of Satan, through the fall, by the just judgment of God in the punishment of men, concreated or original righteousness was lost . . . and human nature corrupted."

"Apol. Aug. Confession," p. 58.—"In Genesis the penalty imposed for original sin is described. For there was human nature subjected not only to death and corporeal evils, but also to the reign of the devil. . . . Defect and concupiscence are both penal evils and sins."

Quenstedt (1688), "Ques. Theo. Did.," Pol 1., 994.—"It was not simply of the good pleasure or the absolute sovereignty of God, but of the highest justice and equity, that the sin, which Adam as the root and origin of the whole human race committed, should be imputed to us, and propagated in us so as to constitute us guilty."

Both the Second Helvetic, ch. 8, and the Gallic Confessions, Art. 9, say that Adam, by his own fault (culpa) became subject to sin, and such as he became after the fall, such are all who were propagated by him, they being subject to sin, death, and various calamities.

Peter Martyr, Professor at Zurich (1500–1561), as quoted by Turretin (Loco 9., 2, 9, § 43), says, "Assuredly there is no one who can doubt that original sin (inherent) is inflicted upon us in revenge and punishment of the first fall."

Calvin.—"God by a just judgment condemned us to wrath in Adam, and willed us to be born corrupt on account of his sin."

Ursinus (1535–1583), friend of Melanchthon, professor at Heidelberg and author of the "Heidelberg Catechism," says (Quest. 7, pp. 40, 41), "original sin" (inherent) "passes over" to their descendants, "not through the body, nor through the soul, but through the impure generation of the whole man, on account of (propter) the guilt of our first parents, on account of which, God, by a just judgment, while he creates our souls, at the same time deprives them of the original rectitude and gifts which he had conferred upon the parents."

L. Danaeus (1530–1596).—"There are three things which constitute a man guilty before God:1. The sin flowing from this that we have all sinned in the first Man 1:2. Corruption, which is the punishment of this sin, which fell upon Adam and upon all his posterity. 3. Actual sins."

Theodore Beza (1519–1605), on Romans 12:1-21., etc.—"As Adam, by the commission of sin, first was made guilty of the wrath of God, then, as being guilty, underwent as the punishment of his sin the corruption of soul and body, so also he TRANSMITTED to posterity a nature in the first place guilty, next, corrupted."

J. Arminius, of Leyden (1560–1609).—"Whatever punishment, therefore, was inflicted on our first parents, has gone down through and now rests on all their posterity; so that all are children of

wrath by nature, being obnoxious to condemnation . . . and to a destitution of righteousness and true holiness," are destitute of original righteousness, which penalty is usually called a loss of the divine image, and original sin.

G. J. Vossius, Leyden (1577–1649), "Hist. Pelag.," Lb. 2., 1.—1. "The Catholic Church has always thus decided, that the first sin is imputed to all; that is, that its effects are, according to the just judgment of God, transmitted to all the children of Adam . . . on account whereof we are born without original righteousness."

Synod of Dort (1618).—"Such as man was after the fall, such children also he begat, . . . by the propagation of a vicious nature, by the just Judgment of God."

Francis Turretin, Geneva (1623–1687), Locus 9, Q. 9, § 6, 14.

Amesius, "Medulla Theolog.," Lib. prim., cap. 17.— "2. This propagation of sin consists in two parts, in imputation and in real communication. 3. By imputation that single act of disobedience which Adam committed is made also ours. 4. By real communication, not indeed the single sin. 5. Original sin, since it essentially consists in deprivation of original righteousness, and this deprivation follows the first sin as a penalty, this has in the first instance the nature of a penalty rather than of a sin. Inasmuch as that original righteousness is denied by the Justice of God, so far forth it is penalty; inasmuch as it ought to be present and is absent by human fault, so far forth it is sin. 6. Therefore this privation is handed down from Adam after the manner of ill–desert in so far as it is penalty, and after the manner of real efficiency in so far as it has adjoined to it the nature of sin."

H. Witsius (1636–1708), "Economy," Bk. 1., ch. 8, §5 33 and 34.—"It is therefore necessary that the sin of Adam in virtue of the covenant of works, be so laid to the charge of his posterity, who were comprised with him in the same covenant, that, on account of the demerit of his sin, they are born destitute of original righteousness," etc.

"Formula Consensus Helvetica "(1675), canon 10.—"But there appears no way in which hereditary corruption could fall, as spiritual death, upon the whole human race by the just judgment, of God, unless some sin of that race preceded, incurring the penalty of that death. For God, the supremely just Judge of all the earth, punishes none but the guilty."

Westminster "Confession and Cat"; "Confession faith," ch. 7., § 2 and ch. 6., § 3; "Larger Catechism," 22 and 25; "Shorter Catechism," 18.

President Witherspoon, "Works," Vol. 4., p. 96.—"It seems very plain that the state of corruption and wickedness which men are now in, is stated in Scripture as being the effect and punishment of Adam's first sin."

See also the truth of this position affirmed by Dr. Tho. Chalmers, "Institutes of Theology," part 1, ch. 6; and by Dr. William Cunningham; "Theology of the Reformation," Essay 7., § 2; Dr. James Thornwell, "Collected Writings," Vol. 1., pp. 479, 559, 561, etc.; and a learned article by Prof. Geo. P. Fisher, of New Haven, Theo. Sem., in the "New Englander," July, 1868.

Thus we have the consensus of Catholic and Protestant, Lutheran and Reformed, of Supralapsarian and Infralapsarian, of Gomar, and Arminius, of the Synod of Dort and the

Westminster Assembly, of Scotland and of New England.

12. Why was this doctrine expressed technically as the imputation of the guilt of Adam's apostatizing act? and state the meaning of the terms. At the Council of Trent Albertus Pighius and Ambrosius Catherinus (F. Paul's by Hist. Con. Trent, Lib. 2., s., 65) maintained that the imputed guilt of Adam's first sin constituted the only ground of the condemnation which rests upon men at birth. The Council did not allow this heresy, but nevertheless maintained a rather negative than positive view of man's inherent guilty corruption. Consequently Calvin and all the first Reformers and Creeds were principally concerned in emphasizing the fact that original sin inherent, as distinguished from original sin imputed, is intrinsically and justly, as moral corruption, worthy of God's wrath and curse. It is the reason why the salvation of infants is referred to the sovereign grace of God and the expiatory merits of Christ, and it continues in adults the source of all actual sin and the main ground of condemnation to eternal death. Infants and adults suffer, and adults are damned on account of the guilt of inherent sin, but never on account of Adam's sin imputed. But when the question is asked why God, either directly or indirectly, brings us into existence thus corrupt, the whole church answered as above shown, because God has thereby justly punished us for Adam's apostasy. This is technically expressed as the "imputation to us of the guilt of Adam's act."

"Guilt" is just liability to punishment. The recognition of guilt is a judicial and not sovereign act of God.

"Imputation" (the Hebrew ■■■■■■■ and the Greek λογιζομαι frequently occurring and translated "to count,""to reckon,""to impute," etc.) is simply to lay to one's charge as a just ground of legal procedure, whether the thing imputed antecedently belonged to the person to whom it is charged, or for any other adequate reason he is Justly responsible for it. Thus not to impute sin to the doer of it, is of course graciously to refrain from charging the guilt of his own act or state upon him as a ground of punishment; while to impute righteousness without works is graciously to credit the believer with a righteousness which is not personally his own.—Romans 4:6; Romans 4:8; 2 Corinthians 5:19; see Numbers 30:15; Numbers 18:22-27; Numbers 18:30; Leviticus 5:17-18; Leviticus 7:18; Leviticus 16:22; Romans 2:26; 2 Timothy 4:16, etc. The imputation, i. e., judicial charging of Adam's sin to us, is rather to be considered as contemplating. the race as a whole, as one moral body, than as a series of individuals. The race was condemned as a whole, and hence each individual comes into existence in a state of just antenatal forfeiture. Turretin calls it "commune peccatum, communis culpa(common sin, common fault)," 50. 9, Q. 9. This and this alone is what the church has meant by this doctrine. Afterwards in our own persons God condemns us only and most justly because of our inherent moral corruption and our actual transgressions. The imputation of the guilt of Adam's apostatizing act to us in common leads judicially to spiritual desertion in particular, and spiritual desertion leads by necessary consequence to inherent depravity. The imputation of our sins in common to Christ leads to his desertion (Matthew 27:46), but his temporary desertion leads to no tendency to inherent sin, because he was the God–man. The imputation of Christ's righteousness to us is the condition of the restoration of the Holy Ghost, and that restoration leads by necessary consequence to regeneration and sanctification. "It is only when justificatio forensis(forum of justification) maintains its Reformation position at the head of the process of salvation, that it has any firm or secure standing at all."—Dr. J. A. Dorner's "Hist. Prot. Theo.," Vol. 2., p. 160.

13. What is the origin of the Distinction between the Mediate and the Immediate Imputation of Adam's sin, and what has been the usage with respect to those terms among theologians? As above shown, from the beginning, the universal Church has agreed in holding that the guilt of Adam's first sin was directly charged to the account of the human race in mass, just as it was charged to himself. Likewise, Adam's first sin was punished in the race by desertion and consequent depravity, just as it was punished in him. This was uniformly expressed by the technical phrase, the imputation of the guilt of his first sin to his descendants. In the first half of the seventeenth century, Joshua Placaeus, professor at Saumur, was universally understood to deny any imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, and to admit only inherent innate corruption as derived from Adam by natural generation. This was explicitly condemned by the French National Synod at Charenton, 1645; and repudiated by all orthodox theologians, Lutheran and Reformed. Placaeus subsequently originated the distinction between Immediate and Mediate Imputation. By Immediate Imputation he meant the direct charging of the guilt of Adam's sin antecedent to their own sinful state. By Mediate Imputation he meant that we are found guilty with Adam of his apostasy because in virtue of inherent depravity we are apostates also. Placaeus held to the view of Mediate Imputation.

It is obvious—

1st. That this doctrine of mediate imputation alone is virtually the "New England Root Theory," above discussed, which refers the abandoning of the human race to the operation of the natural law of inheritance to the sovereign will, instead of to the just judgment, of God.

2nd. It is a denial of the universal doctrine of the Church that Adam's sin is justly charged to his descendants as to himself, and punished in them by depravity as it was punished in himself. That imputation was obviously, whatever its ground, purely immediate and antecedent.

3rd. It is evident that Adam's sin cannot at the same time be both immediately and mediately imputed to the same effect. It would be absurd to think that mankind are judicially punished with inherent corruption as a just punishment for Adam's sin, and at the same time counted guilty of Adam's sin because they are afflicted with that punishment. It is for this reason that so many advocates of the church doctrine of immediate imputation deny that imputation can in any sense be mediate.

4th. But the penalty of Adam's sin was "Death;" that is, all penal evils, temporal, and eternal. The strongest advocates of immediate imputation, in order to account for the infliction of innate inherent sin, admit that all the other elements of the penalty denounced upon Adam come upon us because of our own inherent and actual sins.—See Turretin, 50. 9, Ques. 9, § 14, and "Princeton Essays."

5th. The immediate imputation of the guilt of Adam's sin is to the race as a whole, and respects each individual prior to his existence as a judicial cause of his commencing that existence in a depraved condition. When each single man is considered in himself personally and subsequent to birth, all agree that he is condemned with Adam because of a common inherent depravity and life.

6th. Many found difficulty in conceiving how inherited inherent corruption can be guilt as well as pollution. Their idea was that a sinful state must originate in the free choice of the person concerned, in order to invoke the moral responsibility implied by guilt. Yet all acknowledge that

inherent corruption is guilt. Some silently accounted for this on the principle of Edwards, that the essence of the virtue or vice of dispositions of the heart lies not in their cause, but in their nature. Others, however, held that the guilt inherent in innate sin is due to the fact that this sin is connected as an effect with the apostasy of Adam. If the question then be, Why the race is under and we are allowed to commence our agency in a depraved condition? all the orthodox answer in terms or in effect, “Because of the most just immediate IMPUTATION of Adam’s first sin.”

If the question be, Why are we severally, after birth, judged guilty as well as corrupt, and why are we punished with all the temporal and eternal penal evils denounced upon Adam? many of the orthodox say, “Because of our own inherent sin mediating the full IMPUTATION of his sin.”

Andrew Quenstedt, Wittenberg (1688), “Theo. Did. Pol.,” 1., 998.—“The first sin of Adam is imputed to us immediately inasmuch as we exist hitherto in Adam. But the sin of Adam is imputed to us mediately in so for as we are regarded individually and in our own proper persons.”

F. Turretin, Geneva (1687), Locus 9, Quest. 9, § 14.—“The penalty which sin brings upon us is either privative or positive. The former is the want or privation of original righteousness. The latter is death both temporal and eternal, and in general all evils which are sent upon sinners. . . . With respect to the former we say that the sin of Adam is imputed to us immediately to the effect of the privative penalty, because it is the cause of the privation of original righteousness, and so ought to go before privation, at least in the order of nature; but as to the latter, the positive penalty may be said to be mediately imputed, because we are not obnoxious to that, unless after we are born and corrupt.”

Hence—

(1.) All in effect admit immediate imputation, and deny mediate imputation alone.

(2.) Many ignore the distinction, which never emerged till the time of Placaeus.

(3.) A number, in the senses above shown, assert both.

14. How is this Doctrine proved by the analogy which Paul (Romans 5:12-21) asserts between our condemnation in Adam and our justification 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.” The analogy here asserted is as to the fact and nature of the imputation in both cases, not at all as to the ground of it.

Christ is one with his elect because of the gracious appointment of the Father and his voluntary assumption of their nature. Adam is one with his descendants because he is their natural head, and because of the gracious appointment of God. In these respects the cases differ. But the cases are identical in so far as in view of the oneness in both cases subsisting, we are justly charged with the guilt of Adam’s first sin and punished therefor, and Christ is justly charged with the guilt of our “many offences” and punished therefor, and we are justly credited with the merit of his righteousness and accepted, regenerated, and saved therefor.—See above Ques. 12.

If the imputation of Christ's righteousness is immediate the imputation of Adam's sin must be the same, though the basis of the one is grace it is no less just. Although the basis of the other be justice, the original constitution from which it originated is no less gracious.

15. How have orthodox theologians explained the GROUND for this universally assumed judicial charging of the guilt of Adam's apostatizing act to his descendants?

They are generally agreed that the race is justly responsible for the judicial consequences of that act. Beyond this the accounts rendered of the latter have been different, and often vague.

1st. Augustine conceived of the race as essentially one. As far as Adam is considered as a person his sin was his own, but as far as the entire race in its essential undistributed, unindividualized form of existence was in him, his act was the apostasy of that whole race, and the common nature being both guilty and depraved is justly distributed to each individual in that condition and under that condemnation. The whole race was not personally nor individually, but virtually or potentially, coexistent and coactive in him.—Dr. Philip Schaff in "Lange on Rom.," pp. 191–196; Dr. Geo. P. Fisher, "New Englander," July, 1860. This is a mode of thought which at least presupposes Realism, and language to the same effect became traditional in the church, and has been used in a general sense by many, who were in no degree philosophical realists, when treating of our relation to Adam. Forms of expression originating in this view have lingered among theologians who have explicitly rejected realism, and have definitely substituted for it a different explanation of the facts. The whole race has been considered one organically, and we have been said to have been in Adam as branches in a tree, etc. Such renderings of the matter have continued to late times, and been commingled with others essentially different, as that of representation, etc.

It is, however unsatisfactory as an explanation of guilt, in the highest degree orthodox, both because of the number and high authority of the writers who have used it, and because it implies the highest conceivable ground of immediate imputation. The apostatizing act is imputed to us, as it is imputed to Adam, "because we were guilty coagents with him in that act."—Shedd's "Essays."

2nd. The Federal View presupposes the natural relation. Adam stands before God in Eden a free, responsible, fallible moral agent, with an animal body and a generative nature. Without a miracle his children must be carried along with him in his destinies. His own status was and must ever continue according to bare law contingent upon free will. God, therefore, as the benevolent and righteous guardian of the interests of all moral creatures, graciously constituted him the federal head and representative of his race as a whole, and promised him for himself and for all eternal life, or confirmed holiness and happiness, on condition of temporary obedience under favorable conditions, with the penalty for him and for them of death, or condemnation and desertion, on condition of disobedience. This was an act of grace to him, as it substituted a temporal for an eternal probation. It was no less an act of grace for the race, for reasons stated below. This "Federal Theology" was developed and introduced in all its fullness of detail and bearings by Coccejus (1602–1669), Prof. at Franecker and Leyden. It was regarded as eminently a Scriptural system, supplanting the prevailing scholasticism, and destroying forever the influence of supralapsarian speculations, and it gradually found acceptance, under appropriate modifications, with Lutherans and Arminians as well as Calvinists.

Two things however are historically certain—

1st. That the idea of a covenant with Adam including his descendants had long before been clearly conceived and prominently advanced. This was done by Catherinus before the “Council of Trent” (Father Paul’s “Hist. Council Trent” pp. 175, 177), and by such men among Protestants as Hyperius (1567), Olevianus (circum. 1563), and Raphael Eglin (Dorner’s “Hist. Prot. Theo,” Vol. 2., pp. 31–45).

2nd. That the essential ideas of federal representation were long and very generally prevalent among Protestant theologians from the beginning. Dr. Charles P. Krauth says, with respect to Lutheran theology as a whole, “The reasons assigned for the imputation and transmission centre in the representative character of Adam (and Eve). The technicalities of the federal idea are late in appearing, but the essential idea itself comes in from the beginning in our theology.” Melanchthon said, “Adam and Eve merited guilt and depravity for their posterity, because integrity had been bestowed on our first parents, that they might preserve them for their entire posterity, and in this trial they represented the whole human race.”—“Explicatio Symboli Niceni, Corp. Refor.,” 23. 403 and 583.

Chemnitz (1522–1586), “Loci. Theo.,” fol. 213, 214, says, “God deposited those gifts with which he willed to adorn human nature with Adam, on this condition, that if he kept them for himself he should keep them for his posterity; but if he lost them and depraved himself, he should beget children after his own likeness.”—Hutter, Wittenberg (1616), Lb. “Chr. Con. Expli.,” 90. “Adam represented the whole human race.” Thus also James Arminius (1609) (Disp. 31, Thes. ix); John Owen (1616–1683) (“Justification,” p. 286), and West “Confession Faith,” Ch. 7. § 2, and “Larger Catechism,” 22 (1646 and 1647).

Hence it appears that when theological writers, before to the prevalence of the realistic philosophy, explain our moral oneness with Adam by the uninterpreted general phrases “that we sinned in him being in his loins,” or “he being our Root,” they are not to be understood as excluding all reference to representation, or to covenant responsibility. The language holds true under either theory, or when both are combined in one notion. And from the interchange of terms it is certain that very often both theories were latent under a common general notion.

16. What can be fairly proved in support of the Augustinian mode of explaining our moral oneness with Adam? This view explains our moral oneness entirely on the ground of his being the natural head and root of the race, and the consequent physical or organic oneness of the whole race in him.

It may be fairly argued in behalf of this view—

1st. That if it can be proved that we were “guilty coagents with Adam in his sin,” the highest and most satisfactory reason possible is assigned for the righteous immediate imputation of the guilt of that sin to us.

2nd. The analogy, as far as it goes, of all God’s providential dealings, both general and special, with mankind God’s covenants with Noah, Abraham, and David embrace the children with the parents, and rest upon the natural relations of generator and generated. The constitutions alike of the Jewish and Christian Churches provide that the rights of infants are predetermined by the status of their parents. This is, of course, determined by a gracious covenant, yet that covenant presupposes the more fundamental and general natural relation of generation and education. All

human condition and charac– ter, aside from any supernatural intervention, is determined by historical conditions. Hugh Miller ("Testimony of the Rocks") says, as a Christian scientist:"It is a fact broad and palpable as the economy of nature, that . . . lapsed progenitors, when cut off from civilization and all external interference of a missionary character, become founders of a lapsed race. The iniquities of the parents are visited upon their children.""It is one of the inevitable consequences of that nature of man which the Creator, bound fast in fate, while he left free his will, that the free–will of the parent should become the destiny of the child."

17. What can be fairly argued against the sufficiency of this explanation of the ground of the immediate imputation of the guilt of Adam's first sin?

1st. Observe

(l.) that the Jewish and Christian Churches, to whom the second commandment (Exodus 20:5) was given, and the children of Noah, Abraham, and David were embraced under special gracious covenants.

(2.) Observe that in the cases in which God visits the iniquities of parents upon their children in natural providence, irrespective of any special covenant obligations, God is acting with a most just though sovereign discretion in dealing with rebels already under previous righteous condemnation.

2nd. When the Natural Headship of Adam is referred to in general terms, and we are said to have been in him as a "Root," or as "branches in a tree," the notion is unsatisfactory, because (1.) Utterly indefinite.

(2.) Because it is, as far as it goes, material and mechanical, and therefore utterly fails to explain moral responsibility, which is essentially spiritual and personal.

(3.) Besides this notion at least latently assumes the fallacy that the laws of natural development are either necessary limits of divine agency, or agents independent of him, or independent concauses with him. The truth simply being that the constitution of nature is the creature and instruments of God.

(4.) This theory assigns no reason, either on the ground of principle or analogy, why only the first sin of Adam, and not all the subsequent sins of all ancestors, is imputed to posterity as the ground of parental forfeiture.

3rd. The idea of a non–personal but virtual or potential coexistence and coagency (see Dr. W. G. T. Shedd's "Essays" and "Hist. Christ. Doc.," and Dr. Philip Schaff's "Lange. Rom.," pp. 192–194) as the sole basis of just moral responsibility has no support in that testimony of CONSCIOUSNESS, which is our only citadel of defense from materialism, naturalism, and pantheism. Consciousness gives us no conception of sin but as a state or an act of a free personal agent. Even if impersonal, virtual, potential, moral coagency be a fact, it transcends both consciousness and understanding, and being dark itself can throw no light upon the mysterious facts it is adduced to explain and to Justify.

4th. When the attempt is made to expound this theory in the full sense of realistic philosophy the case does not appear to be improved.

(1.) In pure realism humanity is a single, generic, spiritual substance which voluntarily apostatized and corrupted itself in Adam. Human persons are the individual manifestations of this common spirit in connection with separate bodily organizations. But—(a.) If we so far leave consciousness behind how can we defend ourselves from pantheism? (b.) How are individual spirits justified and sanctified while the general spirit remains corrupt and guilty? (c.) How did the Logos become incarnate? (d.) How, finally, will part of this spiritual substance be eternally glorified, while another part is eternally damned?

(2.) Dr. Shedd explains that the generic spiritual substance which sinned has since, through the agency of Adam, been distributed and explicated into a series of individuals. But can a spirit be divided and its parts distributed, each part an agent as the whole was from which it was separated? Is not this to confound the attributes of spirit and matter, and to explain spirit as material, and is not SIN preeminently spiritual and personal?

18. State the reasons which establish the superior satisfactory character of the Federal Theory of our oneness with Adam?

1st. The federal headship of Adam presupposes and rests upon his natural headship. He was our natural head before he was our federal head. He was doubtless made our federal representative because he was our natural progenitor, and was so conditioned that his agency must affect our destinies, and because our very nature was on trial (typically if not essentially) in him. Whatever, therefore, of virtue in this explanation the natural headship of Adam may be supposed to contain the federal theory retains.

2nd. The Covenant as shown above was an act of supreme divine grace to Adam himself. It was still more so as it respects his descendants. All God's moral creatures are introduced into existence in a condition of real, though unstable, moral integrity. This is obviously true of men and angels, and certainly equitable. They must, therefore, pass through a probation either limited or unlimited. Adam was under conditions to stand that graciously limited probation with every conceivable advantage. But, apparently, his descendants could have no fair probation except in his person. "Three plans exhaust the possible.

(1.) The whole race might have been left under their natural relation to God forever.

(2.) Each might have been left to stand for himself under a gracious covenant of works.

(3.) That the race as a whole should stand for a limited period represented in its natural head. The first would have certainly led to universal sin. The second is the one Pelagians suppose actual. The third is incomparably the most advantageous for the whole." Dr. Robert L. Dabney's "Syllabus." The separate probation of nascent souls in infant bodies was certainly not to be preferred.

3rd. God certainly did as a matter of fact condition Adam with a promise of "Life," and the alternative of "Death," upon a special and temporally limited probationary test. The precise penalty threatened upon him, has been in its general sense and special terms (Genesis 2:17; Genesis 3:16-19) inflicted upon all his posterity.

4th. This view also is confirmed by the analogy which the Scriptures assert existed between the imputation of Adam's first sin to us, and the imputation of our sins to Christ, and of his

righteousness to us. This, of course, implies necessarily that the race is one with Adam, and the elect one with Christ. And the analogy certainly is the more complete on the federal view of Adam's union with the race, than on that view which ignores it. Both the Covenant of Grace including the elect, and the Covenant of Works including the race, were gracious. Christ voluntarily assumed his headship out of love. Adam obediently assumed his out of interest and duty. God graciously chose the elect out of love, and graciously included the descendants of Adam in his representation out of benevolence. Does not the remaining mystery lose itself in that abyss which is opened by the fact of the permission of sin, before which all schools of Theists on this side the veil must bow in silence.

02.22. The Covenant of Grace.

Chapter 22 The Covenant of Grace.

All questions concerned with the general subject of Redemption will fall under the heads of—

1st. The Plan of Redemption, including the Covenant of Grace and eternal Election, considered above, ch. 11.

2nd. The Person and Work of Christ in the Accomplishment of Redemption.

3rd. The Application and Consummation of Redemption by the agency of the Holy Ghost, together with the Means of Grace divinely appointed to that end.

It is evident.—

1st. That as God is an infinite, eternal, and immutable intelligence he must have formed, from the beginning, an all–comprehensive and unchangeable Plan of all his works in time, including Creation, Providence, and Redemption.

2nd. A Plan formed by and intended to be executed in its several reciprocal distributed parts by Three Persons, as Sender, and Sent, as Principal and Mediator, as Executor and Applier, must necessarily possess all the essential attributes of an eternal Covenant between those Persons.

3rd. Since God in all departments of his moral government treats man as an intelligent, voluntary, and responsible moral agent, it follows that the execution of the eternal Plan of Redemption must be in its general character ethical and not magical, must proceed by the revelation of truth, and the influences of motives, and must be voluntarily appropriated by the subject as an offered grace, and obeyed as an enjoined duty upon pain of reprobation. Hence its application must possess all the essential attributes of a Covenant in time between God and his people.

1. What is the usage of the word ■■■■■■■in the Hebrew Scriptures? This word occurs more than two hundred and eighty times in the Old Testament, and is in our translation in the vast majority of instances represented by the English word “Covenant,” in a number of instances by the word “League,”Joshua 9:15, etc., and once each by the words “Confederate,”Genesis 14:13, and “Confederacy,”Obadiah 1:7.

It is used to express.—

1st. A natural ordinance. “God’s covenant with the day, the night,” etc.—Jeremiah 33:20.

2nd. A covenant of one man with another. Jonathan and David.—1 Samuel 18:3 and 1 Samuel 20:1-42; David and Abner.—2 Samuel 3:13.

3rd. The covenant of God with Noah, Genesis 6:18-19, as to his family; and with the human race in him, Genesis 9:9. The bow was “a token of a covenant.”—Genesis 9:13.

4th. The “Covenant of Grace” with Abraham, Genesis 17:2-7, which Paul calls the “gospel,”Galatians 3:17. Circumcision was the “token of this covenant.”—Genesis 17:11; cf. Acts 7:8.

5th. The same covenant as formed generally with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.—Exodus 2:24, etc.

6th. The same covenant, with special and temporary modifications of form, constituting the National–Ecclesiastical Covenant of God with the people of Israel. The law of this Covenant on its legal side was written by Moses first in a book (“the book of the covenant,”Exodus 24:7), and then upon tables of stone (“ the words of the covenant, the ten commandments,”Exodus 34:27-28), which were afterwards deposited in a golden chest, “the ark of the covenant.”—Numbers 10:33.

7th. The covenant with Aaron of an everlasting priesthood. Numbers 25:12-13.

8th. The covenant with David.—Jeremiah 33:21-22; Psalms 89:3-4.

2. What is the New Testament usage of the termδιαθηκη ? This word occurs thirty–three times in the New Testament, and is almost uniformly translated covenant when it refers to the dealings of God with his ancient church, and testament when it refers to his dealings with his church under the gospel dispensation. Its fundamental sense is that of disposition, arrangement; in the classics generally that specific form of arrangement or disposition called a testament, which sense, however, it properly bears in but one passage in the New Testament, viz., Hebrews 9:16-17. Although it is never used to designate that eternal Covenant of Grace which the father made with the Son as the second Adam, in behalf of his people, yet it always designates either the old or the new dispensation, i. e., mode of administration of that changeless covenant, or some special covenant which Christ has formed with his people in the way of administering the Covenant of Grace, e. g., the covenants with Abraham and with David.

Thus the disposition made by God with the ancient church through Moses, the Old contrasted in the New Testament with the New διαθηκη(Galatians 4:24), was really a covenant, both civil and religious, formed between Jehovah and the Israelites, yet alike in its legal element, “which was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made,” and in its symbolic and typical element teaching of Christ, it was in a higher view a dispensation, or mode of administration of the Covenant of Grace. So also the present gospel dispensation introduced by Christ assumes the form of a covenant between him and his people, including many gracious promises, suspended on conditions, yet it is evidently in its highest aspect that mode of administering the changeless Covenant of Grace, which is called the “new and better dispensation, in contrast with the comparatively imperfect old and first dispensation” of that same covenant.—See 2 Corinthians 3:14; Hebrews 7:6; Hebrews 7:8-10; Hebrews 9:15; Galatians 4:24. The present dispensation of the Covenant of Grace by our Savior, in one respect, evidently bears a near analogy to a will or testamentary disposition, since it dispenses blessings which could be fully enjoyed only after, and by means of his death. Consequently Paul uses the word διαθηκη in one single passage, to designate the present dispensation of the Covenant of Grace in this interesting aspect of it.—Hebrews 9:16-17. Yet since the various dispensations of that eternal covenant are always elsewhere in Scripture represented under the form of special administrative covenants, and not under the form of testaments, it is to be regretted that our translators have so frequently rendered this term διαθηκη, by the specific word testament, instead of the word

covenant, or by the more general word dispensation.—See 1 Corinthians 3:6; 1 Corinthians 3:14; Galatians 3:15; Hebrews 7:22; Hebrews 12:24; Hebrews 13:20.

3. What are the three views as to the parties in the covenant of grace held by Calvinists?

These differences do not in the least involve the truth of any doctrine taught in the Scriptures, but concern only the form in which that truth may be more or less clearly presented.

1st. The first view regards the Covenant of Grace as made by God with elect sinners. God promising to save sinners as such on the condition of faith, they, when converted, promising faith and obedience. Christ in this view is not one of the parties to the covenant, but its Mediator in behalf of his elect, and their surety; i. e., he guarantees that all the conditions demanded of them shall be fulfilled by them through his grace.

2nd. The second view supposes two covenants, the first, called the Covenant of Redemption, formed from eternity between the Father and the Son as parties. The Son promising to obey and suffer, the Father promising to give him a people and to grant them in him all spiritual blessings and eternal life. The second, called the Covenant of Grace, formed by God with the elect as parties, Christ being mediator and surety in behalf of his people.

3rd. As there are two Adams set forth in the Scripture, the one representing the entire race in an economy of nature, and the other representing the whole body of the elect in an economy of grace, it appears more simple to regard as the foundation of all God's dealings with mankind, of whatever class, only the two great contrasted Covenants of works and of grace. The Covenant of works made by God at the creation of the world with Adam, as the federal head and representative of all his posterity. Of the promises, conditions, penalty, and issue of that Covenant I have spoken under a former head, see Chapter 17. The Covenant of Grace, formed in the counsels of eternity between the Father and the Son as contracting parties, the Son therein contracting as the Second Adam, representing all his people as their mediator and surety, assuming their place and undertaking all their obligations, under the unsatisfied Covenant of Works, and undertaking to apply to them all the benefits secured by this eternal Covenant of Grace, and to secure the performance upon their part of all those duties which are involved therein. Thus in one aspect this Covenant may be viewed as contracted with the head for the salvation of the members, and in another as contracted with the members in their head and sponsor. For that which is a grace from God is a duty upon our part and hence results this complex view of the Covenant. As embraced under one or other of these two great Covenants of works or of grace, every man in the world stands in God's sight. It is to be remembered, however, that in the several dispensations, or modes of administration of the eternal Covenant of Grace, Christ has contracted various special covenants with his people, as administrative provisions for carrying out the engagements, and for applying to them the benefits of his covenant with the Father. Thus, the covenant of Jehovah (the Second Person, see above, Chapter 9., Question 14) with Noah, the second natural head of the human family, Genesis 9:11; Genesis 9:15. The covenant with Abraham, the typical believer, bearing the visible sign and seal of circumcision, and thus founding the visible church as an a gathering of families. This covenant continues to be the charter of the visible church to this day. The sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper now attached to it, signifying and sealing the benefits of the Covenant of Grace, to wit, eternal life, faith, repentance, obedience, etc., on God's part, as matters of promise; on ours as matters of duty, i. e., so far as they are to he performed by

ourselves.—Compare Genesis 17:9-13, with Galatians 3:15-17. The national covenant with the Jews, then constituting the visible church, Exodus 34:27. The covenant with David, the type of Christ as Mediatorial King, 2 Samuel 7:15-16; 2 Chronicles 7:18. The universal offers of the gospel during the present dispensation, also, are presented in the form of a covenant. Salvation is offered to all on the condition of faith, but faith is God's gift secured for and promised to the elect, and when given exercised by them. Every believer, when brought to the knowledge of the truth, enters into a covenant with his Lord, which he renews in all acts of faith and prayer. But these special covenants all and several are provisions for the administration of the eternal Covenant of Grace, and are designed solely to convey the benefits therein secured to those to whom they belong. For the statements of our standards upon this subject, compare "Confession of Faith," chapter 7., section 3, with "Larger Catechism," Questions 30–36.

4. Prove from the Scriptures that a "Covenant of Grace "was actually formed in eternity between the Divine Persons, in which the "Son" represented this elect.

1st. As shown at the opening of this chapter such a Covenant is virtually implied in the existence of an eternal plan of salvation mutually formed by and to be executed by three Persons.

2nd. That Christ represented his elect in that Covenant is necessarily implied in the doctrine of sovereign personal election to grace and salvation. Christ says of his sheep, "Thine they were, and thou gavest them me," and "Those whom thou gavest me I have kept," etc.—John 17:6; John 17:12.

3rd. The Scriptures declare the existence of the promise and conditions of such a Covenant, and present them in connection.—Isaiah 53:10-11.

4th. The Scriptures expressly affirm the existence of such a Covenant.—Isaiah 13:6; Psalms 89:3.

5th. Christ makes constant reference to a previous commission he had received of his Father.—John 10:18; Luke 22:29.

6th. Christ claims a reward which had been conditioned upon the fulfillment of that commission.—John 17:4.

7th. Christ constantly asserts that his people and his expected glory are given to him as a reward by his Father.— John 17:6; John 17:9; John 17:24; Php 2:6-11.

5. Who were the parties to this Covenant of Grace; what were its promises or conditions on the part of the Father; and what its conditions on the part of the Son?

1st. The contracting parties were the Father representing the entire Godhead in its indivisible sovereignty; and, on the other hand, God the Son, as Mediator, representing all his elect people, and as administrator of the Covenant, standing their surety for their performance of all those duties which were involved on their part.

2nd. The conditions upon the part of the Father were, (1) all needful preparation, Hebrews 10:5; Isaiah 13:1-7; (2) support in his work, Luke 22:43; (3) a glorious reward, first in the exaltation of his theanthropic person "above every name that is named,"Php 2:6-11, and the universal dominion committed to him as Mediator, John 5:22; Psalms 110:1; and in committing to his hand the

administration of all the provisions of the Covenant of Grace in behalf of all his people, Matthew 28:18; John 1:12; John 17:2; John 7:39; Acts 2:33; and, secondly, in the salvation of all those for whom he acted, including the provisions of regeneration, justification, sanctification, perseverance, and glory—Titus 1:2; Jeremiah 31:33; Jeremiah 32:40; Isaiah 35:10; Isaiah 53:10-11; Dicks, “Theo. Lect.,” Vol. 1., pp. 506–509.

3rd. The conditions upon the part of the Son were—

(1.) That he should become incarnate, made of a woman, made under the law.—Galatians 4:4-5.

(2.) That he should assume and fully discharge, in behalf of his elect, all violated conditions and incurred liabilities of the covenant of works, Matthew 5:17-18, which he was to accomplish, first, by rendering to the precept of the law a perfect obedience, Psalms 40:8; Isaiah 13:21; John 9:4-5; John 8:29; Matthew 19:17; and, secondly, in suffering the full penalty incurred by the sins of his people.—Isaiah 53:1-12 :; 2 Corinthians 5:21; Galatians 3:13; Ephesians 5:2.

6. In what sense is Christ said to be the mediator of the Covenant of Grace?

Christ is the mediator of the eternal Covenant of Grace because—

1st. As the one mediator between God and man, he contracted it.

2nd. As mediator, he fulfills all its conditions in behalf of his people.

3rd. As mediator he administers it and dispenses all its blessings.

4th. In all this, Christ was not a mere mediatorial internuntius, as Moses is called (Galatians 3:19), but he was mediator (1) plenipotentiary (Matthew 28:18), and (2) as high priest actually effecting reconciliation by sacrifice (Romans 3:25).

5th. The phrase μεσιτης διαθηκης mediator of the covenant, is applied to Christ three times in the New Testament (Hebrews 8:6; Hebrews 9:15; Hebrews 12:24); but as in each case the term for covenant is qualified by either the adjective “new” or “better,” it evidently here is used to designate not the Covenant of Grace properly, but that new dispensation of that eternal covenant which Christ introduced in person in contrast to the less perfect administration of it which was instrumentally introduced by Moses. In the general administration of the Covenant of Grace, Christ has acted as sacerdotal mediator from the foundation of the world (Revelation 13:8). On the other hand, the first or “old dispensation,” or special mode of administering that Covenant visibly among men, was instrumentally, and as to visible form, “ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator,”i. e., Moses (Galatians 3:19). It is precisely in contradistinction to this relation which Moses sustained to the outward revelation of those symbolical and typical institutions, through which the Covenant of Grace was then administered. That the superior excellence of the “new ”and “better” dispensation is declared to consist in this, that now Christ the “Son in his own house” visibly discloses himself as the true mediator in the spiritual and personal administration of his covenant. Hence he who from the beginning was the “one mediator between God and man” (1 Timothy 2:5) now is revealed as in way of eminence, the mediator and surety of that eternal Covenant under the “new” and “better ” dispensation of it, since now he is rendered visible in the fullness of his spiritual graces, as the immediate administrator thereof; whereas under the “first” and “old” dispensation he was hidden.—See Sampson’s Commentary on Hebrews.

6th. As Mediator also Christ undertakes to give His people faith and repentance and every grace, and guarantees for them that they shall on their part exercise faith and repentance and every duty.

7. In what sense is Christ said to be Surety of the covenant of Grace? In the only instance in which the term surety is applied to Christ in the New Testament (Hebrews 7:22), “surety of a better testament,” the word translated testament evidently is designed to designate the new dispensation of the Covenant of Grace, as contrasted with the old. Paul is contracting the priesthood of Christ with the Levitical. He is priest or surety after a higher order, under a clearer revelation, and a more real and direct administration of grace, than were the typical priests descended from Aaron. Christ is our surety at once as priest and as king. As priest because, as, such, he assumes and discharges all our obligations under the broken covenant of works. As king (the two in him are inseparable, he is always a royal priest), because, as such, he administers the blessings of his covenant to his people, and to this end entering into covenants with them, offering them grace upon the condition of faith and obedience, and then, as their surety, giving them the graces of faith and obedience, that they may fulfill their part.

8. What general method has characterized Christ’s administration of his covenant under all dispensations? The purchased benefits of the covenant are placed in Christ’s hand, to be bestowed upon his people as free and sovereign gifts. From Christ to us they are all gifts, but from us to Christ many of them are duties. Thus, in the administration of the Covenant of Grace, many of these purchased blessings, which are to take effect in our acts, e. g., faith, etc., he demands of us as duties, and promises other benefits as a reward conditioned on our obedience. Thus, so to speak, he rewards grace with grace, and conditions grace, upon grace. Promising faith to his elect, then working faith in them, then rewarding them for its exercise with peace of conscience, joy in the Holy Ghost, and eternal life, etc., etc.

9. What is the Arminian view of the Covenant of Grace?

They hold,

1st., as to the parties of the Covenant of Grace, that God offers it to all men, and that he actually contracts it with all believers.

2nd. As to its promises, that they include all the temporal and eternal benefits of Christ’s redemption.

3rd. As to its conditions, that God now graciously accepts faith and evangelical obedience for righteousness, in the place of that perfect legal obedience he demanded of man under the Covenant of works, the meritorious work of Christ making it consistent with the principles of divine justice for him so to do. They regard all men as rendered by sufficient grace capable of fulfilling such conditions, if they will.

10. In what sense can faith be called a condition of salvation?

Faith is a condition sine qua non of salvation, i. e., no adult man can be saved if he does not believe, and every man that does believe shall be saved. It is, however, a gift of God and the first part or stage of salvation. Viewed on God’s side it is the beginning and index of his saving work in us. Viewed on our side it is our duty, and must be our own act. It is, therefore, as our act, the instrument of our union with Christ, and thus the necessary antecedent, though never the

meritorious cause, of the gracious salvation which follows. Faith as the condition is of course living faith, which necessarily brings forth “confession” and obedience.

11. What are the promises which Christ, as the administrator of the covenant of grace, makes to all those who believe? The promise to Abraham to be a “God to him and to his seed after him” (Genesis 17:7) embraces all others. All things alike, physical and moral, in providence and grace, for time and eternity, are to work together for our good. “All are yours, and ye are Christ’s, and Christ is God’s.”—1 Corinthians 3:22-23. This gospel covenant is often called the “Covenant of Grace” as distinguished from the “Covenant of Redemption.” See above, Q. 3, § 2. “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.”Mark 16:16.

12. Prove that Christ was mediator of men before as well as after his advent in the flesh.

1st. As mediator he is both priest and sacrifice, and as such it is affirmed that he is the “Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,” and a “propitiation for the sins that are past.”Revelation 3:8; Romans 3:25; Hebrews 9:15.

2nd. He was promised to Adam.—Genesis 3:15.

3rd. In the 3rd chapter of Galatians Paul proves that the promise made to Abraham (Genesis 17:7; Genesis 22:18) is the very same gospel that the apostle himself preached. Thus Abraham became the father of those that believe.

4th Acts 10:43.—“To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth on him shall receive remission of sin.”—See Isaiah 53:1-12, also Isaiah 42:6.

5th. The ceremonial institutions of Moses were symbolical and typical of Christ’s work; as symbols they signified Christ’s merit and grace to the ancient worshipper for his present salvation, while as types they prophesied the substance which was to come.—Hebrews 10:1-10; Colossians 2:17.

6th. Christ was the Jehovah of the old dispensation.—See above, Chap. 9., Question 14.

13. Prove that faith was the condition of salvation before the advent of Christ, in the same sense that it is now.

1st. This is affirmed in the Old Testament.—Habakkuk 2:4; Psalms 2:12.

2nd. The New Testament writers illustrate their doctrine of justification by faith by the examples of Old Testament believers.—See Romans 4:1-25 :, and Hebrews 11:1-40 :

14. Show that Christ, as administrator of the Covenant of Grace, gave to the members of the Old Testament Church precisely the same promises that he does to us.

1st. The promises given to Christ’s ancient people clearly embrace all spiritual and eternal blessings, e. g., the promise given to Abraham, Genesis 17:7, as expounded by Christ, Matthew 22:32, and the promise given to Abraham, Genesis 22:18; Genesis 12:3, as expounded by Paul, Galatians 3:16; see also Isaiah 43:25; Ezekiel 36:27; Daniel 12:2-3.

2nd. This is plain also from the expectation and prayers of God’s people.— Psalms 51:1-19 and Psalms 16:1-11; Job 19:24-27; Psalms 73:24-26.

15. How was the covenant of grace administered from Adam to Abraham?

1st. By promise.—Genesis 3:15.

2nd. By means of typical sacrifices instituted in the family of Adam.

3rd. By means of immediate revelations and appearances of the Jehovah, or divine mediator to his people. Thus “the Lord” is represented throughout the first eleven chapters of Genesis as “speaking” to men. That these promises and sacrifices were then understood in their true spiritual intent is proved by Paul.—Hebrews 11:4-7. And that this administration of the covenant of grace reached many of the people of the earth, during this era, is proved by the history of Job in Arabia, of Abraham in Mesopotamia, and of Melchizedek in Canaan.

16. How was it administered from Abraham to Moses?

1st. The promise given during the preceding period (Genesis 3:15), is now renewed in the form of a more definite covenant, revealing the coming Savior as in the line of Abraham’s posterity through Isaac, and the interest of the whole world in his salvation is more fully set forth.—Genesis 17:7; Genesis 22:18. This was the gospel preached beforehand.—Galatians 3:8.

2nd. Sacrifices were continued as before.

3rd. The church, or company of believers, which existed from the beginning in its individual members, was now formed into a general body as an a gathering of families, by the institution of circumcision, as a visible symbol of the benefits of the covenant of grace, and as a badge of church membership.

17. What was the true nature of the covenant made by God with the Israelites through Moses?

It may be regarded in three aspects—

1st. As a national and political covenant, whereby, in a political sense, they became his people, under his theocratic government, and in this peculiar sense he became their God. The church and the state were identical. In one aspect the whole system had reference to this relation.

2nd. It was in one aspect a legal covenant, because the moral law, obedience to which was the condition of the covenant of works, was prominently set forth, and conformity to this law was made the condition of God’s favor, and of all national blessings. Even the ceremonial system in its merely literal, and apart from its symbolical aspect, was also a rule of works for cursed was he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them.—Deuteronomy 27:26.

3rd. But, in the symbolical and typical significance of all the Mosaic institutions, they were a clearer and fuller revelation of the provisions of the Covenant of Grace than had ever before been made. This Paul abundantly proves throughout the Epistle to the Hebrews.—Hodge on Romans.

18. What are the characteristic differences between the dispensation of the Covenant of Grace under the law of Moses and after the advent of Christ?

These differences. of course, relate only to the mode of administration, and not to the matter of the truth revealed, nor of the grace administered.

1st. The truth was then signified by symbols, which, at the same time, were types of the real atonement for sin afterwards to be made. Now the truth is revealed in the plain gospel history.

2nd. That revelation was less full as well as less clear.

3rd. It was so encumbered with ceremonies as to be comparatively a carnal dispensation. The present dispensation is spiritual.

4th. It was confined to one people. The present dispensation, disembarrassed from all national organizations, embraces the whole earth.

5th. The former method of administration was evidently preparatory to the present, which is final. For the Calvinistic view of the “Covenant of Grace,” see Turretin, “Inst. Theo. Elench.,” Loc. 12.; Witsius, “AEcon. of the Covs.” For Arminian view see Fletcher’s works and Richard Watson’s “Inst. of Theo.”

02.23. The Person of Christ

Chapter 23 The Person of Christ

1. How can it be proved that the promised Messiah of the Scriptures has already come, and that Jesus Christ is that person?

We prove that he must have already come by showing that the conditions of time and circumstances, which the prophets declare should mark his advent, are no longer possible. We prove, secondly, that Jesus of Nazareth was that person by showing that every one of those conditions was fulfilled in him.

2. Prove that Genesis 49:10, refers to the Messiah, and show how it proves that the Messiah must have already come. The original word translated Shiloh, signifies peace, and is applied to the Messiah.—Compare Micah 5:2; Micah 5:5. with Matthew 2:6. Besides, it is only to the Messiah that the gathering of the nations is to be.—See Isaiah 55:5; Isaiah 60:3; Haggai 2:7. The Jews, moreover, have always understood this passage as referring to the Messiah.

Up to the time of the birth of Jesus Christ the scepter and the lawgiver did remain with Judah; but seventy years after his birth, at the destruction of Jerusalem, they finally departed. If the advent of the Messiah had not occurred previously this prophecy is false.

3. Do the same with reference to the prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27. This prophecy refers expressly to the Messiah, and to his peculiar and exclusive work. That the seventy weeks here mentioned are to be interpreted weeks of years is certain, 1st., from the fact that it was the Jewish custom so to divide time;

2nd., from the fact that this was precisely the common usage of the prophetical books, see Ezekiel 4:6; Revelation 12:6; Revelation 13:5;

3rd. from the fact that the literal application of the language as seventy common weeks is impracticable. The prophecy is, that seven weeks of years, or forty–nine years from the end of the captivity, the city would be rebuilt. That sixty–two weeks of years, or four hundred and thirty–four years after the rebuilding of the city, the Messiah should appear, and that during the period of one week of years he should confirm the covenant, and in the midst of the week be cut off.

There is some doubt as to the precise date from which the calculation ought to commence. The greatest difference, however, is only ten years, and the most probable date causes the prophecy to coincide precisely with the history of Jesus Christ.

4. What prophecies, relating to the time, place, and circumstances of the birth of the Messiah, have been fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth? As to time, it was predicted that he should come before the scepter departed from Judah (Genesis 49:10), at the end of four hundred and ninety years after the going forth of the command to rebuild Jerusalem, and while the second temple was still standing. Haggai 2:9; Malachi 3:1. As to place and circumstances, he was to be born in Bethlehem

(Micah 5:2), of the tribe of Judah, of the family of David. Jeremiah 23:5-6. He was to be born of a virgin, Isaiah 7:14; and to be preceded by a forerunner.—Malachi 3:1. All these met in Jesus Christ, and can never again be fulfilled in another, since the genealogies of tribes and families have been lost.

5. What remarkable characteristics of the Messiah, as described in the Old Testament, were verified in our Savior?

He was to be a king and conqueror of universal empire, Psalms 2:6 and Psalms 14:1-7; Isaiah 9:6-7; and yet despised and rejected, a man of sorrow, a prisoner, pouring forth is soul unto death. Isaiah 53:1-12 :He was to be a light to lighten the Gentiles, and under his administration the moral condition of the whole earth was to be changed.—Isaiah 42:6; Isaiah 49:6; Isaiah 60:1-22. His death was to be vicarious.—Isaiah 53:5; Isaiah 53:9; Isaiah 53:12. He was to enter the city riding upon an ass.—Zechariah 9:9. He was to be sold for thirty pieces of silver, and his price purchase a potter's field. Zechariah 11:12-13. His garments were to be parted by lot.—Psalms 22:18. They were to give him vinegar to drink.—Psalms 69:21. The very words he was to utter on the cross are predicted, Psalms 22:1; also that he should be pierced, Zechariah 12:10; and make his grave with the wicked and with the rich, Isaiah 53:9.—See Dr. Alexander's "Evidences of Christianity."

6. What peculiar work was the Messiah to accomplish, which has been performed by Christ?

All his mediatorial offices were predicted in substance. He was to do the work of a prophet (Isaiah 13:6; Isaiah 60:3), and that of a priest (Isaiah 53:10), to make reconciliation for sin (Daniel 9:24). As king, he was to administer the several dispensations of his kingdom, closing one and introducing another, sealing up the vision and prophecy, causing the sacrifice and oblation to cease (Daniel 9:24), and setting up a kingdom that should never cease (Daniel 2:44) 7. State the five points involved in the church doctrine as to the Person of Christ.

1st. Jesus of Nazareth was very God, possessing the divine nature and all its essential attributes.

2nd. He is also true man, his human nature derived by generation from the stock of Adam.

3rd. These natures continue united in his Person, yet ever remain true divinity and true humanity, unmixed and as to essence unchanged. So that Christ possesses at once in the unity of his Person two spirits with all their essential attributes, a human consciousness, mind, heart, and will, and a divine consciousness, mind, feeling, and will. Yet it does not become us to attempt to explain the manner in which the two spirits mutually affect each other, or how far they meet in one consciousness, nor how the two wills cooperate in one activity, in the union of the one person.

4th. Nevertheless they constitute as thus united one single Person, and the attributes of both natures belong to the one Person.

5th. This Personality is not a new one constituted by the union of the two natures in the womb of the Virgin, but it is the eternal and immutable Person of the λογο, which in time assumed into itself a nascent human nature, and ever subsequently embraces the human nature with the divine in the Personality which eternally belongs to the latter.

8. How may it be proved that Christ is really a man?

He is called man.—1 Timothy 2:5. His most common title is Son of Man, Matthew 13:37, also seed of the woman, Genesis 3:15; the seed of Abraham, Acts 3:25; Son of David, and fruit of his loins, Luke 1:32; made of a woman.—Galatians 4:4. He had a body, ate, drank, slept, and increased in stature, Luke 2:52; and through a life of thirty–three years was recognized by all men as a true man. He died in agony on the cross, was buried, rose, and proved his identity by physical signs.—Luke 24:36-44. He had a reasonable soul, for he increased in wisdom. He exercised the common feelings of our nature, he groaned in spirit and was troubled, he wept.—John 11:33; John 11:35. He loved Martha and Mary, and the disciple that Jesus loved leaned upon his bosom.—John 13:23. The absolute divinity of Christ has been proved above, Chap. 9.

9. How may it be proved that both these natures constituted but one person? In many passages both natures are referred to, when it is evident that only one person was intended.—Php 2:6-11. In many passages both natures are set forth as united. It is never affirmed that divinity abstractly, or a divine power, was united to, or manifested in a human nature, but of the divine nature concretely, that a divine person was united to a human nature.—Hebrews 2:11-14; 1 Timothy 3:16; Galatians 4:4; Romans 8:3; Romans 1:3-4; Romans 9:5; John 1:14; 1 John 4:3. The union of two natures in one person is also clearly taught by those passages in which the attributes of one nature are predicated of the person, while that person is designated by a title derived from the other nature. Thus human attributes and actions are predicated of Christ in certain passages, while the person of whom these attributes or actions are predicated, is designated by a divine title.—Acts 20:28; Romans 8:32; 1 Corinthians 2:8; Matthew 1:23; Luke 1:31-32; Colossians 1:13-14. On the other hand, in other passages, divine attributes and actions are predicated of Christ, while his person, of whom those attributes are predicated, is designated by a human title. John 3:13; John 6:62; Romans 9:5; Revelation 5:12.

10. What is the general principle upon which those passages are to be explained which designate the person of Christ from one nature, and predicate attributes to it belonging to the other? The person of Christ, constituted of two natures, is one person. He may, therefore, indifferently be designated by divine or human titles, and both divine and human attributes may be truly predicated of him. He is still God when he dies, and still man when he raises his people from their graves.

Mediatorial actions pertain to both natures. It must he remembered, however, that while the person is one, the natures are distinct, as such. What belongs to either nature is attributed to the one person to which both belong, but what is peculiar to one nature is never attributed to the other. God, i. e., the divine person who is at once God and man, gave his blood for his church, i. e., died as to his human nature (Acts 20:28). But human attributes or actions are never asserted of Christ's divine nature, nor are divine attributes or actions ever asserted of his human nature.

11. How have theologians defined the ideas of "nature," a "person" as they are involved in this doctrine? In the doctrine of the Trinity the difficulty is that one spirit exists as three Persons. In the doctrine of the Incarnation the difficulty is that two spirits exist in union as one Person.

"Nature" in this connection has been defined by the terms, "essence,""being,""substance."

"Person" in this connection has been defined as "an individual substance, which is neither part of, nor is sustained by some other thing," or as "an intelligent individual subsistence, per se subsistens." The human nature in Christ never was "per se subsistens," but since it began to be as

a germ generated into personal union with the eternal Second Person of the Godhead, so from the beginning “in altero sustentatur.”

12. What were the elects of this personal union upon the Divine nature of Christ? His divine nature being eternal and immutable, and, of course, incapable of addition, remained essentially unchanged by this union. The whole immutable divine essence continued to subsist as the eternal Personal Word, now embracing a perfect human nature in the unity of his person, and as the organ of his will. Yet thereby is the relation of the divine nature changed to the whole creation, since he has become Emmanuel, “God with us,”“God manifest in the flesh.”

13. What were the effects of that union upon his human nature? The human nature, being perfect after its kind, began to exist in union with the divine nature, and as one constituent of the divine Person, and as such it ever continues unmixed and essentially unchanged human nature. The effect of this union upon Christ human nature, therefore, was—

1st. Exaltation of all human excellencies above the standard of human and of creaturely nature.—John 1:14; John 3:34; Isaiah 12:2.

2nd. Unparalleled exaltation to dignity and glory, above every name that is named, and a community of honor and worship with the divinity in virtue of its union therewith in the one divine Person.

3rd. As in the union of soul and body in the natural person, the soul although absolutely destitute of extension in itself, is in virtue of its union with the body present at once from the crown of the head to the sole of the foot—that is virtually, if not essentially, present in conscious perception and active volition—so through its personal union with the eternal Word is the human nature of Christ, (a) virtually present (although logically in heaven) with his people in the most distant parts of the earth at the same time, sympathizing with each severally as one who has himself also been tempted, (b) rendered practically inexhaustible in all those draughts made upon its energies by the constant exercise of those mediatorial functions which involve both natures.

Hence the church doctrine concerning the “communicatio idiomatum vel proprietatum ” of the two natures of Christ. It is affirmed in the concrete in respect to the person, but denied in the abstract in respect to the natures; it is affirmed utrius natural ad personam, but denied utrius naturoe ad naturam.

14. To what extent is the human nature of Christ included in the worship due to him?

We must distinguish between the object and the grounds of worship. There can be no proper ground of worship, except the possession of divine attributes. The object of worship is not the divine excellence in the abstract, but the divine person Of whom that excellence is an attribute. The God–man, consisting of two natures, is to be worshipped in the perfection of his entire person, because only of his divine attributes.

15. State the analogy presented in the union of two natures in the persons of men.

1st. Every human person comprehends two distinct natures, (a) a conscious, self–acting, self–determined spirit absolutely without extension in space, and (b) an extended highly organized body composed of passive matter.

2nd. These constitute but one person. The body is part of the person.

3rd. These natures remain distinct, the attributes of the spirit never being made common to the material body, nor the attributes of the body to the spirit, but the attributes of both body and spirit are common to the one person. The person is often designated by a title proper to one nature while the predicate is proper to the other nature.

4th. The spirit is the person. When the spirit leaves the body the latter is buried as a corpse, while the former goes to judgment. At the resurrection the spirit will resume the corpse into the person.

5th. While in union the person possesses and exercises the attributes of both natures. And in virtue of the union the unextended spirit is present virtually wherever the extended body is, and the inert insensible matter of the nerve tissues thrill with feeling and throb with will as organs of the feeling and willing soul.

16. What is the peculiar view as to the “communicatio idiomatum ” introduced into theology by the Lutherans? and state the reasons for not accepting it. In connection with, and in the process of maintaining, his peculiar view as to the presence of the very substance of Christ’s body and blood in, with, and under the bread and the wine in the Eucharist, Luther and his followers introduced and elaborated a doctrine that, in consequence of the hypostatic union of the divine natures in the one person of Christ, each nature shares in the essential attributes of the other nature. When they came to explain the matter more fully, they did not affirm that any distinctive attribute of humanity was shared by the divinity, nor that the human nature shared all the attributes of the divine; they affirmed in detail simply that the humanity shared with the divine in its omniscience, omnipresence, and power of giving life. The advocates of this doctrine were divided into two schools:

1st. The most extreme and logically consistent, represented by John Brentz and the theologians of Tubingen. These maintained that the every act of incarnation effected, as the essence of the personal union, the participation of each nature in the properties of the other. From his conception in the womb of the Virgin the human nature of Christ was inalienably endowed with all the divine majesty, and all those properties which constitute it. These were necessarily exercised from the first., but not manifested during his earthly life, their exercise being hidden. The facts of Christ’s life during his estate of humiliation are therefore explained by a voluntary Krypsis, or hiding of the divine properties of his humanity.

2nd. The other less extreme view was represented by Martin Chemnitz, and the theologians of Giessen. They held also, that, by the very act of incarnation the humanity of Christ was endowed with divine perfections. That as to his relation to space, “Logos icon extra carnem, et caro non extra Logon(The Logos is not beyond the fleash, and the flesh is not beyond the Logos).” Yet they taught that the exercise of these perfections was not necessary, but subject to the will of the divine person, who causes his human nature to be present wherever and whenever he wills, and who during the period of his humiliation on earth voluntarily emptied (Kenosis) his human nature of its use and exercise of its divine attributes. Prof. A. B. Bruce, D.D., “Humiliation of Christ,” Lecture 3.—“The Lutherans held the exaltation of the humanity to meet the divinity, and (while on earth) the Kenosis of the humanity. The Reformed insisted on the reality of the human life of Christ, and the self–emptying (Kenosis) of the divinity to meet the humanity. The Lutherans held the double

life of the glorified humanity (the local presence and the illocal omnipresence). The Reformed tendency was to recognize a double life of the Logos— totus extra Jesum, and totus in Jesu."

We reject the Lutheran view because—

1st. It is not taught in the Bible. It really rests upon their mistaken interpretation of the words of Christ—"This is my body."

2nd. It is impossible to reconcile it with the phenomena of Christ's earthly life. It increases the difficulties of the problem it was invented to explain.

3rd. It virtually destroys the incarnation by assimilating the human nature to the divine in the co–partnership of properties, whereby it is virtually abrogated, and in effect only the divine remains.

4th. It involves the fallacy of conceiving of properties as separable from the substances of which they are the active powers, and thus is open to the same criticisms as the doctrine of transubstantiation.

17. How can it be shown that the doctrine of the incarnation is a fundamental doctrine of the Gospel?

1st. This doctrine, and all the elements thereof; is set forth in the Scriptures with preeminent clearness and prominence.

2nd. Its truth is essentially involved in every other doctrine of the entire system of faith; in every mediatorial act of Christ, as prophet, priest and king; in the whole history of his estate of humiliation, and in every aspect of his estate of exaltation; and, above all, in the significance and value of that vicarious sacrifice which is the heart of the gospel. If Christ is not in the same person both God and man, he either could not die, or his death could not avail. If he be not man, his whole history is a myth; if he be not God, to worship him is idolatry, y et not to worship him is to disobey the Father.—John 5:23.

3rd. Scripture expressly declares that this doctrine is essential.—1 John 4:2-3.

18. In what Creeds and by what Councils has this doctrine been most accurately defined?

1st. The Creed of the Council of Nice, amended by the Council of Constantinople, and the Athanasian Creed, and the Creed of the Council of Chalcedon, are accurate and authoritative statements of the whole church as to this doctrine. They are all to be found above, Ch. 7.

2nd. The decision of the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, condemning the Nestorians, and affirming the unity of the Person; the decision of the Council of Chalcedon (451) against Eutyches, affirming the distinction of natures; and the decision of the Council of Constantinople (681) against the Monothelites, affirming that Christ's human nature retains in its unimpaired integrity a separate will as well as intelligence, closed the gradually perfected definition of the church doctrine as to the Person of Christ, and have been accepted by all Protestants.

19. How may 3rd. Heresies on this subject be classified? As they seek relief from the impossibility which reason experiences in the effort fully to comprehend the mutual consistency of all the

elements of this doctrine (1) in the denial of the divine element, (2) or in the denial of the human element in its reality and integrity, or (3) in the denial of the unity of the person embracing both natures.

20. What parties have held that Jesus was a mere man? In the early church the Ebionites, and the Alogi. At the time of the Reformation the Socinians. In latter times Rationalists and Unitarians. for an account of their history and doctrines, see above, Ch. 6., Q. 11, and Q. 13, and below, at the close of this chapter.

21. What parties denied Christ's true humanity and on what grounds?

These speculations were all of Gnostic origin. Hence came the conviction that matter was inherently evil, and that innumerable AEons, or great spiritual emanations from the absolute God, mediate between him and the actual world. πνευματα come from God, but matter is self–existent, and the animal souls of men come from some being less than God. Hence the Docetae (from δοκεω to think, to appear) held that the human nature (body and soul) of Christ was a mere φαντασμα, or appearance, having no real substantial existence. It was a mere vision or phantom through which the Logos chose to manifest himself to mankind for a time.

22. State the Apollinarian Heresy.

Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, circum. 370, of general repute for orthodoxy and learning, taught that as man naturally consists of a body, σωμα, and an animal soul, ψυκη, and a rational soul, πνευμα, all comprehended in one person, so in Christ the divine logos takes the place of the human πνευμα, and his one person consists of the divine πνευμα, or reasonable soul, and the human animal soul and body. He thus gets rid of the difficulty attending the coexistence of two rational, self–conscious, self–determining spirits in one person, and at the same time destroys the revealed fact that Christ is at once very man and very God. This was condemned by the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381.

23. What was the Nestorian Heresy? This term rather expresses an exaggerated, one–sided tendency of speculation on this subject than a positive definable false doctrine. It is the tendency to so emphasize the distinction of the two complete, unmodified natures in Christ, as to throw into the shade the equally revealed fact of the unity of his Person. This tendency was most conspicuous in the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the leader of the Antiochian school, and from him it became the general character of that school. The theology of the Eastern Church of the fourth and fifth centuries was divided between the two great rival schools of Alexandria and Antioch. "In the Alexandrian school, an intuitive mode of thought inclining to the mystical; in the Antiochian, a logical reflective bent of the understanding predominated."—Neander, "Hist.," Torrey's Trans., Vol. 2., p. 352.

Nestorius, who had been a monk at Antioch, became patriarch of Constantinople. He disapproved of the phrase, "Mother of God"θεοτοκο, as applied to the Virgin, maintaining that Mary had given birth to Christ but not to God. Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, opposed him, and both pronounced anathemas against each other. Nestorius supposed, in accordance with the Antiochian mode of thought, that the divine and the human natures of Christ ought to be distinctly separated, and admitted only a συναφεια(junction) of the one and the other, an ενοικησι(indwelling) of the Deity. Cyril, on the contrary, was led by the tendencies of the Egyptian (Alexandrian) school, to maintain

the perfect union of the two natures φυσικη ενωσι. Nestorius, as the representative of his party, was condemned by the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431.—Hagenbach's "Hist. of Doct.," Vol. 1., § 100.

24. What was the Eutychian or Monophysite Heresy?

Eutyches was an abbot at Constantinople, and an extreme disciple of Dioscuros, the successor of Cyril. He pressed the opposition to the Nestorians to the length of confounding the two natures of Christ, and hence holding that Christ possessed but one nature, resulting from the union of Divinity with humanity. They were styled Monophysites. They were condemned by the Council of Chalcedon (A. D. 451), which adopted the statement communicated by Leo the Great, bishop of Rome, to Flavian, patriarch of Constantinople. "Totus in suis, totus in nostris."

25. What was the doctrine of the Monothelites? The Emperor Heraclius attempted to reunite the Monophysites with the orthodox Church by adopting, as a compromise, the decision of the Council of Chalcedon as the coexistence of two distinct natures in the one Person of Christ, with the amendment that there was in consequence of the personal union but one divine–human energy (ενεργεια) and but one will in Christ. In opposition to this the sixth (Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (A. D. 681), with the cooperation of the bishop of Rome, adopted the doctrine of two wills in Christ, and two energies, as the orthodox doctrine, but decided that the human will must always be conceived as subordinate to the divine.—Hagenbach, "Hist. of Doct.," § 104. With this decision the definition of this doctrine, as received by the whole church, Greek, Roman, and Protestant, was closed.

26. What is the modern doctrine of Kenosis? The old Socinian doctrine teaches that Jesus, a true man after his ascension, becomes the subject of an apotheosis, whereby he is exalted into a condition and rank between that of God and the universe. The Eutychians taught that the human nature was absorbed by and assimilated to the divine. The Lutherans taught that the human nature was endowed with the properties of the divine. The modern doctrine of Kenosis is that instead of man becoming God, or being personally united to divinity, God literally became man. It is taught with various modifications by Drs. Thomasius, Hofmann, Ebrard, Martensen, and others, and very clearly by Dr. W. F. Gess in a work translated admirably by Dr. J. A. Reubelt, of Indiana. The term signifies a voluntary emptying of himself; of his divinity, by the Logos. It is derived from Php 2:7, εαυτον εκενωσε, "he emptied himself;" and is supported by such declarations as John 1:14. "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us."

I. The Father alone is from himself. He eternally communicates the fullness of his divine essence and perfections to the Son, thus giving to him to have life in himself. The Son thus eternally flowing from the Father unites with the Father in communicating their fullness to the Spirit, and is himself the life of the world.

II. "But the Logos is God; he has life in himself even as the Father; his volition to receive life from the Father is the source of his life; his self–consciousness is his own act. Hence it follows that he can suspend his self–consciousness."

III. In condescending to be conceived of the Virgin, the Logos laid aside his self–consciousness, and with it the communication of the Father's life to the Son, by which the Son has life in himself even as the Father, and hence his omniscience, omnipresence, and omnipotent government of the

world was suspended.

IV. When the substance of the Logos awoke to self–consciousness as the infant Jesus, it was as a true human infant, and he grew and developed in knowledge and powers, as a true man without sin, endowed with preeminent grace and the fullness of the indwelling Spirit of God.

V. When glorified the ante–mundane eternal communication of the fullness of divine life from the Father to the Logos recommenced, and though continuing truly human, he is no less truly God. He is again eternal, omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent. “Thus a man is received into the trinitarian life of the Deity, from and by the glorification of the Son.”—“Script. Doc. Pers. Christ. Gess.,” by Reubelt. This doctrine.—

1st. Does violence to the infinite perfections and immutability of the divine nature.

2nd. It is not consistent with the Scriptural fact that Christ, while on earth, was real and absolute God.

3rd. It is not consistent with the fact that the humanity of Christ was real humanity generated of the seed of Abraham.

4th. It is confessedly different from the immemorial and universal faith of the Church. For a thorough discussion, see Dr. A. B. Bruce’s “Humiliation of Christ.”

AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS. The GREEK, ROMAN, and PROTESTANT Churches all agree in accepting the definitions of the Creeds, those of Nice and of Chalcedon and the Athanasian (so called).—See above Chap. 7. The LUTHERAN DOCTRINE as to the Relations of the two Natures.

“Formula Concordioe,” Pars. 1., Epitome, ch. 8, §§ 11 and 12.— “Therefore not only as God, but also as man, he knows all things, and had power to do all things, is present to all creatures, and has all things which are in heaven, on earth, and under the earth, under his feet, and in his hands. ‘All things are given to me in heaven and On earth’ and ‘he ascended above all heavens, and fills all things.’ Being everywhere present, he is able to exercise this his power, neither is anything to him either impossible or unknown. Hence, moreover, and most easily, is he being present, able to distribute his true body and blood in the sacred Supper. But this is done not according to the mode and property of human nature, but according to the mode and property of the right hand of God. . . . And this presence of Christ in the sacred Supper is neither physical nor earthly, nor capernaitish (see John 6:52-59), nevertheless, it is most true and substantial.”

Pars. 2 (“Solida Declaratio ”), ch. 8, § 4.—“For that communion of natures, and of properties, is not the result of an essential, or natural effusion of the properties of the divine nature upon the human:as if the humanity of Christ had them subsisting independently and separate from divinity, or as, if by that communion, the human nature of Christ had laid aside its natural properties, and was either converted into the divine nature, or was made equal in itself, and per se to the divine nature by those properties thus communicated, or that the natural properties and operations were identical or even equal. For these and like errors have justly been rejected, etc.”

Luther says, “Where you put God, there you must put the humanity (of Christ), they cannot be sundered or riven; it is one person, and the humanity is more closely united with God than is our skin with our flesh, yea, more intimately than body with soul.”

Confessio Helvetica Posteri ch. sit—“We acknowledge, therefore, that in one and the same Lord Jesus Christ, there are two natures, and we say that these are so conjoined and united that they are not absorbed, nor confused nor mixed; but are rather united and conjoined in one person, being preserved with their permanent properties; so that we worship one Lord the Christ, and not two; one we say, true God and man according to his divine nature consubstantial with the Father, and according to his human nature consubstantial with us men, and in all things like us, sin excepted. Therefore, as we abominate the Nestorian dogma making two out of one Christ, and dissolving the union of the Person so, also, we heartily execrate the madness of Eutyches and of the Monophysites and the Monothelites, expunging the property of the human nature. Therefore, we in no wise teach that the divine nature in Christ suffered, or that Christ according to his human nature has hitherto been in this world, and so is everywhere. ”

“West. Con.,” Ch. 8, § 2.—“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, and all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin:being conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of her substance. So that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the Godhead and the 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 man.”

02.24. Mediatorial Office of Christ.

Chapter 24 Mediatorial Office of Christ.

1. What are the different senses of the word Mediator, and in which of these senses is it used when applied to Christ?

1st. In the sense of internuntius or messenger, to explain the will and to perform the commands of one or both the contracting parties, e. g., Moses, Galatians 3:19.

2nd. In the sense of simple advocate or intercessor, pleading the cause of the offending in the presence of the offended party.

3rd. In the sense of efficient peace–maker. Christ, as Mediator, 1st., has all power and judgment committed to his hands, Matthew 28:18; Matthew 9:6; John 5:22; John 5:25-27; and,

2nd., he efficiently makes reconciliation between God and man by an all–satisfactory expiation and meritorious obedience.

2. Why was it necessary that the Mediator should be possessed both of a divine and human nature?

1st. It was clearly necessary that the Mediator should be God.

(1.) That he might be independent, and not the mere creature of either party, or otherwise he could not be the efficient maker of peace.

(2.) That he might reveal God and his salvation to men, “for no man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.”—Matthew 11:27; John 1:18.

(3.) That being, as to person, above all law, and as to dignity of nature, infinite, he might render to the law in behalf of his people a free obedience, which he did not otherwise owe for himself, and that his obedience and suffering might possess an infinite value.

(4.) That be might possess the infinite wisdom, knowledge, and power requisite to administer the infinite realms of providence and grace, which are committed to his hands as mediatorial prince.

2nd. It is clearly necessary that he should be man.

(1.) That he might truly represent man as the second Adam.

(2.) That he might be made under the law, in order to render obedience, suffering, and temptation possible.—Galatians 4:4-5; Luke 4:1-13

(3.) “In all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest.”Hebrews 2:17-18; Hebrews 4:15-16.

(4.) That in his glorified humanity he might be the head of the glorified church, the example and pattern to whom his people are “predestined to be conformed, that he might be the first–born among many brethren.”—Romans 8:29.

3. What diversity of opinion exists as to whether Christ acts as Mediator in one or both natures? The Romanists hold that Christ was Mediator only in his human nature, arguing that it is impossible that God could mediate between man and himself The very opposite has been maintained, viz., that Christ was Mediator only in his divine nature. The doctrine of the Bible is, that Christ was Mediator as the God–man, in both natures.

4. How may the acts of Christ be classified with reference to his two natures?

Theologians have properly distinguished (vide Turretin, in loco) between the person who acts and the nature or inward energy whereby he acts.

Thus we affirm of the one man, that he thinks and that he walks. The same person performs these two classes of action so radically distinct, in virtue of the two natures embraced in his single person. So the single person of the God–man performs all actions involving the attributes of a divine nature in virtue of his divine nature, and all actions involving the attributes of a human nature in virtue of his human nature.

5. How can it be proved that he was Mediator, and acted as such both in his divine and human natures?

1st. From the fact that the discharge of each of the three great functions of the mediatorial office, the prophetical, priestly, and kingly, involves the attributes of both natures, as has been fully proved under Question 2.

2nd. From the fact that the Bible attributes all his acts as Mediator to the one person, viewed as embracing both natures. The person is often designated by a term derived from the attributes of one nature, while the mediatorial action attributed to that person is plainly performed in virtue of the other nature embraced within it.—See Acts 20:28; 1 Corinthians 2:8; Hebrews 9:14.

3rd. From the fact that he was Mediator from the foundation of the earth (see Chapter 22., Question 11), it is clear that he was not Mediator in his human nature alone; and from the fact that the Eternal Word became incarnate, in order to prepare himself for the full discharge of his mediatorial work (Hebrews 2:17-18), it is equally plain that he was not Mediator in his divine nature alone.

6. In what sense do the Romanists regard saints and angels as mediators?

They do not attribute either to saints or angels the work of propitiation proper. Yet they hold that the merits of the saint are the ground and measure of the efficiency of his intercession, as in the case of Christ.

7. To what extent do they ascribe a mediatorial character to their priests? The Protestant holds that the church is composed of a company of men united to one another in virtue of the immediate union of each with Christ the head. The Romanist holds, on the contrary, that each individual member is united immediately to the church, and through the church to Christ. Their priests,

therefore, of the true apostolic succession, subject to apostolic bishops, being the only authorized dispensers of the sacraments, and through them of Christ's grace, are mediators—

1st. Between the individual and Christ, the necessary link of union with him.

2nd. In their offering the sacrifice of the Mass, and making therein a true propitiation for the venial sins of the people. Christ's great sacrifice having atoned for original sin, and laid the foundation for the propitiatory virtue which belongs to the Mass.

3rd. In their being eminent intercessors.

8. How can it be proved that Christ is our only Mediator in the proper sense of the term?

1st. Direct testimony of Scripture.—1 Timothy 2:5.

2nd. Because the Scriptures show forth Christ as fulfilling in our behalf every mediatorial function that is necessary, alike propitiation and advocacy, 1 John 2:1; on earth and in heaven, —Hebrews 9:12; Hebrews 9:24; Hebrews 7:25.

3rd. Because in virtue of the infinite dignity of his person and perfection of his nature, all these functions were discharged by him exhaustively.—Hebrews 10:14; Colossians 2:10.

4th. Because there is "complete" salvation in him, and no salvation in any other, and no man can come to the Father except through him.—John 14:6; Acts 4:12.

5th. There is no room for any mediator between the indi– vidual and Christ—(l) because he is our "brother" and sympathizing high priest, who invites every man immediately to himself, Matthew 11:28; (2) because the work of drawing men to Christ belongs to the Holy Ghost.—John 6:44; John 16:14.

9. What relation do the Scriptures represent the Holy Ghost as sustaining to the mediatorial work of Christ?

1st. Begetting and replenishing his human nature.—Luke 1:35; Luke 2:40; John 3:34; Psalms 45:7.

2nd. All Christ's mediatorial functions were fulfilled in the Spirit; his prophetical teachings, his priestly sacrifice, and his kingly administrations. The Spirit descended upon him at his baptism, Luke 3:22; and led him into the wilderness to be tempted, Matthew 4:1; he returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee, Luke 4:14; through the eternal Spirit he offered himself without spot to God.—Hebrews 9:14.

3rd. The dispensation of the Spirit, as "the Spirit of truth,""the Sanctifier," and "the Comforter," vests in Christ as Mediator, as part of the condition of the covenant of grace.—John 15:26; John 16:7; John 7:39; Acts 2:33.

4th. The Holy Spirit thus dispensed by Christ as Mediator acts for him, and leads to him in teaching, quickening, sanctifying, preserving, and acting all grace in his people. As Christ when on earth led only to the Father, so the Holy Ghost now leads only to Christ.—John 15:26; John 6:13-14; Acts 5:32; 1 Corinthians 12:3.

5th. While Christ as Mediator is said to be our “παρακλητο,”“advocate,” with the Father (1 John 2:1), the Holy Ghost is said to be our “παρακλητο,”“advocate,” translated “Comforter”on earth, to abide with us forever, to teach us the things of Christ, and to hold a controversy with the world.—John 14:16; John 14:26; John 15:26; John 16:7-9.

6th. While Christ is said to be our Mediator to make inter– cession for us in heaven, Hebrews 7:25; Romans 8:34, the Holy Ghost, by forming thoughts and desires within us according to the will of God, is said to make intercession for us with unutterable groanings.—Romans 8:26-27.

7th. The sum of the whole is, “We have introduction to the Father through the Son by the Spirit.”—Ephesians 2:18.

10. On what ground are the threefold offices of prophet, priest, and king applied to Christ?

1st. Because these three functions are all equally necessary, and together exhaust the whole mediatorial work.

2nd. Because the Bible ascribes all of these functions to Christ. Prophetical, Deuteronomy 18:15; Deuteronomy 18:18; compare Acts 3:22; Acts 7:37; Hebrews 1:2; priestly, Psalms 110:4, and the whole Epistle to the Hebrews; kingly, Acts 5:31; 1 Timothy 6:15; Revelation 17:14.

It is always to be remembered that these are not three offices, but three functions of the one indivisible office of mediator. These functions are abstractly most distinguishable, but in the concrete and in their exercise they qualify one another in every act. Thus, when he teaches, he is essentially a royal and priestly teacher, and when he rules he is a priestly and prophetical king, and when he either atones or intercedes he is a prophetical and kingly priest.

These were first grouped together as belonging to Christ by Eusebius (261–340), Bk. I, ch 3.—“So that all these have a reference to the true Christ, the divine and heavenly Word, the only high priest of all men, the only king of all creation, and the father’s only supreme Prophet of prophets.”

11. What is the Scriptural sense of the word prophet? Its general sense is one who speaks for another with authority as interpreter. Thus Moses was prophet for his brother Aaron.—Exodus 7:1. A prophet of God is one qualified and authorized to speak for God to men. Foretelling future events is only incidental.

12. How does Christ execute the office of a prophet?

I. Immediately in his own person, as when (1) on earth with his disciples, and (2) the light of the new Jerusalem in the midst of the throne.—Revelation 21:23.

II. Mediately, 1st., through his Spirit, (1) by inspiration, (2) by spiritual illumination.

2nd. Through the officers of his church, (1) those inspired as apostles and prophets, and (2) those naturally endowed, as the stated ministry.—Ephesians 4:11.

III. Both externally, as through his word and works addressed to the understanding, and, IV. Internally, by the spiritual illumination of the heart.—1 John 2:20; 1 John 5:20.

V. In three grand successive stages of development. (a) Before his incarnation; (b) since his incarnation; (c) throughout eternity in glory.—Revelation 7:17; Revelation 21:23.

13. How can it be proved that he acted as such before his incarnation?

1st. His divine title of Logos, “Word,” as by nature as well as office the eternal Revealer.

2nd. It has been before proved (Chap. 22., Question 11, and Chap. 9., Question 14) that he was the Jehovah of the Old Testament economy. Called Counselor.—Isaiah 9:6. Angel of the Covenant.—Malachi 3:1. Interpreter.—Job 33:23.

3rd. The fact is directly affirmed in the New Testament.—1 Peter 1:11.

14. What is essential to the priestly office, or what is a priest in the Scriptural sense of that term? As the general idea of a prophet is, one qualified and authorized to speak for God to men, so the general idea of a priest is, one qualified and authorized to treat in behalf of men with God. A priest, therefore, must—

1st. Be taken from among men to represent them.—Hebrews 5:1-2; Exodus 28:9; Exodus 28:12; Exodus 28:21; Exodus 28:29.

2nd. Chosen by God as his special election and property.— Numbers 16:5; Hebrews 5:4.

3rd. Holy, morally pure and consecrated to the Lord.—Leviticus 21:6; Leviticus 21:8; Psalms 106:16; Exodus 39:30-31.

4th. They have a right to draw near to Jehovah, and to bring near, or offer sacrifice, and to make intercession.—Numbers 16:5; Exodus 19:22; Leviticus 16:3; Leviticus 16:7; Leviticus 16:12; Leviticus 16:15. The priest, therefore, was essentially a mediator, admitted from among men to stand before God, for the purpose, 1st., of propitiation by sacrifice, Hebrews 5:1-3; and,

2nd., of intercession, Luke 1:10; Exodus 30:8; Revelation 5:8; Revelation 8:3-4. Taken from Fairbairn’s “Typology,” Vol. IT., Part 3., Chap. 3.

15. Prove from the Old Testament that Christ was truly a priest.

1st. It is expressly declared.—Compare Psalms 110:4, with Hebrews 5:1; Hebrews 6:20; Zechariah 6:13.

2nd. Priestly functions are ascribed to him.—Is. 53:10,12; Daniel 9:24-25.

3rd. The whole meaning and virtue of the temple, of its services, and of the Levitical priesthood, lay in the fact that they were all typical of Christ and his work as priest. This Paul clearly proves in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

16. Show from the New Testament that all the requisites of a priest were found in him.

1st. Christ was a man taken from among men to represent them before God.—Hebrews 2:16; Hebrews 4:15.

2nd. He was chosen by God.—Hebrews 5:5-6.

3rd. He was perfectly holy.—Luke 1:35; Hebrews 7:26.

4th. He had the right of the nearest access, and the greatest influence with the Father.—John 16:28; John 11:42; Hebrews 1:3; Hebrews 9:11-14; Hebrews 9:24.

17. Show that he actually performed all the duties of the office. The duty of the priest is to mediate by (1) propitiation, (2) intercession.

1st. He mediated in the general sense of the word.—John 14:6; 1 Timothy 2:5; Hebrews 8:6; Hebrews 12:24.

2nd. He offered propitiation.—Ephesians 5:2; Hebrews 9:26; Hebrews 10:12; 1 John 2:2.

3rd. He offered intercession.—Romans 8:34; Hebrews 7:25; 1 John 2:1. That this propitiatory work of Christ was real, and not metaphorical, is evident from the fact that it superseded the temple services, which were only typical of it. A type and shadow necessarily presupposes a. literal substance.—Hebrews 9:10-12; Hebrews 10:1; Colossians 2:17.

18. What part of his priestly work did Christ execute on earth, and what part in heaven? On earth he rendered obedience, propitiation, intercession. Hebrews 5:7-9; Hebrews 9:26; Hebrews 9:28; Romans 5:19. In heaven he has presented his sacrifice in the most holy place, and ever liveth to make intercession for us.—Hebrews 7:24-25; Hebrews 9:12; Hebrews 9:24.

19. In what respects did the priesthood of Christ excel the Aaronic?

1st. In the dignity of his person. They were mere men. He was the eternal Son. They were sinners who had first to make atonement for their own sin, and afterwards for the sin of the people. He was holy, harmless and undefiled.—Hebrews 7:26-27. He was perfect man, and yet his access to God was infinitely nearer than that of any other being.—John 10:30; Zechariah 13:7.

2nd. In the infinite value of his sacrifice. Theirs could not cleanse from sin, Hebrews 10:4, and were repeated continually.—Hebrews 10:1-3. His sacrifice was perfectly efficacious, and once for all.—Hebrews 10:10-14. Thus theirs were only the shadow of his.—Hebrews 10:1.

3rd. In the manner of their consecration. They without, he with an oath.—Hebrews 7:20-22.

4th. They, being many, succeeded each other by generation. He continueth forever.—Hebrews 7:24.

5th. Christ's priesthood is connected with a "greater and more perfect tabernacle," earth the outer court, heaven the true sanctuary.—Hebrews 9:11-24.

6th. Christ's intercession is offered from a throne.—Romans 8:34, and Hebrews 8:1-2.

7th. While several of the Old Testament servants of God were at once both prophet and king, as David; and others both prophet and priest, as Ezra; Christ alone, and that in divine perfection, was at once prophet, priest, and king. Thus his divine, prophetical, and kingly perfections qualified and enhanced the transcendent virtue of every priestly act.—Zechariah 6:13.

20. In what sense was Christ a priest after the order of Melchizedek? The Aaronic priesthood was typical of Christ, but in two principal respects it failed in representing the great antitype.

1st. It consisted of succeeding generations of mortal men.

2nd. It consisted of priests not royal. The Holy Ghost, on the other hand, suddenly brings Melchizedek before us in the patriarchal history, a royal priest, with the significant names "King of

Righteousness ”and “King of Peace,”Genesis 14:18-20, and as suddenly withdraws him. Whence he comes and whither he goes we know not. As a private man he had an unwritten history, like others. But as a royal priest he ever remains without father, without mother, without origin, succession, or end; and therefore, as Paul says, Hebrews 7:3, made beforehand of God, an exact type of the eternity of the priesthood of Christ, Psalms 110:4. The prophecy was, “Thou shalt be a priest forever,” or an eternal priest “after the order of Melchizedek.” The similitude of this type, therefore, included two things:

1st., an everlasting priesthood;

2nd., the union of the kingly and priestly functions in one person.—Fairbairn’s “Typology,” Vol. 2., Part 3., Chap. 3.

21. How can it be proved that the Christian ministry is not a priesthood?

1st. Human priests were ever possible only as types, but types are possible only before the revelation of the antitype. The purpose of the Aaronic priesthood was fulfilled in Christ, and therefore the institution was forever abolished by Christ. Hebrews 10:1; Hebrews 10:9; Hebrews 10:18.

2nd. Christ exhaustively discharges all the duties and purposes of the priestly office, so that any human priest (so–called) is an antichrist.—Hebrews 10:14; Colossians 2:10.

3rd. There can be no need of any priest to open the way for us to Christ. Because, while the Scriptures teach us that we can only go to God by Christ, John 14:6, they teach us no less emphatically that we must come immediately to Christ, Matthew 11:28; John 5:40; John 7:37; Revelation 3:20; Revelation 22:17.

4th. No priestly function is ever attributed to any New Testament officer, inspired or uninspired, extraordinary or ordinary. The whole duty of all these officers of every kind is comprised in the functions of teaching and ruling.—1 Corinthians 12:28; Ephesians 4:11-12; 1 Timothy 3:1-13; 1 Peter 5:2.

5th. They are constantly called by different designations, expressive of an entirely different class of functions, as “messengers, watchmen, heralds of salvation, teachers, rulers, overseers, shepherds, and elders.”—See “Bib. Repertory,” Jan., 1845.

22. In what sense are all believers priests?

Although there cannot be in the Christian church any class of priests standing between their brethren and Christ, yet in consequence of the union, both federal and vital, which every Christian sustains to Christ, which involves fellowship with him in all of his human graces, and in all of his mediatorial functions and prerogatives, every believer has part in the priesthood of his head in such a sense that he has immediate access to God through Christ, even into the holiest of all, Hebrews 10:19-22; and that being sanctified and spiritually qualified, he may there offer up, as a “holy priest,” a “royal priest,” spiritual sacrifices, not expiatory, but the oblation of praise, supplication, and thanksgiving, through Jesus Christ, and intercession for living friends, Hebrews 13:15; 1 Timothy 2:1-2; 1 Peter 2:5; 1 Peter 2:9.

They are by equal reason also prophets and kings in fellowship with Christ.—1 John 2:20; John 16:13; Revelation 1:6; Revelation 5:10.

AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS.

Catholic Doctrine of the Christian Priesthood.—“Council of Trent.” Sess. 23, ch. 1.—“Sacrifice and priesthood are, by the ordinance of God, in such wise conjoined, as that both have existed in every law. Whereas, therefore, in the New Testament, the Catholic Church has received, from the institution of Christ, the holy visible sacrifice of the Eucharist, it must needs also be confessed, that there is, in that church, a new, visible, and external priesthood, into which the old has been translated. And the sacred Scriptures show, and the traditions of the Catholic Church have always taught, that this priesthood was instituted by the same Lord our Savior, and that to the apostles, and their successors in the priesthood, was the power delivered of consecrating, offering, and administering his body and blood, as also of forgiving and of retaining sins.”

Protestant Doctrine.—“Confession Helv.,” 2. cap. 18.—“The priestly office and the ministerial office differ exceedingly from each other. The former is common to all Christians, the latter is not. . . . In the New Testament of Christ there is no more such a priesthood as that which existed among the ancient people, which had an external unction sacred vestments, and numerous ceremonies, which were types of Christ, who by coming and fulfilling them has abrogated all these things. But he remains eternally the only priest, and lest we should derogate aught from him, we give the name of priest to none of the class of ministers. For our Lord himself has not ordained in the church of the New Testament any priests to offer daily the sacrifice of his body and blood but only ministers to preach and to administer the sacraments.”

Socinian Doctrine as to the Mediatorial Offices of Christ.—The Racovian Catechism teaches that Christ is both Prophet, Priest, and King. But it occupies one hundred and eighty pages (Section 5.) in discussing his Prophetical office, and only eleven pages (Section 6.) in discussing his Priestly, and nine pages (Section 7.) his Kingly office. His death and the manner in which it contributes to our salvation is discussed (See. 5. ch. 8.) under the head of his Prophetical office, while his Priestly work though vaguely stated, is made to consist chiefly in his appearing in heaven as our advocate, his intercession being rendered prevalent with God by his virtues and sufferings as a martyr.

02.25. The Atonement:its Nature, Necessity, Perfection, and Extent.

Chapter 25 The Atonement:its Nature, Necessity, Perfection, and Extent.

I. The Nature of the Atonement.

1. Define the usage and true meaning of the different terms used in the discussion of this topic.

1st. The present word used to designate the precise nature of Christ's work of self–sacrifice on the cross is "ATONEMENT." In the Old Testament, it is used frequently to translate the Hebrew word ■■■■■■, to cover by an atoning sacrifice. In the English New Testament it occurs but once, Romans 5:11, and there translates the Greek word καταλλαγη, reconciliation. Its proper meaning is to make moral or legal reparation for a fault, or injury. In its Old Testament and proper theological usage, it expresses not the reconciliation effected by Christ, but that legal satisfaction which is the ground of that reconciliation. Its sense is too limited to express adequately the full nature of Christ's work as our Substitute, because while it properly denotes the expiation of guilt effected by suffering the penalty of sin, it fails entirely to express the fact that Christ also merited for us the positive reward of eternal life by his active obedience.

2nd. The old word used by the divines of the seventeenth century was "SATISFACTION." This accurately and adequately expresses what Christ did. As the Second Adam he satisfied all the conditions of the broken covenant of works, as left by the first Adam. (a.) He suffered the penalty of transgression. (b.) He rendered that obedience which was the condition of "life."

3rd. The distinction between a PENAL AND A FINANCIAL SATISFACTION. The first concerns crime and person, the other concerns debt and things. They differ.

(1.) In crime the demand terminates upon the person of the criminal; in debt upon the thing due.

(2.) In crime the demand is for that kind, degree, and duration of suffering that enlightened reason discerns to be demanded by justice; in debt the demand is precisely and only for the thing due, an exact quid pro quo.

(3.) In crime a vicarious suffering of the penalty is admissible only at the absolute discretion of the sovereign; and the consequent release of the criminal is a matter of grace; in debt the payment of the thing due, by whomsoever made, ipso facto liberates, and its acceptance and the release of the debtor is no matter of grace. (Turretin 50. 14. Qs. 10).

4th. The significance of the term PENALTY and the distinction between CALAMITIES, CHASTISEMENTS, and PENAL EVILS. Calamities are sufferings considered without any reference to the purpose with which they are indicted or permitted. Chastisements are sufferings designed for the moral improvement of the sufferer. Penal evils are sufferings inflicted with the design of satisfying the claims of justice and law. "Penalty" is that kind and degree of suffering which the supreme legislator and judge determines to be legally and justly due in the case of any specific criminal. If these sufferings are endured by a substitute, they are no less the penalty of the

law if they in fact satisfy the law. The nature and degree of the sufferings may be changed justly with the change of the person suffering, but the character of the sufferings as penalty remains, or the substitution fails.

5th. The meaning of the terms SUBSTITUTION and VICARIOUS. Substitution is the gracious act of a sovereign in allowing a person not bound to discharge a service, or to suffer a punishment in the stead of a person who is bound. The discharge of that service, and the suffering of that penalty by the substitute and therefore the services and sufferings themselves, are strictly vicarious, that is in the stead of (vice) as well as in the behalf of the person originally bound.

6th. EXPIATION AND PROPITIATION. Both these words represent the Greek word ιλασκεσθαι. When construed, as it constantly is in the classics, with τ■ θεον and τους θεους it means to propitiate for sin, by sacrificial atonement. In the New Testament it is construed with τας αμαρτιας(Hebrews 2:17), and signifies to expiate the guilt of sin. Expiation has respect to the bearing which satisfaction has upon sin or the sinner. Propitiation has respect to the effect of satisfaction in thus removing the judicial displeasure of God.

7th. IMPETRATION and APPLICATION. Impetration signifies the purchase, or meritorious procurement by sacrifice, of that salvation which God provides for his own people, and Application signifies its subsequent application to them in the process commencing with Justification and Regeneration, and ending in Glorification.

8th. The usage as to ATONEMENT and REDEMPTION.

(1.) During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the words Redemption and Atonement were used by all parties, Calvinist and Arminian, as equivalent, as in Baxter's and Dr. Isaac Barrow's treatises on "Universal Redemption" (See Dr. Cunningham's "Hist. Theo.," Vol. 2, p. 327, and Dr. H. B. Smith in Hagenbach, "Hist. Doc.," Vol. 2, pp. 356 and 357). Also "Confession of Faith," ch. 8, § 1, and "Larger Catechism," Q. 59.

(2.) In modern times some Calvinistic advocates of an indefinite atonement distinguish between the terms thus. Atonement, or the sacrificial impetration of salvation, they claim to be made indefinitely for all men. Redemption, which they understand to include the intended application as well as the impetration of salvation, they hold to be confined to the elect (Dr. W. B. Weeks, in "Park's Atonement," p. 579).

(3.) In the Scriptures Atonement ■■■■■■■■ — ιλασμο signifies the expiation of guilt by means of a poena vicaria(substitutionary punishment) in order to propitiate God. But the scriptural usage of Redemption απολυτρωσι is less definite and more comprehensive. It signifies deliverance from loss or from ruin by the payment for us of a ransom by our substitute. Hence it may signify either (a) the act of one substitute in paying that ransom, when it is precisely equivalent to Atonement (Galatians 3:13); or, (b) it may mean our consequent deliverance from some particular element of our lost condition, as "death," or the "devil" (Colossians 2:15; Hosea 13:14); or, our complete investiture with the full salvation thereby secured (Ephesians 1:14; Ephesians 4:30; Romans 8:23, etc.)

9th. MERITUM and SATISFACTIO. This distinction was first signalized by Thomas Aquinas (1274), "Summa Theologiae," Pars. 3., Q. 48, 49. Christ as the Second Adam fulfills in our behalf

all the conditions of the broken Covenant of Works. “Satisfactio” expresses the quality and effect of his entire earthly work of suffering obedience even unto death regarded as a suffering of the penalty, in order to the release therefrom of his people. “Meritum” expresses the quality and effect of the same work regarded as the rendering of that obedience which was for them the condition of life. In Protestant theology this distinction is expressed by the terms active and passive obedience. or the one vicarious work of Christ, viewed (a) as a suffering of penal evils, (b) viewed as obedience to covenant requirements.

2. State the difference between the “natural,” the “federal,” and the “penal” relations which men sustain to the divine law.

1st. Every moral agent is brought at the moment of creation, in consequence of his nature, necessarily under obligation to be conformed in state and act to the divine law of absolute moral perfection, any want of conformity to which is sin. This relation is “natural,” perpetual, inalienable, and incapable of being assumed by one person in place of another, or representatively sustained.

2nd. It pleased God graciously to place man at his creation under a special covenant, in which, upon condition of perfect obedience under a special test, and favorable conditions, for a limited period, he promised to endow the race with “eternal life,” including establishment in an indefectable, holy character, and a heavenly inheritance forever. The penalty of instant “death” being the alternative. This is the “federal” relation to law, in which originally the whole race fell, represented by Adam. and in which subsequently the elect are made to stand, represented by Christ.

3rd. By the fall of Adam all men are brought into “penal” relation to the law, from which the elect are relieved, since it has been voluntarily assumed in their behalf by Christ.

3. What is Antinomianism? And show that this abominable heresy is in no degree involved in the common doctrine of the Protestant Reformers and their followers.

“Antinomianism,” as the word imports, is the doctrine that Christ has in such a sense fulfilled all the claims of the moral law in behalf of all the elect, or of all believers, that they are released from all obligations to fulfill its precepts as a standard of character and action. This horrible doctrine, slanderously charged against Paul, is repudiated by him.—Romans 3:8; Romans 6:1. In their natural reaction from the Papal doctrine of work righteousness, Luther and Melanchthon at first used some unguarded expressions which seem to suggest this heresy. But their entire theological system, the spirit of their lives, and the body of their writings, are as far as possible removed from it. When real Antinomianism was consistently taught by John Agricola (1566), he was strenuously opposed and successfully refuted by Luther, and caused to retreat. Some hyper–Calvinists in the 17th century, in England, e. g., Dr. Crisp, rector of Brinkworth (1642), are charged with it, though they denied the inferences put by others upon their doctrine. It has often been ignorantly or maliciously charged upon Calvinism as a necessary inference by Arminians. As a tendency it naturally besets the human heart when religious enthusiasm is unqualified by Scriptural knowledge and real sanctification, and is one to which ignorant fanatics and all classes of perfectionists are liable to be betrayed.

It is evident that the doctrines of satisfaction by Christ, and of justification by the imputation of his righteousness, as held by the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, have nothing in common with

Antinomianism. Because they teach—

(1.) That Christ discharges for his people only the federal and penal obligations of the law, and that his obedience and suffering in that relation constitute his righteousness, which is imputed.

(2.) That the very end of his satisfaction is to “redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.”—Titus 2:14.

(3.) Believers remain under the “natural” relation to the law, which is personally untransferable, in which they will be gradually perfected by that sanctification which the righteousness of Christ impetrates for them.—See “Vindication of Luther,” by Julius C. Hare.

4. Show how the perfect satisfaction of Christ embraces both his “active” and his “passive” obedience, and the relation which each of these elements sustains to our justification.

Christ, although a man, was a divine person. As such he voluntarily “was made under the law,” and all his earthly obedience to the law under human conditions was as vicarious as his sufferings. His “active” obedience embraces his entire life and death viewed as vicarious obedience. His “passive” obedience embraces his entire life, and especially his sacrificial death, viewed as vicarious suffering.

Adam represented the race under the original gracious covenant of works. He fell, forfeiting the “eternal life” conditioned on obedience, and incurring the penalty of death conditioned upon disobedience. Christ, the second Adam, assumes the covenant in behalf of his elect just as Adam left it. He (a) discharges the penalty—“the soul that sinneth it shall die,” and (b) earns the reward—“he that doeth these things shall live by them.” His whole vicarious suffering obedience, or obedient suffering is one righteousness. As “passive” obedience it “satisfies” the penal demand of the law. As “active” obedience it merits for us eternal life from regeneration to glorification. The imputation of this righteousness to us is our justification.

5. State the true doctrine of Christ’s Satisfaction.

1st. Negatively.

(1.) The sufferings of Christ were not a substitute for the infliction of the penalty of the law upon sinners in person, but they are the penalty itself executed on their Substitute.

(2.) It was not of the nature of a pecuniary payment, an exact quid pro quo. But it was a strict penal satisfaction, the person suffering being a substitute.

(3.) It was not a mere example of a punishment.

(4.) It was not a mere exhibition of love, or of heroic consecration.

2nd. Positively.

(1.) Its MOTIVE was the ineffable love of God for the elect.—John 10:15; Galatians 2:20.

(2.) As to its NATURE. (a.) Being a divine Person he assumed the legal responsibilities of his people under the conditions of a human being. (b.) He obeyed and suffered as their Substitute. His obedience and suffering were vicarious. (c.) The guilt, or just legal responsibility of our sins, were

imputed to him, i. e., charged upon and punished in him. (d.) He did not suffer the same sufferings either in kind, degree, or duration, which would have been inflicted on them, but he did suffer precisely that suffering which divine justice demanded of his person standing in their stead. (e.) His sufferings were those of a divine Person in a human nature.

(3.) As to its EFFECTS. (a.) It was the effect not the cause of God's love. It satisfied his justice and rendered the exercise of his love consistent with his righteousness. (b.) It expiated the guilt of sin, and reconciled God to us as a righteous Ruler. (c.) It secured the salvation of those for whom he died, purchasing the gift of the Holy Spirit, the means of grace, and the application and consummation of salvation. (d.) It did not ipso facto liberate, as a pecuniary satisfaction, but as a vicarious penal satisfaction its benefits accrue to the persons, at the times, and under the conditions, prescribed by the covenant between the Father and the Son. Its application is a matter of right to Christ, but of grace to us. (e.) Being an execution in strict justice of vicarious punishment it is a most effective and real example of punishment to the moral universe. (f.) Being an exercise of amazing love it produces legitimately the most profound moral impression, melting the heart, subduing the rebellion, and dissipating the fears of convinced sinners.

BIBLICAL PROOF OF THE DOCTRINE.

6. State the argument in support of this doctrine derived from the nature of divine justice.

It is obvious that God punishes sin, either (1) because of its intrinsic ill–desert, which is opposed to the essential and immutable rectitude of his nature; or, (2) because of the injury it does his creatures, from a principle o wise benevolence prompting him to restrain it by furnishing deterring motives; or, (3) from pure sovereignty. But we have before proven (See above, Ch. 8., Q. 59–66)—

(1.) That the moral perfection of God is essential and fundamental, and not a product of his self–determination.

(2.) That his essential moral perfection includes a principle of justice which makes the punishment of sin an end in itself.

(3.) That virtue, and especially justice, can not be resolved into disinterested benevolence. The essential attributes of benevolence and justice do not conflict. Justice is free but not optional. Benevolence to the undeserving is grace, which is essentially optional.

7. State the proof derived from the immutability of the divine law and from the absolute truth of God. The will of God is freely determined by his nature. His law including precept and penalty is the expression and revelation at once of his nature and his will As far as the law represents his nature and purpose it must be immutable. As far as it is a revelation of that purpose, its immutability is pledged by his inviolable truth.

But—

1st. God has declared that his law is immutable, Luke 16:17, i. e., his revealed law in all its elements, if the ceremonial, a fortiori the moral law.

2nd. It is declared that Christ came to fulfill and not to suspend or abate the law.—Matthew 5:17-18; Romans 10:4; Romans 3:31.

3rd. It is affirmed that God will punish sin.—Genesis 2:17; Ezekiel 18:4; Romans 3:26.

8. Show that the Scriptures teach that Christ suffered as our Substitute in the definite sense of that term. A substitute is one appointed or accepted to act or to suffer in the stead of another, and his actions or sufferings are vicarious. That Christ obeyed and suffered as the substitute of his people is proved—

1st. The preposition υπερ with the genitive signifies “instead of” (John 11:50; 2 Corinthians 5:20; Philemon 1:13), and this construction is used to set forth the relation of Christ’s work to us.—2 Corinthians 5:14; 2 Corinthians 5:21; Galatians 3:13; 1 Peter 3:18.

2nd. The preposition αντι definitely and always expresses substitution (Winer, “N. T. Gram.,” Pt. 3, § 47).—Matthew 2:22; Matthew 5:38. This is rendered more emphatic by being associated with λυτρον ransom, redemption price. Christ came as a ransom in the stead of many.—Matthew 20:28; Mark 10:45; 1 Timothy 2:6. Christ is called αντιλυτρον i. e., substitutionary ransom.

3rd. The same is proved by what the Scriptures teach as to our sins being “laid upon” Christ.—See below, Q. 9.

4th. And by what the Scriptures teach as to the nature of sacrifices, and the sacrificial character of Christ’s work.—See below, Qs. 10 and 11.

9. Do the same with regard to those passages which speak of our sins being “laid upon” Christ, and of his “bearing” sin or iniquity.

Sin may be considered (1) in its formal nature as “transgression of law,”1 John 3:4; or, (2) as a moral quality inherent in the agent, Romans 6:11-13; or, (3) in respect to its legal obligation to punishment. In this last sense alone is it ever said that the sin of one is laid upon or borne by another.

1st. To impute sin is simply to charge it to one’s account as the ground of punishment.

(1.) The Hebrew word ■■■■■■ means to estimate, count, credit, impute as belonging to.—Genesis 31:15; Leviticus 7:18; Numbers 18:27; Psalms 106:31.

(2.) The same is true with regard to the Greek word λογιζομαι —Isaiah 53:12; Romans 2:26; Romans 4:3-9; 2 Corinthians 5:19.

(3.) The Scriptures assert that our sins are imputed to Christ.—Mark 15:28; Isaiah 53:6 and Isaiah 53:12; 2 Corinthians 5:21; Galatians 3:13.

2nd.

(1.) The Hebrew word ■■■■■ has the precise sense of bearing not bearing away, or removing, but in the sense of carrying.Lamentations 5:7. This is applied to Christ’s bearing our sins.—Isaiah 53:11.

(2.) Also ■■■■■■ has the sense, when construed with “sin,” of bearing sin in the sense of being “penally responsible” for it.—Numbers 30:15; Leviticus 5:17-18; Leviticus 16:22.

(3.) The Septuagint translates these words sometimes by αιρω to bear, and sometimes by φερω and αναφερω which always means in this connection to bear off one’s self in order to bear away.—Robinson, “Lex.” Compare Matthew 8:17 with Isaiah 53:4.

10. Show that the Jewish Sacrifices were vicarious sufferers of the penalties to which the offerers were exposed, and that they were in the strict sense typical of the Sacrifice of Christ.

It is admitted by all that sacrifices prevailed among all heathen nations from the earliest times, and that they were designed to propitiate offended justice.

I. That victims of the Jewish bloody sacrifices vicariously suffered the penalty due the sins of the offenders is proved—

1st. From their occasion.—Leviticus 4:1-35; Leviticus 5:1-19; Leviticus 6:1-13. This was some sin, including moral as well as ceremonial transgressions.

2nd. From the qualifications of the victims. They must be the highest class of clean animals intimately associated with man, e. g., sheep, bullocks, goats, pigeons, the individuals selected to be the most perfect of their kind, as to age, sex, and physical condition.—Leviticus 22:20-27; Exodus 22:30; Exodus 29:1.

3rd. From the ritual of the sacrifice itself:This included—

(1.) The laying on of hands, with confession of sins.—Leviticus 1:4; Leviticus 3:2; Leviticus 4:4; Leviticus 16:21; 2 Chronicles 29:23. This act always in Scripture expresses transfer from the person imposing to the person or thing upon whom the hands are imposed; e. g., of official authority, Deuteronomy 34:9; Acts 6:6; or of healing virtue, Matthew 9:18; Acts 9:12; Acts 9:17; or of sin, Leviticus 16:7-22. Rabbi Aaron Ben. Chajim says, “Where there is no confession of sins there is no imposition of hands.”—Outram, De Sacrificiis D. 1., C. 15., §§ 8, 10, 11. Hence the victim, although perfect in itself, was always called ■■■■■■■sin,Leviticus 4:3, and ■■■■■■quilt,Leviticus 5:6.

(2.) The slaying of the victim. It was offered by the sinner, and “accepted for him to make atonement for him,”Leviticus 4:1-35 :, and then executed,“ for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.”—Leviticus 17:11.

(3.) The sprinkling of blood, in the case of ordinary sacrifices on the horns of the altar, but on the Day of Atonement the blood of the victim offered for the whole people was carried within the veil and sprinkled on the mercy–seat.—Leviticus 4:5, etc. This signified its application to the covering of sin, and its acceptance by God.

4th. From their effect which was always forgiveness. “And it shall be forgiven him” was the constant promise.—Leviticus 4:20-31; Leviticus 6:30, etc. It is expressed everywhere by the Hebrew word ■■■■■ to cover sin, and by the Greek word ιλασκεσθαι to expiate or propitiate.—See Leviticus 4:5 :chs.; Hebrews 2:17. The “mercy–seat” was called the ■■■■■■■■■■, ιλαστηριον , propitiatorium, or seat of expiation.

5th. This is the interpretation of these rites given by all learned Jews of subsequent ages.—See Outram, “De. Sac.,” D. 1., Chs.20–22.

II. That they were in the strict sense typical of the sacrifice of Christ is proved—

1st. They are expressly called “shadows” of which Christ is the “body” and “patterns.”—Hebrews 9:13-24; Hebrews 10:1; Hebrews 10:13; Hebrews 11:12.

2nd Christ affirms that the law as well as the prophets spoke of him and his work.—John 1:45; John 5:39; Luke 24:27.

3rd. He is declared to be “our Passover sacrificed for us.”1 Corinthians 5:7 and Luke 24:44. Compare Exodus 12:46 and Numbers 9:12.

4th. He is declared to be “sacrificed” for his people, by his “blood” being made a sin–offering, etc.—John 1:29; Hebrews 9:26; Hebrews 9:28; Hebrews 10:12; Hebrews 10:14; 1 Peter 1:19; Ephesians 5:2; 2 Corinthians 5:21.

5th. He is everywhere declared to accomplish for the man who comes to God through him precisely what the ancient sacrifices did on a lower sphere.—Galatians 3:13; Matthew 20:28; 1 John 2:2; 1 John 4:10; Romans 3:24-25; Romans 5:9-10; Ephesians 1:7; Ephesians 2:13; Colossians 1:14-20.

11. Exhibit the argument derived from the fact that Christ made satisfaction for his people as their High Priest.

I. The priest was—

1st. A man taken from among men to represent them in things pertaining to God.—Hebrews 5:1. This was especially true of the high priest. “He represented the whole people, all Israel were reckoned as being in him.” Vitringa, Obs. Sac., p. 292; Exodus 28:9-29. If he sinned it vas regarded as the sin of the whole people.—Leviticus 4:3. He wore the names of all the tribes on his breastplate. He placed his hands upon the scape–goat and confessed the sin of the whole people.—Leviticus 16:15-21.

2nd. He had a right to “bring near” to God, and all the people had access to God only through the priest, especially the High Priest.—Numbers 16:5.

3rd. This the priest effected by propitiary sacrifices and intercession.—see above, Ques. 10. Hebrews 5:1-3; Numbers 6:22-27.

II. Christ is declared to save his people in the character of a High Priest.

1st. He is expressly asserted both in the Old Testament and in the New to be a Priest.—Psalms 110:4; Zechariah 6:13; Hebrews 5:6.

2nd. He possessed all the qualifications for the office.

(1.) He vas chosen from among men to represent them.—Compare Hebrews 5:1-2 with Hebrews 2:14-18; Hebrews 4:15.

(2.) He was chosen of God.—Hebrews 5:4-6.

(3.) He was holy.—Hebrews 7:26.

(4.) He possessed right of access to God.—Hebrews 1:3; Hebrews 9:11-14.

3rd. He discharged all the functions of a priest.—Daniel 9:24-26; Ephesians 5:2; Hebrews 9:26; Hebrews 10:12; 1 John 2:1.

4th. The instant Christ's work was accomplished the veil of the temple was rent in twain, and the whole typical sacrificial system was discharged as functus officio.—Matthew 27:50-51.

12. Prove the truth of the doctrine as to the nature of the satisfaction of Christ above stated from the effects which are attributed to it in Scripture.

1st. As these effects respect God they are declared to be propitiation and reconciliation.

(1.) ιλασκεσθαι signifies to propitiate an offended Deity by means of expiatory sacrifice.—Hebrews 2:17; 1 John 2:2; 1 John 4:10; Romans 3:25.

(2.) ■■■■■ in respect to sin a covering, and in respect to God propitiation. It is properly translated in our version to make atonement, to appease, to pacify, to reconcile, to purge, to purge away,Ezekiel 16:63; Genesis 32:20-21; Psalms 65:3-4; Psalms 78:38; 1 Samuel 3:14; Numbers 35:33; to ransom,Psalms 49:7; to make satisfaction,Numbers 35:31-32.

(3.) Καταλλασσειν to reconcile—by the death of Christ, not imputing transgressions, justifying lay blood, etc., Romans 5:9-10; 2 Corinthians 5:18-20.

2nd. As these effects respect sin they are declared to be expiation.—Hebrews 2:17; 1 John 2:2; 1 John 4:10; Leviticus 16:6-16.

3rd. As they respect the sinner himself they are declared to be redemption, that is, deliverance by ransom.—1 Corinthians 7:23; Revelation 5:9; Galatians 3:13; 1 Peter 1:18-19; 1 Timothy 2:6; Isaiah 51:11, and Isaiah 62:12.

Christ's work is set forth in the same sentences as (a) an expiatory offering, (b) a ransom price, (c) a satisfaction to the law. Thus we are redeemed with the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb without blemish and without spot. Christ "gave his life a ransom for many." He "redeemed us from the curse of the law being made a curse for us." God "hash made him, who knew no sin, to be a sin–offering for us that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Thus Christ is not said to be a sacrifice and a ransom and a bearer of the curse of the law, but that he is that particular species of sacrifice which is a ransom—that his redemption is of that nature which is effected by his bearing the curse of the law in our stead, and that he redeems us by offering himself as a bleeding sacrifice to God.

13. In what sense and on what grounds was the satisfaction rendered by Christ necessary? and how does the true answer to this question confirm the orthodox doctrine as to its nature?

Since the salvation of men is a matter of sovereign grace, there could have been no necessity on the part of God for the provision of means to secure it, but on condition of God s determining to save sinners, then in what sense was the satisfaction rendered by Christ necessary?

1st. The advocates of the Socinian or Moral Influence Theory say that it was necessary only contingently and relatively, as the best means conceivable of proving the love of God and of subduing the opposition of sinners.

2nd. The advocates of the Governmental Atonement Theory hold that it was only relatively necessary as the best sin deterring example of God's determination to punish sin.

3rd. Some Supralapsarians, as Dr. Twisse, prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly, in order to exalt the sovereignty of God, held that it was only hypothetically necessary, i. e., because God had sovereignly determined to forgive sin on no other condition.

4th. The true view is that it was absolutely necessary as the only means possible of satisfying the justice of God in view of the pardon of sin. The grounds of an absolute necessity on the part of God, can, of course, only be found in the immutable righteousness of his nature, lying behind and determining his will. That it is absolutely necessary is proved—

(1.) If salvation could have been secured otherwise Christ would be dead in vain.—Galatians 2:21; Galatians 3:21.

(2.) God has declared that his gift of Christ is the amazing measure of his love for his people. If so, of course, he could have had no alternative, otherwise his love would not be the cause of the sacrifice.—Romans 5:8; John 3:16; John 4:9.

(3.) Paul says it was necessary as a vindication of God's righteousness in view of the forgiveness of sins that were past.—Romans 3:25-26.

It is plain that if the necessity for the satisfaction was absolute, it must have had its ground ill the nature of God. If so, it must have been in its essence a satisfaction of the justice or essential righteousness of that nature. But a satisfaction of outraged justice is penal suffering.

14. Prove that Christ's satisfaction includes his "active" as well as his "passive" obedience.

See above, Ques. 1, § 8. Christ as the second Adam takes up the covenant obligations of his people as these were left by the fall of the first Adam. The sanctions of that covenant were—

(1.) "The man that doeth these things shall live by them."—Leviticus 18:5, comp., and Romans 10:5, and Galatians 3:12, and Matthew 19:17.

(2.) The penalty of death. If Christ should only suffer the penalty of death, and not render the federal obedience required of Adam, it would necessarily follow, either (1) God would alter the conditions of law and give "eternal life" in the absence of the condition demanded; or, (2) we must continue forever destitute of it; or, (3) we must start where Adam did before his apostasy, and work out the conditions of the covenant of works in our own persons. This last would have been impossible, and therefore Christ by his obedience fulfilled them for us. This is proven—

1st. The Scriptures explicitly declare that he not only suffered the penalty but also meritoriously secured for us "eternal life," the "adoption of sons," and an "eternal inheritance."—Galatians 3:13-14; Galatians 4:4-5; Ephesians 1:3-13; Ephesians 5:25-27; Romans 8:15-17.

2nd. It is expressly said that he saves us by his obedience as well as by his suffering.—Romans 5:18-19.

15. What is the Church doctrine as to the Perfection of Christ's Satisfaction?

I. As to its intrinsic justice–satisfying value it has been held—

1st. By Duns Scotus (1308), who referred the necessity of the Atonement to the will and not to the nature, that "every created oblation avails for just as much as God pleases to accept it." He graciously pleases to accept the sufferings of the human nature of Christ as sufficient, on the principle of accepti latio, "the optional taking of something for nothing, or of a part for the whole."

2nd. Grotius (1645) in his great work,"De Satisfactione" etc., held that as the law was a product of the divine will, God had the inalienable prerogative of relaxing it (relaxatio), and that he did graciously relax it in accepting in the sufferings of Christ something different and less than the demands of the law, an aliud pro quo, not a quid pro quo.

3rd. Limborch and Curcellaeus (1712 and 1659)—"Apol. Theo.," 3. 21, 6, and "Institutio Rel. Christ," vol. 5., chap. 19., § 5—held that Christ did not suffer the penalty of the law, but saves us as a sacrifice, which was not a payment of a debt; but a condition graciously estimated as sufficient by God, upon which he graciously remitted the penalty.

4th. The Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed Churches have always held that the satisfaction of Christ was that of a divine Person, and hence (1) was superogatory, not due from himself; and free to be credited to others, (2) was of infinite value. From the time of Thomas Aquinas the Catholic Church has held that it is of superabundant value. Hence they satisfy the claims of the law in strict rigor of justice.

II. As to its intention and effect—

1st. The Reformed Churches all agree in opposition to the Romanists, Arminians, and advocates of an indefinite atonement, that the satisfaction of Christ is perfect in the sense of not only making the salvation of those for whom it was offered possible, but of meritoriously securing its own application to them and their certain and complete salvation.

2nd. The Romanists hold that through the instrumentality of baptism the merits of Christ (1) cancel the guilt of all sins original and actual preceding baptism, and (2) transmute the penalty of all post–baptismal sins from eternal death to temporal pains. Nevertheless persons guilty of post–baptismal sins must expiate them by penances or works of charity in this world, or in the next by the pains of purgatory.—"Counc. Trident," Sess. 14, ch. 8., and Sess. 6, can. 29 and 30.

III.. Arminians hold that the satisfaction of Christ makes the salvation of all men possible, and secures for them sufficient grace, but that its full effect is suspended on the condition of their free choice. The truth of the Reformed doctrine is proved (1) from the fact that the Scriptures refer the removal of condemnation solely to the death of Christ, and represent all sufferings of believers as disciplinary.—Romans 8:1-34 and Hebrews 12:5-11.

(2.) They declare that the blood of Christ "cleanses from all sin," and that we are "complete in him" who "by one sacrifice" perfects us.—Colossians 2:10; Hebrews 10:12-14; 1 John 1:7.

(3.) Salvation is conditioned only upon trust in Christ's work, and this very trust (faith) is itself given to us as a result of Christ's merits.—Ephesians 2:7-10.

(4.) We have above proved (Ques. 14) that the satisfaction of Christ meritoriously secures actual and complete salvation for its beneficiaries, and not merely the possibility of salvation upon conditions. See also below, Ques. 21.

16. State and answer the objections which have been urged against the truth of the orthodox doctrine.

1st. It is objected by Socinians and others that while it is an imperative duty and Christian virtue in man to forgive offenses freely, that our doctrine ascribes the vice of vindictiveness to God.

We ANSWER.—

(1.) That we forgive injuries and have nothing to do with the punishment of sins, while God punishes sin, and is incapable of suffering injury.

(2.) We have proved above, Ch. 8., Q. 53–58, that all virtue can not be resolved into benevolence, and that justice is an essential attribute of God, and that sin is intrinsic ill–desert.

2nd. Socinus and others maintained that if sin is punished it can not be forgiven, and that if it is forgiven it can not be punished, and hence our doctrine excludes the exercise of free grace on the part of God in man's salvation.

We ANSWER.—

(1.) Free grace is shown in the sovereign admission and acceptance by God of Christ's substitution.

(2.) In the sovereign imputation of his merits to the individual sinner.

(3.) That the infinite freeness of the love of God and the self–sacrificing grace of Christ is a thousand times more conspicuous in view of the facts that men were righteously condemned, and that justice inexorably demanded satisfaction in the self–humiliation of our Substitute, than it could have been in any merely sovereign relaxation of law, or by any simple forgiveness upon repentance.

3rd. That Christ did not suffer the penalty of the law, because that included essentially (a) remorse, (b) eternal death.

We ANSWER that the penalty of the law is essentially simple divine displeasure involving the withdrawal of the life–giving communion of the Holy Ghost. This in the case of every creature (a) leads to spiritual death, (b) hence is naturally everlasting. Christ suffered this displeasure and desertion, Matthew 27:46, but being a divine person spiritual death was impossible. He suffered precisely that kind and degree and duration of pain which divine wisdom, interpreting divine justice, required in a divine person suffering vicariously the penalty of human sin, for the same reason the temporal suffering of one divine Person, is a full legal equivalent for the ill–desert of all mankind.

4th. The objection urged by Piscator (Prof. at Herborn 1584–1625) and others against the recognition of the active obedience of Christ as an element of his satisfaction.

(1.) That the law made obedience and penal suffering alternatives. If the precept is obeyed the penalty should not be inflicted.

(2.) That Christ, as a man, needed his active righteousness for himself, as the essential qualification of his personal character.

We ANSWER.—

(1.) As shown above, Ques. 2 and 14. Christ stood as our Representative in our federal and not in our natural relation to law. His active and his passive obedience have different purposes, the former merits the positive rewards conditioned on obedience, the latter merits the negative blessing of remission of penalty.

(2.) Christ, although a man, was a divine person, and therefore never personally subject to the Adamic covenant of works. He was essentially righteous, but he was made under the law only as our representative, and his obedience under the voluntarily assumed conditions of his earthly life was purely vicarious.

5th. It is objected by Arminians and others that the doctrine that Christ satisfies in our behalf the preceptive demands of the law by his active obedience, as well as the penal demands by his passive obedience, leads to Antinomianism. This is ANSWERED above, under Ques. 3.

6th. It is objected by Socinus (1539–1604) and by all the adversaries of the orthodox doctrine, that the demands of justice for penal satisfaction are essentially personal. The demand of outraged justice is specifically for the punishment of the person sinning. How then can the demands of the divine nature be satisfied by pains inflicted upon a person arbitrarily substituted in the place of the criminal by the divine will? How can the sufferings of an innocent man take the place in the eye of justice of those of the guilty man.

ANSWER.—The substitution of Christ in the stead of elect sinners was not arbitrary. He made satisfaction for them as the truly responsible Head of a community, constituting one moral person or corporate body. This responsible union with his people was constituted (a) by his own voluntary assumption of their legal responsibilities, (b) by the recognition of his sponsorship by God, the source of all law in the universe, (c) by his assumption of our nature. This, at least, is the testimony of revelation, if it can not be explained, it can not be disproved. THE DESIGN OF THE ATONEMENT.

17. State first negatively, and then positively, the true doctrine as to the design of the Father and the Son in providing satisfaction.

I. Negatively—

1st. There is no debate among Christians as to the sufficiency of that satisfaction to accomplish the salvation of all men, however vast the number. This is absolutely limitless.

2nd. Nor as to its applicability to the case of any and every possible human sinner who will ever exist. The relations of all to the demands of the law are identical. What would save one would save

another.

3rd. Nor to the bona fide character of the offer which God has made to “whomsoever wills” in the gospel. It is applicable to every one, it will infallibly be applied to every believer.

4th. Nor as to its actual application. Arminians agree with Calvinists that of adults only those who believe are saved, while Calvinists agree with Arminians that all dying in infancy are redeemed and saved.

5th. Nor is there any debate as to the universal reference of some of the benefits purchased by Christ. Calvinists believe that the entire dispensation of forbearance under which the human family rest since the fall, including for the unjust as well as the just temporal mercies—and means of grace, is part of the purchase of Christ’s blood. They admit also that Christ did in such a sense die for all men, that he thereby removed all legal obstacles from the salvation of any and every man, and that his satisfaction may be applied to one man as well as to another if God so wills it.

II. But positively the question is what was the design of the Father and Son in the vicarious death of Christ. Did they purpose to make the salvation of the elect certain, or merely to make the salvation of all men possible? Did his satisfaction have reference indifferently as much to one man as to another? Did the satisfaction purchase and secure its own application, and all the means thereof, to all for whom it was specifically rendered? Has the impetration and the application of this atonement the same range of objects? Was it, in the order of the divine purpose, a means to accomplish the purpose of election, or is the election of individuals a means to carry into effect the satisfaction of Christ otherwise inoperative? Our Confession answers—

Ch. 8., sect. 5.—“The Lord Jesus, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, . . . purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven for all those whom the Father hath given unto him.”—Chapter 3., sect. 6. “As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore they that are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed in Christ. . . . Neither are any other redeemed by Christ . . . . but the elect only.”

Ch. 8., sect. 8.—“ To all those for whom Christ hath purchased redemption, he doth certainly and effectually apply and communicate the same.”—“Articles of Synod of Dort,” Ch. 2., §§ 1, 2, 8. The design of Christ in dying was to effect what he actually does effect in the result.

1st. Incidentally to remove the legal impediments out of the way of all men, and render the salvation of every hearer of the gospel objectively possible, so that each one has a right to appropriate it at will, to impetrate temporal blessings for all, and the means of grace for all to whom they are providentially supplied. But,

2nd. Specifically his design was to impetrate the actual salvation of his own people, in all the means, conditions, and stages of it, and render it infallibly certain. This last, from the nature of the case, must have been his real motive. After the manner of the Augustinian Schoolmen Calvin, on 1 John 2:2, says, “Christ died sufficiently. for all, but efficiently only for the elect.”—So Archbishop Ussher, Numbers 22:1-41; Numbers 23:1-30 of Letters published by his Chaplain, Richard Parr, D.D.

18. State the Arminian doctrine on this subject. That the design of Christ was to render a sacrificial oblation in behalf of all men indiscriminately, by which “sufficient grace” is meritoriously secured for each, and their sins rendered remissible upon the terms of the Evangelical Covenant; i. e., upon condition of faith.—Watson’s “Theo. Institutes,” Pt. 2., Ch. 25.

19. What was the doctrine of the “Marrow Men” in Scotland? The “Marrow of Modern Divinity” was published in England, 1646, and republished in Scotland by James Hog of Carnock, 1726. The “Marrow Men” were Hog, Thomas Boston, and Ralph and Ebenezer Erskine, and their followers in the Secession Church. They were perfectly orthodox with respect to the reference of the atonement to the elect. Their peculiarity was that they emphasized the general reference of the atonement to all men. They said Christ did not die for all, but he is dead for all, i. e., available. “God made a deed of gift and grant of Christ unto all men.” They distinguished between his “giving love,” which was universal, and his “electing love,” which was special (“Marrow of Mod. Divinity”). Dr. John Brown said before the synod of the United Secession Church, 1845, “In the sense of the Universalist, that Christ died so as to secure salvation, I hold that he died only for the elect. In the sense of the Arminian, that Christ died so as to purchase easier terms of salvation, and common grace to enable men to comply with those terms, I hold that he died for no man. In the sense of the great body of Calvinists, that Christ died to remove legal obstacles in the way of human salvation by making perfect satisfaction for sin, I hold that he died for all men” (“Hist. of Atonement Controversy in Secess. Church,” by Rev. And. Robertson).

20. State the doctrine of Amyraldus of the French School of Saumur, and of Baxter in England. This scheme of Hypothetical or Conditional Universalism holds that God gave his Son to die in order to provide redemption for all men indiscriminately, suspending its actual enjoyment upon their free appropriation of it. At the same time he sovereignly wills to give the effectual grace which determines that free self–appropriation only to the elect. The ordinary Calvinistic doctrine logically makes the decree to provide redemption the means to carry into effect the decree of election. The French and Baxterian view makes the decree of election the means of carrying into effect so far forth the general purpose of redemption (See “Universal Redemption of Mankind by the Lord Jesus Christ,” by Richard Baxter. Answered by John Owen in his “Death of Christ,” etc.). These “Novelties” were explained away before the French Synod, 1637, and virtually condemned.

21. Exhibit the Biblical evidence upon which the Calvinistic doctrine as to the “Design” of the Atonement rests.

1st. It is proved by the fact that this doctrine alone is consistent with the Scriptural doctrine that God has from eternity sovereignly elected certain persons to eternal life, and to all the means thereof. It is evident that the rendering of satisfaction specially for the elect is a rational means for carrying the decree of election into execution. But, on the other hand, the election of some to faith and repentance is no rational provision for executing the purpose to redeem all men. R. Watson (“Institutes,” Vol. 2., p. 411) says that the view of Baxter, etc., “is the most inconsistent theory to which the attempts to modify Calvinism have given rise.” It is plain that if God purposed that the elect should certainly be saved, and others left to the just consequences of their sins, Christ could not have designed the benefits of his death indifferently for all men.

2nd. Its design is shown from the very nature of the atonement as above proved.

(1.) Christ expiated our sins as our substitute in the strict sense. But a substitute represents definite persons, and his service, when accepted, actually discharges the obligation of those for whom it was rendered.

(2.) Christ being our substitute under the “covenant of works” actually and perfectly satisfied all the demands of the covenant. In that case the terms of the covenant itself provide that those for whom it is satisfied must enjoy the reward. It is not the possibility of life, but life itself that is promised.

3rd. The Scriptures declare everywhere that the design and legal effect of Christ’s work is not to render salvation possible but actually to save, to reconcile God and not to render him only reconcilable.—Matthew 18:11; Romans 5:10; 2 Corinthians 5:21; Galatians 1:4; Galatians 3:13; Ephesians 1:7; Ephesians 2:16.

4th. The Scriptures everywhere teach that Christ purchased faith, repentance, and the Holy Spirit’s influences by his death and obedience. Hence he must have purchased them for those for whom he suffered and obeyed, and they can not, therefore, be the conditions upon which the enjoyment of the benefits of his death are suspended. “We are blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly things in Christ.”—Ephesians 1:3-4. The Holy Ghost is “shed on us through Jesus Christ our Saviour.”Titus 3:5-6; Galatians 3:13-14; Php 1:29; Titus 2:14; Ephesians 5:25-27; 1 Corinthians 1:30.

5th. Christ died in execution of the terms of an eternal covenant between the Father and himself. This is certain—

(1.) Because three intelligent eternal Persons must have always had a mutual plan comprehending all their works, prescribing their several parts therein.

(2.) The Scriptures often refer to this covenant.—Psalms 89:3-4; Isaiah 13:6-7, and Isaiah 53:10, Isaiah 53:12.

(3.) Christ made constant reference to it while executing it. Luke 22:29; John 6:38; John 10:18.

(4.) Christ claims its reward.—John 17:4-9

(5.) And speaks of those who had been previously given him by his father.—John 10:15-26. Then he must have died specially for those “whom the father had given him.”

6th. The motive for his self–sacrifice is always declared to be the highest form of personal love.—John 15:13; Romans 5:8; Romans 8:32; Galatians 2:20; Ephesians 3:18-19; 1 John 3:16; 1 John 4:9-10.

7th. The doctrine that Christ died specifically for the elect is everywhere stated in scripture.—John 10:11; John 10:15; Acts 20:28; Romans 8:32-35; Ephesians 5:25-27.

22. If Christ died only for his own people, on what ground does the general offer of the gospel rest?

“The Lord Jesus, in order to secure the salvation of his people, and with a specific view to that end, fulfilled the condition of the law or covenant under which they and all mankind were placed. These conditions were—(1) perfect obedience (2) satisfaction to divine justice. Christ’s righteousness,

therefore, consists of his obedience and death. That righteousness is precisely what the law demands of every sinner in order to Justification before God. It is, therefore, in its nature adapted to all sinners who were under that law. Its nature is not altered by the fact that it was wrought out for a portion only of such sinners, or that it is secured to them by the covenant between the Father and the Son. What is necessary for the salvation of one man is necessary for the salvation of another and of all. It is also of infinite value, being the righteousness of the eternal Son of God, and therefore sufficient for all."—Hodge's "Essays," pp. 181, 182. A bona fide offer of the gospel, therefore, is to be made to all men—

1st. Because the satisfaction rendered to the law is sufficient for all men.

2nd. Because it is exactly adapted to the redemption of all.

3rd. Because God designs that whosoever exercises faith in Christ shall be saved by him. Thus the atonement makes the salvation of every man to whom it is offered objectively possible. The design of Christ's death being to secure the salvation of his own people, incidentally to the accomplishment of that end, it comprehends the offer of that salvation freely and honestly to all men on the condition of their faith. No man is lost for the want of an atonement, or because there is any other barrier in the way of his salvation than his own most free and wicked will.

23. How can the condemnation of men for the rejection of Christ be reconciled with the doctrine that Christ died for the elect only? A salvation all–sufficient and exactly adapted to his necessities is honestly offered to every man to whom the gospel comes; and in every case it is his, if he believes; and in DO case does any thing prevent his believing other than his own evil disposition. Evidently he is in no way concerned with the design of God in providing that salvation beyond the assurance that God intends to give it to him if he believes. If a man is responsible for a bad heart, and the exercises thereof, he must be above all worthy of condemnation for rejecting such Savior.

24. On, what principles are these texts to be explained which speak of Christ bearing the sins of the WORLD, and of his dying for ALL?

These are such passages as Hebrews 2:9; 1 Corinthians 15:22; 1 John 2:2; 1 Timothy 2:6; John 1:29; John 3:16-17; John 6:51. These terms, "world" and "all," are unquestionably used in very various degrees of latitude in the Scriptures. In many passages that latitude is evidently limited by the context, e. g.,1 Corinthians 15:22; Romans 5:18; Romans 8:32; John 12:32; Ephesians 1:10; Colossians 1:20; 2 Corinthians 5:14-15. In others the word "world" is opposed to the Jewish nation as a people of exclusive privileges.—Romans 11:12; Romans 11:15; 1 John 2:2. It is evident that statements as to the design of Christ's death, involving such general terms, must be defined by the more definite ones above exhibited. Sometimes this general form of statement is used to give prominence to the fact that Christ, being a single victim, by one sacrifice atoned for so many.—Compare Matthew 20:28, with 1 Timothy 2:6, and Hebrews 9:28. And although Christ did not die with the design of saving all, yet he did suffer the penalty of that law under which all were placed, and he does offer the righteousness thus wrought out to all.

25. How are we to understand those passages which speak of the possibility of those perishing for whom Christ died?

Such passages are hypothetical, and truly indicate the nature and tendency of the action against which they warn us, and are the means which God uses under the administration of his Spirit to fulfill his purposes. God always deals with men by addressing motives to their understandings and wills, thus fulfilling his own design through their agency. In the case of Paul's shipwreck, it was certain that none should perish, and yet all would perish except they abode in the ship.—Acts 27:24-31. On the same principle must be explained all such passages as Hebrews 10:26-30; 1 Corinthians 8:11, etc.

HISTORY OF THE VARIOUS VIEWS HELD IN THE CHURCH.

26. State the general character of the Soteriology of the Early Fathers.

1st. From the very first the representative Christian Fathers taught in a crude, unscientific manner that Christ suffered as a substitute for his people, to expiate sin and to propitiate God.

They freely applied to Christ's work the sacrificial language of the Scriptures. Outram, Dis. 1, ch. 17.—"As it regards the work of Christ as the Redeemer of mankind, we find already in the language used by the Church Fathers on this point, in the period under consideration, all the elements that lay at the basis of the doctrine as it afterwards came to be defined by the Church."—Neander's "Ch. Hist.," Vol. 1., p. 640, see testimonies below.

2nd. Together with this view there was combined during the whole earlier age until the time of Anselm a view especially emphasized by Origen (185–254) and Irenaeus (200), to the effect that Christ was offered by God as a ransom for his people to Satan, who held them by the power of conquest. This view was founded on such passages as Colossians 2:15, and Hebrews 2:14.

27. State generally the four theories under one or other of which all views ever entertained as to the nature of the reconciliation effected by Christ may be grouped.

1st. The MYSTICAL, which, although it has assumed various forms, may be generally stated thus:The reconciliation effected by Christ was [brought about by the mysterious union of God and man accomplished by the incarnation, rather than by his sacrificial death. This view was entertained by some of the Platonizing fathers, by the disciples of Scotus Erigena during the Middle Ages, by Osiander and Schwenkfeld at the Reformation, and by the school of Schleiermacher among modern German theologians.

2nd. The Moral Influence THEORY first distinctively elaborated by Abelard (1142) and held by the Socinians, and such Trinitarians as Maurice, Young, Jowett, Bushnell, etc. The points involved are—

(1.) There is no such principle as vindicatory justice in God.

(2.) Benevolence is the single ultimate principle determining God in his provisions for human redemption.

(3.) The sole object of the life and death of Christ is to produce a moral effect upon the individual sinner, subduing his obdurate aversion to God and his sullen distrust of his willingness to forgive. Thus reconciling man to God instead of God to man.

(4.) The Socinians held in addition that Christ's death was the necessary precondition of his resurrection, by which he brought immortality to light.

3rd. The Governmental Theory, which, presupposing all the positive truth contained in the "Moral Influence Theory," maintains—

(1.) That justice in God is not vindicatory, but is to be referred to a general Governmental rectitude, based upon a BENEVOLENT regard for the highest ultimate and most general well–being of the subjects of his moral government.

(2.) Law is a product of the divine will and therefore relaxable (3.) God's sovereign prerogative includes the right of pardon.

(4.) But the governmental rectitude above explained, in view of the fact that indiscriminate pardon would encourage the violation of law, determines God to condition the pardon of human sinners upon an imposing example of suffering in a victim so related to mankind and to himself, as effectually to demonstrate his determination that sin should not be indulged with impunity. Therefore—(a.) Christ's sufferings were not punishment, but an example of a determination to punish hereafter. (b.) They were designed not to satisfy divine justice, but to impress the public mind of the moral universe with a sin–deterring motive. This theory was first elaborated by Hugo Grotius (1645) in his great work, "Defensio Fidei Catholicoe de Satisfactione Christi," in which he abandoned the faith he assumed to defend. It has never been embodied in the creed of any historical church, but has been held by several schools of theologians, e. g., the Supernaturalists of the last age in Germany, as Staudlin, Flatt, and Storr, and in America by Jonathan Edwards, Jr., Smalley, Maxey, Dwight, Emmons, and Park.

REMARKS.—While this theory embraces much precious truth, it fails in the essential point on which the integrity of the whole depends. For—

(1.) Only a real bona fide punishment can be an example of a punishment, or a proof of God's determination to punish sin.

(2.) It ignores the essential justice of God, and (3.) the [act that sin is an essential evil in itself, and (4.) the fact that Christ suffered as the HEAD in whom all his members were UNITED.

4th. The SATISFACTION THEORY consistently embraces the positive elements of the "Moral Influence" and "Governmental" theories above stated. It was first analyzed and set forth in a scientific form by Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury (1093–1109) in his epoch–making book, "Cur Deus Homo," and it has formed the basis of the Soteriological doctrines of all the creeds and classical theological literature of all the historical churches since his time. It has been sufficiently stated and proved in the former part of this chapter.

LITERATURE.—Hase, "Libri Symbolici Eccle. Evangelicoe"; Nieleyer, "Collectio Confessionum," etc.; Streitwolf, "Libri Symbolici Eccle. Catholicoe.""De Sacrificiis, Gulielmo Outramo Auctore"; Neander's and Shaff's "Church Histories"; Archb. Magee, "The Atonement"; Shedd's "History of Christian Doctrine"; Owen's "Works," vol. 10, "Redemption"; Ritschl, "Crit. Hist. of the Christ. Doctrine of Reconciliation"; Candlish, "The Atonement"; Watson's "Institutes."

CLASSICAL AND CONFESSIONAL AUTHORITIES.

Origen, “Homil. ad Levit.,” 1, speaking of Christ says, “He laid his hand upon the head of the calf, i. e., he laid the sins of mankind upon his own head, for he is the head of the body, the Church.”

Athanasius(373), contra Arianos, 1, 45–60.—“The death of the incarnate Logos is a ransom for the sins of men and a death of death.” . . . “Laden with guilt the world was condemned by law, but the Logos assumed the condemnation, and suffering in the flesh gave salvation to all.”

Gregory the Great(604), “Moralia in Jobum,” 17, 46.—“Guilt can be extinguished only by penal offering to justice. . . Hence a sinless man must be offered. . . . Hence the Son of God must be born of a virgin, and become man for us. He assumed our nature without our corruption (culpa). He made himself a sacrifice for us, and set forth for sinners his own body, a victim without sin, and able both to die by virtue of its humanity, and to cleanse the guilty, upon grounds of justice.”

Bernard of Clairvaux(1153), “Tract. contr. Err. Abaelardi,” cap. 6, 15.—“ If One has died for all, then all are dead (2 Corinthians 5:14), that is. the satisfaction of one is imputed to all, as that One bore the sins of all, neither is it found that he who offended is one, and he that satisfied another, for the head and the body is one Christ. Therefore the Head made satisfaction for his members.”

Wycliffe(1324–1384), “De Incarn. et Mort. Christ.”—“And since according to the third supposition, it is necessary that satisfaction should be made for sin, so it was necessary that that same race of man should make the satisfaction as great, as it had, in the first parent, made the offence, which no man could do, unless he were at the same time God and man.” The Valenses of Piedmont, in 1542, presented a Confession to Francis I. of France through Cardinal Sadolet. In it they say, “This Confession is that which we have received from our ancestors, even from hand to hand, according as their predecessors in all times, and in every age, have taught and delivered. . . We believe and confess that the gratuitous remission of sins proceeds from the mercy and mere goodness of our Lord Jesus Christ, who died once for our sins, the just for the unjust, who bore our sins in his own body on the gross; who is our advocate with God, himself the price of our reconciliation, who alone has made satisfaction for believers, to whom sins are not imputed as they are to the unbelieving and the reprobates.”

John Wessel(1419–1489), “De Causis Incarnationis.”—“Truly himself God, himself priest, himself victim, he made satisfaction for himself, of himself to himself.”“Exempla Scaloe Meditationis,” Exodus 1:1-22, p. 544.—“Our loving Father willed thee his own loving Son to be a surety, sponsor guaranty with respect to sufficient doing and sufficient suffering, upon just pledge, for my universal failure and miscarriage.”

“ORTHODOX CONFESSION OF THE CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC EASTERN CHURCH,” composed by Petrus Mogilas, Metropolitan of Kiew, 1642, and sanctioned by the Synod of Jerusalem 1672, p. 85. “The death of Christ was of a very different kind from that of all other men in these respects; first because of the weight of our sins, secondly, because he wholly fulfilled the priesthood even to the cross, he offered himself to God and the Father for the ransoming of the human race. Therefore even to the cross he fulfilled the mediation between God and men.”

ROMAN DOCTRINE.—“Council of Trent,” Sess. 6, chap. 7.—“Christ who when we were enemies, on account of the great love wherewith he loved us, merited justification by his most holy passion on the wood of the cross, and made satisfaction to God the Father for us.”“Catechism of Council of Trent,” Pt. 2., ch. 5, Q. 60.—“The first and most excellent satisfaction is that by which whatever is

due by us to God, on account of our sins, has been paid abundantly, although he should deal with us according to the strictest rigor of his justice. This is said to be that satisfaction, which we say has appeased God and rendered him propitious to us, and for it we are indebted to Christ the Lord alone, who having paid the price of our sins on the cross, most fully satisfied God."

LUTHERAN CONFESSIONS, Hase's "Collection," p. 684, "Formula Concordiae."—"That righteousness which before God is of mere grace imputed to faith, or to the believer, is the obedience, suffering, and resurrection of Christ, by which he for our sakes satisfied the law, and expiated our sins. For since Christ was not only man, but God and man in one undivided person, so he was not subject to the law, nor obnoxious to suffering and death on his own account, because he was Lord of the law. On which account his obedience (not merely in respect that he obeyed the Father in his sufferings and death, but also that he for our sakes willingly made himself subject to the law and fulfilled it by his obedience) is imputed to us, so that God on account of that whole obedience (which Christ by his acting and by his suffering in his life and in his death, for our sakes rendered to his Father who is in heaven) remits our sins, reputes us as good and just, and gives us eternal salvation."

REFORMED DOCTRINE.—"Thirty–nine Articles," Arts. 11 and 31.—"The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone."Homily 3d. "On Salvation."—"God sent his only Son our Savior Christ into this world, to fulfill the law for us, and by shedding his most precious blood, to make a sacrifice and satisfaction to his Father for our sins.""Heidelberg Cat.," Ques. 12–18 and 40. "West Confession Faith," ch. 8., sect. 5, and ch. 11., sect. 3. "Form. Cons. Helvetica," cans. 13–15. Cocceius ("De Faed. et Testam. Dei," cap. 5, 92). "Thus that greatest mystery (the eternal covenant between the Father and the Son) is revealed in what manner we are justified and saved by God, in what manner God may both be the one who judges, and who acts as surety, and who thus is himself judged who absolves and who intercedes, who sends and is sent. That is in what manner God himself satisfied himself by his own blood."

REMONSTRANT DOCTRINE.—Limborch, "Apol. Thes.," 3, 22, 5.—"It may here be questioned in what way the sacrifice of one man is able to suffice and in feet did suffice for expiating the innumerable sins of so many myriads of men. Answer. It sufficed on two accounts. First with respect to the divine will, which required nothing more for the liberation of the human race, but was satisfied with this one sacrifice alone. Secondly with respect to the dignity of the person, Jesus Christ . . . 21, 6. The satisfaction of Christ is so–called inasmuch as it releases from all the penalties due our sins, and by hearing and exhausting them, satisfies divine justice. But this sentiment has no foundation in Scripture. The death of Christ is called a sacrifice for sin, but sacrifices are not payments of debts, nor are they full satisfactions for sins; but a gratuitous remission is granted when they are offered."

Remonstrantia, etc., five articles prepared by the Dutch advocates of universal redemption (1610), Art 2.—"Therefore Jesus Christ, the Savior of the world, died for all and every man, so that he impetrated for all through his death reconciliation and remission of sins, nevertheless on this condition, that no one should have actual fruition of that reconciliation, unless he is a believer, and that also according to the gospel."

SOCINIAN DOCTRINE.—“Rac. Cat.,” Sec. 5, ch. 8.—“What was the purpose of the divine will that Christ should suffer for our sins? Ans. First, that a most certain right to, and consequently a sure hope of, the remission of their sins, and of eternal life, might by this means be created for all sinners (Romans 8:32; Romans 5:8-10). Secondly, that all sinners might be incited and drawn to Christ, seeking salvation in and by him alone who died for them. Thirdly, that God might in this manner testify his boundless love to the human race, and might wholly reconcile them to himself (John 3:16).”

02.26. The Intercession of Christ.

Chapter 26 The Intercession of Christ.

1. In what sense is Christ to continue a priest forever? This is asserted by Paul, Hebrews 7:3; Hebrews 7:24, to contrast the priesthood of Christ with that of Aaron, which consisted of a succession of mortal men in their generations. His priesthood is perpetual, because, 1st. By one sacrifice for sin he hath forever perfected them that are sanctified;

2nd. He ever liveth to make intercession for us;

3rd. His person and work as mediator will continue for all eternity the ground of our acceptance, and the medium of our communion with the Father.

2. Did he intercede for his people on earth?

He did exercise this function of his priesthood on earth, Luke 23:34; John 17:20; Hebrews 5:7; the principal scene of its exercise, however, is his estate of exaltation in heaven.

3. What is the view which the Scriptures present of the intercession of Christ?

1st. He appears in the presence of God for us, as the priestly advocate of his people, and presents his sacrifice.—Hebrews 9:12; Hebrews 9:24; Revelation 5:6.

2nd. He acts as our advocate with the Father, and on the basis of his own perfect work under the terms of the covenant of grace, claims as his own right, though as infinitely free grace to usward, the fulfillment of all the promises of his covenant. 1 John 2:1; John 17:24; John 14:16; Acts 2:33; Hebrews 7:25.

3rd. Because of his community of nature with his people, and his personal experience of the same sorrows and temptations which now afflict them, he sympathizes with them, and watches and succors them in all their varying circumstances, and adapts his ceaseless intercessions to the entire current of their experiences.—Hebrews 2:17-18; Hebrews 4:15-16; Matthew 28:20; Matthew 18:20.

4th. He presents, and through his merits gains acceptance for the persons and services of his people.—1 Peter 2:5; Ephesians 1:6; Revelation 8:3-4; Hebrews 4:14-16.

4. For whom does he intercede? Not for the world, but for his own people of every fold, and of all times.—John 10:16; John 17:9; John 17:20.

5. Show that his intercession is an essential part of his priestly work.

It is absolutely essential, Hebrews 7:25, because it is necessary for him as mediator not merely to open up a way of possible salvation, but actually to accomplish the salvation of each of given to him by the Father, and to furnish each with an “introduction”προσαγωγη to the Father.—John 17:12; Ephesians 2:18; Ephesians 3:12. The communion of his people with the Father will ever be

sustained through him as mediatorial priest.—Psalms 110:4; Revelation 7:17.

6. What relation does the work of the Holy Ghost sustain to the intercession of Christ?

Christ is a royal priest.—Zechariah 6:13. From the same throne, as king, he dispenses his Spirit to all the objects of his care, while as priest he intercedes for them. The Spirit acts for him, taking only of his things. They both act with one consent, Christ as principal, the Spirit as his agent. Christ intercedes for us, without us, as our advocate in heaven, according to the provisions of the eternal covenant. The Holy Ghost works upon our minds and hearts, enlightening and quickening, and thus determining our desires “according to the will of God,” as our advocate within us. The work of the one is complementary to that of the other, and, together they form a complete whole.—Romans 8:26-27; John 14:26.

02.27. Mediatorial Kingship of Christ.

Chapter 27 Mediatorial Kingship of Christ.

1. How does sovereignty of Christ as Mediator differ from his sovereignty as God? His sovereignty as God is essential to his nature, underived, absolute, eternal, and unchangeable. His sovereignty as mediatorial King is derived, given to him by his Father as the reward of his obedience and suffering; it is special, having respect to the salvation of his own people and the administration of the provisions of the covenant of grace; and it attaches, not to his divine nature as such, but to his person as God–man, occupying the office of Mediator. His kingdom is a very prominent subject in Scripture.—Daniel 2:44; Matthew 13:1-58; Matthew 20:20-29; Luke 13:23-30; Luke 17:20-21; Romans 14:17; 1 Peter 3:22; Ephesians 1:10; Ephesians 1:21-22.

2. What is the extent of Christ's mediatorial kingdom, and what are the different aspects which it presents?

Christ's mediatorial authority embraces the universe.—Matthew 28:18; Php 2:9-11; Ephesians 1:17-23. It presents two great aspects.

1st. In its general administration as embracing the universe as a whole.

2nd. In its special administration as embracing the church.

It has been distinguished as—

(1.) His kingdom of power, which embraces the entire universe in his providential and judicial administration. The end of this is the subjection of his enemies (Hebrews 10:12-13; 1 Corinthians 15:25), the vindication of divine righteousness (John 5:22-27; John 9:39), and the perfecting of his church.

(2.) His kingdom of grace which is spiritual alike as to its subjects, laws, modes of administration, and instrumentalities.

(3.) His kingdom of glory is the consummation of his providential and gracious administration, and will continue forever.

3. What are the objects of his mediatorial authority over the universe, and how is it administered? Its object is to accomplish the salvation of his church in the execution of all the provisions of the covenant of grace, which devolves upon him as Mediator.—Ephesians 1:23. As the universe constitutes one physical and moral system, it was necessary that his headship as Mediator should extend to the whole, in order to cause all things to work together for good to his people, Romans 8:28; to establish a kingdom for them, Luke 22:29; John 14:2; to reduce to subjection all his enemies, 1 Corinthians 15:25; Hebrews 10:13; and in order that all should worship him.—Hebrews 1:6; Revelation 5:9-13. His general mediatorial government of the universe is administered, 1st, providentially; 2d, judicially.—John 5:22; John 5:27; John 9:39; 2 Corinthians 5:10.

Ephesians 1:10, and Colossians 1:20, seem to indicate that Christ's mediatorial headship sustains very comprehensive relations to the moral universe in general, which otherwise are entirely unrevealed.

4. When did Christ formally assume his mediatorial kingdom?

1st. The advocates of the premillennial advent, and personal reign of Christ on earth, admit that Christ now reigns at his Father's right hand, on his Father's throne, and in his Father's right, but maintain that he will not enter properly upon his own kingdom and sit upon his own throne as Mediator, until his second advent, when he will assume the literal throne of David, and constitute the kingdom from Jerusalem its capital.

2nd. The truth as held by all branches of the historical church is, that while Christ has been virtually mediatorial King as well as Prophet and Priest from the fall of Adam, vet his public and formal assumption of his throne and inauguration of his spiritual kingdom dates from his ascension and session at the right hand of his Father. This is proved because the Old Testament predictions of his kingdom (Psalms 2:6; Jeremiah 23:5; Isaiah 9:6; Daniel 2:44) are in the New Testament applied to the first advent. John the Baptist declared that the kingdom of heaven was at hand. Christ declared "the kingdom of God is come unto you," and likens it to the field with wheat and tares growing together, etc.—Matthew 4:23; Acts 2:29-36.

5. What are the different titles applied in Scripture to this kingdom, and what are the senses in which these titles of the kingdom are used?

It is called—

(1.) The "kingdom of God,"Luke 4:43, because it is pre–eminently of divine origin, and the authority of God is with peculiar directness and fullness exercised in its administration.

(2.) "The kingdom of Christ" and of "God's dear Son,"Matthew 16:28; Colossians 1:13, because he is in person the immediate sovereign.

(3.) "The kingdom of heaven,"Matthew 11:12, because its origin and characteristics are from heaven, and its consummation is to be in heaven.

These phrases are sometimes used to express—

(1.) Christ's mediatorial authority, or its administration, and the power and glory which belong to it, as when we ascribe to him the "kingdom and the power and the glory," or affirm that of "his kingdom there shall be no end."

(2.) The blessings and advantages of all kinds, inward and outward, which are characteristic of this administration, as when we say the "kingdom is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." Thus Napoleon III. said, "The Empire is peace."

(3.) The subjects of the kingdom collectively, as when we are said to "enter the kingdom," and speak of "the keys of the kingdom," which admit to or exclude from this community. In this latter sense the phrase "kingdom of God," or "of heaven," is synonymous with the word "Church." The word βασιλεια in this connection, occurs one hundred and thirty–seven times in the entire New Testament, and one hundred and ten times in the gospels, fifty–three times in Matthew alone, the

gospel most nearly related to the Old Testament, and only twenty times in the epistles, while εκκλησια when referring to the Church of Christ, occurs but once in the gospels and eighty–eight in the epistles and revelations.

6. What is the nature of Christ's kingly administration of the affairs of his own people, i. e., of his kingdom as distinct from the universe?

1st. It is providential. He administers his providential government over the universe with the design of accomplishing thereby the support, defense, enrichment, and glorification of his people.

2nd. It is accomplished by the dispensation of:his Spirit effectually calling, sanctifying, comforting, preserving, raising, and glorifying his people.—John 15:26; Acts 2:33-36.

3rd. It is accomplished by his prescribing the form, and order, and functions of his church, the officers who are to act as the organs of those functions, and the laws which they are to administer.—Matthew 28:18-20; Ephesians 4:8; Ephesians 4:11.

4th. By designating the persons who are successively to assume those offices, by means of a spiritual car], expressed in the witness of the Spirit, the leadings of providence, and the call of the brethren.—Acts 1:23-24; Acts 6:5; Acts 13:2-3; Acts 20:28; 1 Timothy 1:12; 1 Timothy 4:14.

Under this administration this kingdom presents two aspects, 1st, as militant, Ephesians 6:11-16; Ephesians 2:1-22 d, as glorified.—Revelation 3:21. And accordingly Christ presents himself as fulfilling, in his administration of the affairs of his kingdom, the functions of a great Captain, Revelation 19:11; Revelation 19:16, and of a sovereign Prince reigning from a throne.—Revelation 21:5; Revelation 21:22-23. The throne upon which he sits and from which he reigns is presented in three different aspects, corresponding to the different relations he sustains to his people and the world; as a throne of grace, Hebrews 4:16; a throne of judgment, Revelation 20:11-15; and a throne of glory.—Compare Revelation 4:2-5 with Revelation 5:6.

7. In what sense is Christ's kingdom spiritual?

1st. The King is a spiritual and not an earthly sovereign. Matthew 20:28; John 18:36.

2nd. His throne is at the right hand of God.—Acts 2:33.

3rd. His scepter is spiritual.—Isaiah 53:1; Psalms 110:2.

4th. The citizens of his kingdom are spiritual men.—Php 3:20; Ephesians 2:19.

5th. The mode in which he administers his government is spiritual.—Zechariah 4:6-7.

6th. His laws are spiritual.—John 4:24.

7th. The blessings and the penalties of his kingdom are spiritual.—1 Corinthians 5:4-11; 2 Corinthians 10:4; Ephesians 1:3-8; 2 Timothy 4:2; Titus 2:15.

8. What is the extent of the powers which Christ has vested in his visible church? In respect to the civil magistrate the church is absolutely independent. In subjection to the supreme authority of Christ her head the powers of the church are solely, 1st, declarative, i. e., to expound the Scriptures, which are the perfect rule of faith and practice, and thus to witness to and promulgate

the truth in creeds and confessions, by the pulpit and the press. And, 2d, ministerial, i. e., to organize herself according to the pattern furnished in the Word. Then to administer, through the proper officers, the sacraments, and those laws and that discipline prescribed by the Master, and to make provision for the proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom to every creature.—Isaiah 8:20; Deuteronomy 4:2; Matthew 28:18-20; Hebrews 13:17; 1 Peter 2:4.

9. What are the conditions of admission into Christ's kingdom?

Simply practical recognition of the authority of the sovereign. As the sovereign and the entire method of his administration are spiritual, it is plain that his authority must be understood and embraced practically, according to its spiritual nature. This is that spiritual faith which involves spiritual illumination.—John 3:3; John 3:5; John 1:12; 1 Corinthians 12:3.

10. What is the Romish doctrine of the relation of the church to the state?

According to the strictly logical Romish doctrine, the state is only one phase of the church. The whole nation being in all its members a portion of the church universal, the civil organization is comprehended within the church for special subordinate ends, and is responsible to the church for the exercise of all the authority delegated to it.

First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, Council of the Vatican, 1870, Ch. 4:, declares that the judgments of the Pope, pronounced ex cathedra("From the chair," carries weight of infallable authority) as pastor and doctor of all Christians upon any question of faith or morals is infallible and irreformable. This infallibility is personal, independent, separate, and absolute. This comprehends all matter of fact and doctrine revealed, and all such further matters of fact or truth unrevealed yet involved in the defense of that which is revealed. In the third chapter the supreme authority of the infallible Pope is extended "to the supreme and full power of jurisdiction over the universal church, not only in things which belong to faith and morals, but also in those which relate to the discipline and government thereof." In the "Papal Syllabus of Errors," 1864, sent to all the bishops by the authority of the Pope, the right of religious liberty is condemned, the right to enforce the decrees of the church by force is asserted, and the marriage of those who refuse to accept the Romish Sacrament of matrimony declared void (see the affirmative propositions published by Von P. Clemens Schrader, with the approbation of the Pope).

Pope Pius himself; in his reply to the Address from the Academia of the Catholic Religion (July 21, 1873), declares that the Pope possesses the right, which he properly uses, under favorable circumstances, "to pass judgment even in civil affairs, on the acts of princes and of nations."

Archbishop Manning, in "Caesarism and Ultramontanism," p. 35, says, "If, then, the civil power be not competent to decide the limits of the spiritual power, and if the spiritual power can define, with a divine certainty, its own limits, it is evidently supreme. Or in other words, the spiritual power knows with divine certainty the limits of its own jurisdiction; and it knows therefore the limits and competence of the civil power.""Any power which is independent, and can alone fix the limits of its own jurisdiction, and can thereby fix the limits of all other jurisdiction, is ipso facto supreme."—See Hon. Wm. E. Gladstone, "The Vatican Decrees in their bearing on Civil Allegiance," and his "Answer to Reproofs and Replies."

11. What is the Erastian doctrine as to the relation of the church to the state? This doctrine, named from Erastus, a physician resident in Heidelberg in the sixteenth century, is precisely contrary to that of the Romanists, i. e., it regards the church as only one phase of the state. The state, being a divine institution, designed to provide for all the wants of men, spiritual as well as temporal, is consequently charged with the duty of providing for the dissemination of pure doctrine, and for the proper administration of the sacraments, and of discipline. It is the duty of the state, therefore, to support the church, to appoint its officers, to define its laws, and to superintend its administration.

12. What is the common doctrine of the Reformed Church on this point? That the church and the state are both divine institutions, having different objects, and in every respect independent of each other. The members and officers of the Church are, as men, members of the state, and ought to be good citizens; and the members and officers of the state, if Christians, are members of the church, and as such subject to her laws. But neither the officers nor the laws of either have any authority within the sphere of the other.

13. What is the idea and design of the State?

Civil government is a divine institution, designed to protect men in the enjoyment of their civil rights. 1t has, therefore, derived from God authority to define those rights touching all questions of person and property, and to provide for their vindication, to regulate intercourse, and to provide all means necessary for its own preservation.

14. What is the design of the visible Church?

It is a divine institution designed to secure instrumentally the salvation of men. To that end it is specially designed—

1st. To bring men to a knowledge of the truth.

2nd. To secure their obedience to the truth, and to exercise their graces by the public confession of Christ, the fellowship of the brethren, and the administration of the ordinances and discipline.

3rd. To constitute the visible witness and prophetic type of the church invisible and spiritual.

15. What are the duties of the officers of the State with regard to the Church? The state is a divine institution, and the officers thereof are God’s ministers, Romans 13:1-4, Christ the Mediator is, as a revealed fact, “Ruler among the Nations,” King of kings, and Lord of lords, Revelation 19:16; Matthew 28:18; Php 2:9-11; Ephesians 1:17-23, and the Sacred Scriptures are an infallible rule of faith and practice to all men under all conditions.

It follows therefore—

1st. That every nation should explicitly acknowledge the Christ of God to be the Supreme Governor, and his revealed will the supreme fundamental law of the land, to the general principles of which all special legislation should be conformed.

2nd. That all civil officers should make the glory of God their end, and his revealed will their guide.

3rd. That, while no distinction should be made between the various Christian denominations, and perfect liberty of conscience and worship be allowed to all men, nevertheless the Christian

magistrate should seek to promote piety as well as civil order ("Confession Faith," ch. 23, § 2). This they are to do, not by assuming ecclesiastical functions, nor by attempting to patronize or control the church, but by their personal example, by giving impartial protection to church property and facility to church work, by the enactment and enforcement of laws conceived in the true spirit of the Gospel, and especially in maintaining inviolate the Christian Sabbath, and Christian marriage, and in providing for Christian instruction in the public schools.

16. What relation does the civil law in the United States sustain to Church polity, discipline, and property?

I. HISTORY.—

1st. In England the established Church is a corporation created and controlled by the State.

2nd. In most of the American Colonies, the State, at first undertook the absolute control of ecclesiastical affairs, and limited rights of citizenship by religious tests.

II. PRESENT FACTS.—

1st. The Constitution of the United States provides that "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States, and that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The constitutions of the several states provide to the same effect.

2nd. Christianity in a general sense is, as an historical fact, an essential element of the common law of England, and therefore that of the United States (except Louisiana, Texas, New Mexico, California, etc.), incorporated in our customs, principles, precedents, etc.10

3rd. It is recognized by the civil law as the historical and actual religion of the vast majority of the citizens of the United States. The Christian faith and the institutions in which it finds expression, are, therefore, to be reverenced and protected by the civil law.

4th. The civil law, therefore, recognizes the church, as having an historic character, and as being an important element of society. It recognizes and protects its right to exist and enjoy the possession of:its legitimate privileges and powers. Thus the civil law recognizes and protects (1.) the autonomy of the church as to (a) its general polity and (b) its discipline of persons.

(2.) The rights of each church as an organized whole to its property.

5th. The civil courts recognize as final the decisions of church courts as to (1) who are members of the church, and (2) who are the spiritual officers of the church. The civil court will not presume to go back of the decision of the church court in order to determine (1) whether it was rightly constituted (i. e., if the church court in question be recognized by the highest authority in the church), or (2) whether subsequently to its constitution the church court has acted consistently with its own rules.

Judge Rogers, of the Supreme Court of Penna., in the case of the German Reformed Church of Lebanon Co., Pa., said "The decisions of ecclesiastical courts, like every other judicial tribunal, are final, as they are the best judges of what constitutes an offence against the word of God and the constitution of the church." The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of the Walnut

Street Church, Louisville, Ky., 1872, decided—

(1.) Where the subject matter of dispute is strictly and purely ecclesiastical in its character a matter which concerns theological controversy, church discipline, ecclesiastical government, or the conformity of the members of the church to the standard of morals required of them, and the ecclesiastical courts claim jurisdiction, the civil courts will not assume jurisdiction—they will not even inquire into the right of the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical court.

(2.) A spiritual court is the exclusive judge of its own

Jurisdiction:its decision of that question is binding on the secular courts (see “Presbyterian Digest,” Dr. Wm. E. Moore, p. 251).

6th. The civil law recognizes the right of the church to discipline its members. Even the public declaration made pursuant of the rules of order of a church from which a member has been excommunicated, because of his commission of an offense regarded as infamous by the law, is justified, and no action of slander can be maintained for such a publication.

7th. The church proper, or “ecclesiastical society,” is distinguished from the incorporated “religious society” created to hold property for the use of the former. These incorporated religious societies are governed by their charters, and by the by–laws made in pursuance thereof; they hold property by means of trustees, and are virtually civil societies as much as any bank or railroad company. It is governed by the law precisely as other corporations are. It is subject to visitation. Intrusion into its offices may be remedied, and it will be restrained from a maladministration, or a misappropriation of the property. Its articles of association, and by–laws under its charter, providing for meetings, elections, and conduct of temporal affairs, may be changed according to the terms provided by the charter, but are binding while they exist. Substantial conformity to them is essential to the valid transaction of business, and may be reviewed by the civil court.

8th. When the “Will” or “Deed of Gift” or “Terms of Subscription” of the original donors of the property, or the charter of the church, prescribes neither (1) any specific doctrine, nor (2) any particular form of church government, nor connection with any definite religious denomination, then the majority of the members of the church in question control the property, and in case of change of doctrines, or discipline, or of denominational relation, may carry the property with them. But whenever either the doctrine or the form of government or ecclesiastical connection is defined, either by the original donors or by the charter of the church, the civil courts will protect and enforce the trust. In such case, if any change is made by the majority in either of these essential points, the majority, however large, forfeits the property, and the minority, however small, will be maintained in possession. And the civil court will in all such cases receive and act on the decisions of the superior ecclesiastical courts as final (see Lectures by Hon. Wm. Strong, LL.D., Justice of Supreme Court of U. S., 1875).

17. What is the relative jurisdictions of the “Boards of Trustees,” and of the “Sessions” of our Presbyterian Churches, over the houses of worship pertaining to their respective Congregations? The “Session” is the only body of congregational officers known to our ecclesiastical constitution. The “Board of Trustees” is a creature of the civil courts for the purpose of holding the congregational property in trust. As to their respective jurisdictions the decisions of the courts and of the general assembly are in harmony with each other The legal title to the property is vested in

the trustees, and they have the custody of it “for the uses and purposes for which they hold it in trust,” namely, the worship of God, etc., according to the order of the church to which it appertains, including business meetings relating to the congregation. The session is charged with the supervision of the spiritual interests of the congregation, including the right to direct and control the use of the building for such purposes. In the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Louisville Walnut Street case, the following principles were enunciated:“1. By the act of the legislature creating the trustees of a church, a body corporate, and by the acknowledged rules of the Presbyterian Church, the trustees are the mere nominal title–holders and custodians of the church property. 2. That in the use of the property for all religious services, or ecclesiastical purposes, the trustees are under the control of the church session.” In a difference between trustees and the session of a church in Philadelphia respecting an organist, the question was carried to the Supreme Court of that state, who decided that the worship of the congregation was under the charge of the session, and that the service of song was a part of the worship, and hence the appointment of the organist was in the session. The civil courts are very firm in maintaining the rights and privileges of religious worship, and of churches, and in requiring the observance of the trust.

18. What are the duties of the Church with regard to the State?

1st. The church owes obedience to the state in the exercise of her lawful authority over the public property of the church.

2nd. She is bound to use all the lawful means in her possession for carrying the gospel to all the members of the state. Beyond this the church owes no duty to the state whatever.

19. In what sense is Christ to return his kingdom to his Father, and in what sense will his mediatorial headship continue forever? The sum of what is revealed to us upon this subject appears to be, that after the complete glorification of his people, and the destruction of his enemies, Christ will demit his mediatorial authority over the universe, which he has administered as God–man, in order that the Godhead absolute may be immediately all in all to the creature.—1 Corinthians 15:24-28. But his mediatorial headship over his own people, including the offices of prophet, priest, and king, shall continue forever. This is certain—

1st. Because he is a priest forever, and of his kingdom there is no end.—Psalms 110:4; Daniel 7:14; Luke 1:33.

2nd. The personal union between his divine and human nature is to continue forever.

3rd. As Mediator he is the head of the church, which is his fullness, and the consummation of the marriage of the Lamb is the beginning of heaven.—Revelation 19:7; Revelation 21:2; Revelation 21:9.

4th. As “a Lamb that had been slain,” he is represented in heaven on the throne as ever more the temple and the light of the city, and as feeding his people, and leading them to fountains of living waters.—Revelation 5:6; Revelation 7:17; Revelation 21:22-23.

CHRIST EXECUTED HIS OFFICE OF MEDIATOR BOTH IN HIS ESTATE OF HUMILIATION AND EXALTATION 20. Wherein does Christ’s humiliation consist?

See “Larger Catechism,” Questions 46–50; “Shorter Catechism,” Question 27.

21. In what sense was Christ made under the law, and how was that subjection an act of humiliation? In his incarnation Christ was born precisely into the law place of his people, and sustained to the law precisely that relation which they did. He was born under the law, then, 1st. as a rule of duty;

2nd. as a covenant of life;

3rd. as a broken covenant, whose curse was already incurred. His voluntary assumption of such a position was pre–eminently an act of humiliation:

1st. His assumption of a human nature was voluntary.

2nd. After his incarnation his person remained divine, and the claims of law terminating upon persons, and not upon natures, his submission to those claims was purely gratuitous.

3rd. This condescension is immeasurably heightened by the fact that he accepted the curse of the law as of a covenant of life already broken—Galatians 3:10-13; Galatians 4:4-5.

22. In what sense did Christ undergo the curse of the law, and how was that possible for God’s well–beloved Son? In his own person, absolutely considered, Christ is often declared by the father to be his “beloved Son, with whom he was well pleased,”Matthew 3:17; 2 Peter 1:17; and he always did that which pleased God.—John 8:29. But in his office as mediator he had assumed our place, and undertaken to bear the guilt of our sin. The wrath of God, then, which Christ bore, was the infinite displeasure of God against our sins, which displeasure terminated upon Christ’s person vicariously, because of the iniquity of us all which was laid upon him.—Matthew 26:38; Matthew 27:46; Luke 22:44.

23. What are the different interpretations of the phrase in the apostles’ creed, “he descended into hell,” or Hades? The phrase, καταβασις εις αδου, desensus ad inferos, was one of the last incorporated into the ancient Creed. It is supposed to be derived from Psalms 16:10; Acts 2:27; 1 Peter 4:18-19.

1st. The Catholic Church, on the basis of ancient tradition, interpret this phrase to mean that Christ after his death went in his entire person as God–man, to the Limbus Patrum, that department of Hades in which the Old Testament saints remained waiting for the revelation and application to them of his salvation. Here he preached the gospel, and brought them out to heaven. See below the “Cat. Council of Trent.”

2nd. The Lutherans hold that Christ’s death was the last stage in his humiliation, and his descent to Hades the first stage of his exaltation, since he went to reveal and consummate his victory over Satan and the powers of darkness, and to pronounce their sentence of condemnation.

3rd. The Church of England affirms in the

4th. Article—“As Christ died for us and was buried, so also it is to be believed that he went down into hell.” In the first book of Edward VI. it is stated more fully—“The body of Christ lay in the sepulchre until his resurrection, but his ghost departing from him, was with the ghosts which were in prison, or in hell, and did preach to the same, as the place of St. Peter doth testify.” Bishop

Pearson, in his “Exposition of the Creed,” teaches that Christ really went to the place of the damned to consummate the expiation of human sin, and to destroy the power of hell over his redeemed.

5th. Calvin (“Institutes,” Bk. 2, ch. 16., § 10) interprets this phrase metaphorically, as expressing the penal sufferings of Christ on the cross. Our “Confession Faith” affixes to the Creed the explanatory clause, “continued in the state of the dead,” and the American Episcopal Church affixes the equivalent clause, “he went into the place of departed spirits.” That is, Christ was a real man, consisting of soul and body, and his death was a real death, his soul leaving the body and going into the invisible world of spirits, where it continued a separate conscious existence until his resurrection.

24. What is the true meaning of 1 Peter 3:19-21? This passage is very obscure. The Romish interpretation is shown in the answer to the preceding question, i. e., that Christ went to the Limbus Patrum and preached the gospel to those imprisoned spirits that were awaiting his advent. The common Protestant interpretation is that Christ was put to death in the body, but quickened, or restored to life by the Spirit, by which Spirit, inspiring Noah as a preacher of righteousness, Christ many centuries previously had descended from heaven, and preached to the men of that generation, who in their sin and unbelief were the “spirits in prison.” Only eight persons believed and were saved; therefore, Christian professors and teachers ought not to faint because of the unbelief of mankind now.

Another interpretation, suggested by Archbishop Leighton in a note, as his last opinion, is, that Christ dying in the body as a vicarious sacrifice is quickened in the spirit, i. e., spiritually quickened, manifested as a complete Savior in a higher degree than was possible before. As a grain of wheat dying he began to bear much fruit. Thus quickened, he now, through the inspiration of his Spirit, preached to “spirits in prison,” i. e., prisoners of sin and Satan, just as he had before done, though with less power, through Noah and all the prophets when the spirits were disobedient; under the ministry of Noah only eight souls being saved; but since Christ was quickened in spirit, i. e., manifested as a complete Saviour, multitudes believed.

25. Wherein does Christ’s exaltation consist?

“Shorter Cat.,” Question 28, “Larger Cat.,” Questions 51–54.

26. In what sense was it possible for the co–equal Son of God to be exalted? As the co–equal Son of God this was impossible, yet his person as God–man was capable of exaltation in several respects.

1st. Through the union of the divine and human natures, the outward manifestations of the glory of his person had been veiled from the eyes of creatures.

2nd. As Mediator he occupied officially a position inferior to the Father, condescending to occupy the place of sinners. He had been inconceivably humbled, and, as a reward consequent upon his voluntary self–humiliation, the Father highly exalted him.—Php 2:8-9; Hebrews 12:2; Revelation 5:6.

3rd. His human soul and body were inconceivably exalted.—Matthew 17:2; Revelation 1:12-16; Revelation 20:11.

27. What are the various sources proof by which the resurrection of Christ is established?

1st. The Old Testament predicted it. Compare Psalms 16:10, and Acts 2:24-31. All the other predictions concerning the Messiah were fulfilled in Christ, therefore this.

2nd. Christ predicted it, and therefore, if he was a true prophet, he must have risen.—Matthew 20:19; John 10:18.

3rd. The event, his extraordinary origin and character considered, is not antecedently improbable.

4th. The testimony of the eleven apostles. These men are proved by their writings to have been good, intelligent, and serious, and they each had every opportunity of ascertaining the fact, and they sealed their sincerity with their blood.—Acts 1:3.

5th. The separate testimony of Paul, who, as one born out of due time, saw his risen Lord, and derived his revelation and commission from him in person.—1 Corinthians 15:8; Galatians 1:12, Acts 9:3-8.

6th. He was seen by five hundred brethren at once, to whom Paul appeals.—1 Corinthians 15:6.

7th. The change of the `Sabbath, from the last to the first day of the week, is a monument of the concurrent testimony of the whole of the first generation of Christians, to the fact that they believed that Christ rose from the dead.

8th. The miracles wrought by the apostles were God's seals to their testimony that he had raised Christ.—Hebrews 2:4.

9th. The accompanying witness of the Holy Ghost, honoring the apostles' doctrine and ministry not merely by miraculous gifts, but by his sanctifying, elevating, and consoling power.—Acts 5:32. Dr. Hodge.

28. By whose power did Christ rise from the dead? The Scriptures ascribe his resurrection—

1st. To himself.—John 2:19; John 10:17 2nd. To the Father.—Acts 13:33; Romans 10:9; Ephesians 1:20. This is reconciled upon the principle that all acts of divine power, terminating upon objects external to the Godhead, may be attributed to either of the divine persons, or to the Godhead absolutely.—John 5:17-19.

29. On what ground does the apostle declare that our faith is vain if Christ be not risen(1 Corinthians 15:14)?

1st. If Christ be risen indeed, then he is the true Messiah, and all the prophecies of both dispensations have in that fact a pledge of their fulfillment. If he has not risen, then are they all false.

2nd. The resurrection proved him to be the Son of God, Romans 1:4, for (1) he rose by his own power, (2) it authenticated all his claims with respect to himself.

3rd. In the resurrection of Christ the Father publicly declared his approbation and acceptance of Christ's work as surety of his people.—Romans 4:25.

4th. If Christ has risen, we have an advocate with the Father.—Romans 8:34; Hebrews 9:11-12; Hebrews 9:24.

5th. If Christ be raised, we have assurance of eternal life; if he lives, we shall live also.—John 14:19; 1 Peter 1:3-5.

6th. Owing to the union between Christ and his members, which is both federal and spiritual, his resurrection secures ours, (1) because, as we died in Adam, so we must live in Christ, 1 Corinthians 15:21-22; (2) because of his Spirit, that dwelleth in us.—Romans 8:11; 1 Corinthians 6:15; 1 Thessalonians 4:14.

7th. Christ's resurrection illustrates and determines the nature of our resurrection as well as secures it.—1 Corinthians 15:49; Php 3:21; 1 John 3:2. Dr. Hodge.

30. When, at what place, and in whose presence did Christ ascend?

He ascended forty days after his resurrection, from a portion of the Mount of Olives, near to the village of Bethany, in the presence of the eleven apostles, and possibly of other disciples, while he was in the act of blessing them, and while they beheld him, and were looking steadfastly. Luke says, moreover, that there were two glorified men present, who are conjectured by Professor J. A. Alexander to have been Moses and Elijah. He was attended also with angels celebrating his victory over sin, and his exaltation to his mediatorial throne.—Luke 24:50-51; Mark 16:19; Acts 1:9-11; Ephesians 4:8; Colossians 2:13-15; Psalms 24:7-10; Psalms 68:18.

31. What are the different opinions as to the nature of Christ's ascension?

Those who, as the Lutherans, believe that Christ's body is omnipresent to his church, of course, maintain that his ascension consisted not in any local change, but in the withdrawal of his former sensible intercourse with his disciples.

It is certain, however, that his human soul and body did actually pass up from earth to the abode of the blessed, and that his entire person, as the God–man, was gloriously exalted. He ascended as Mediator, triumphing over his enemies, and giving gifts to his friends, Ephesians 4:8-12; to complete his mediatorial John 14:2-3; as the Forerunner of his people, Hebrews 6:20; and to fill the universe with the manifestations of his. glory and power.—Ephesians 4:10.

32. What is included in Christ's sitting at the right hand of the Father?

See Psalms 110:1; Mark 16:19; Romans 8:34; Ephesians 1:20; Ephesians 1:22; Colossians 3:1; Hebrews 1:3-4; Hebrews 10:12; 1 Peter 3:22. This language is evidently figurative, yet it very expressively sets forth the supreme glorification of Christ in heaven. It presents him as the God–man, and in his office as Mediator exalted to supreme and universal glory, felicity, and power over all principalities and powers, and every name that is named.—Hebrews 2:9; Psalms 16:11; Matthew 26:64; Daniel 7:13-14; Php 2:9; Php 2:11; John 5:22; Revelation 5:6. Thus publicly assuming his throne as mediatorial Priest and King over the universe for the benefit of his church.

SEATED UPON THAT THRONE HE, DURING THE PRESENT DISPENSATION, AS MEDIATOR, EFFECTUALLY APPLIES TO HIS PEOPLE, THROUGH HIS SPIRIT, THAT SALVATION WHICH HE HAD PREVIOUSLY ACHIEVED FOB THEM IN HIS ESTATE OF HUMILIATION.

AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS OF DOCTRINES.

ROMAN DOCTRINE.—“Cat. Conc. Trent,” Pt. 1, ch. 6.— “Therefore we profess that, immediately Christ was dead, his soul descended into hell. . . But in these words we at the same time confess, that the same person of Christ was at the same time, in hell and in the sepulchre, for . . . although his soul departed from his body, his divinity was never separated either from soul or body. . . The word “hell” signifies those hidden abodes in which are detained souls that have not attained heavenly bliss. . . These abodes were not all of the same kind. . . A third sort of receptacle is that in which were received the souls of the saints who died before the coming of Christ our Lord; and where, without any sense of pain, sustained by the blessed hope of redemption, they enjoyed a tranquil abode. The souls, then, of these pious men, who in the bosom of Abraham were expecting the Saviour; Christ the Lord liberated, descending into hell. . . . He descended not to suffer aught but to liberate from the miserable weariness of that captivity the holy and the just, and to impart to them the fruit of his passion.”

LUTHERAN DOCTRINE. “Formula Concordiae”(Hase), p. 788.—“Therefore we believe simply, that the entire person, God and man, after burial descended to the lower regions, overcame Satan, overthrew the infernal powers, and took away from the devil all force and authority.” Pp. 767, 768.—“ By virtue of this personal union and communion, he produced all his miracles, and manifested his divine majesty, according to a most free will, when and in what manner seemed good to him, not only after his resurrection and ascension to heaven, but even in his state of humiliation. Indeed he had this majesty immediately upon his conception, even in the womb of his mother; but as the apostle speaks (Php 2:8), he emptied himself; and as Dr. Luther teaches, he had this majesty secretly in the state of his humiliation, nor did he use it always, but as often as seemed to him good. But now, after he has, not in a common manner like any other holy person, ascended into the heavens; but, as the Apostle testifies (Ephesians 4:10), has ascended above all heavens, and truly fills all things, and everywhere present, not only as God, but also as man, rules and reigns from sea to sea, and even to the ends of the earth. . . . These things, however, were not done in an earthly manner, but, as Dr. Luther was accustomed to say, in the way and manner of the right hand of God (pro modo et ratione dexteroe Dei), which is not any fixed and limited place in heaven, but signifies nothing else than the omnipotent power of God which fills heaven and earth—into possession of which Christ really and truly comes as to his humanity without any confusion or equalizing of his natures (divine and human), either as to their essences or essential attributes.”

10 Case of Updegraff 5. The Commonwealth of Penna., 11 S. and R. 400 before Supreme Court, Justices Duncan, Tilghman, and Gibson, 1824.

02.28. Effectual Calling

Chapter 28 Effectual Calling The Application of Redemption accomplished by Christ as Mediatorial King through the Personal Agency of the Holy Ghost.

1. What is the New Testament usage of the wordsκαλειν (to call),κλησις (calling), andκλητος (the called)?

καλειν is used in the sense, 1st, of calling with the voice, John 10:3; Mark 1:20;

2nd, of calling forth, to summon authoritatively, Acts 4:18; Acts 24:2;

3rd, of inviting, Matthew 22:3; Matthew 9:13; 1 Timothy 6:12. Many are called, but few chosen.

4th. Of the effectual call of the Spirit.—Romans 8:28-30; 1 Peter 2:9; 1 Peter 5:10.

5th. Of an appointment to office.—Hebrews 5:4.

6th. In the sense of naming, Matthew 1:21; κλησις occurs eleven times in the New Testament, in each instance it signifies the effectual call of the Holy Spirit, with the exception of 1 Corinthians 7:20, where it is used as synonymous with business or trade. See Romans 11:29; 1 Corinthians 1:26, etc.—Robinson's "Lex."

κλητος occurs ten times in the New Testament. It is used to signify—

1st. Those appointed to any office.—Romans 1:1.

2nd. Those who receive the external call of the word.—Matthew 20:16.

3rd. The effectually called.—Romans 1:7; Romans 8:28; 1 Corinthians 1:2; 1 Corinthians 1:24; Jude 1:1 :; Revelation 17:14. The very word εκκλησια(church) designating the company of the faithful, the heirs of all the promises, signifies, etymologically, the company called forth, the body constituted by "the calling."

2. What is included in the external call?

1st. A declaration of the plan of salvation.

2nd. A declaration of duty on the part of the sinner to repent and believe.

3rd. A declaration of the motives which ought to influence the sinner's mind, such as fear or hope, remorse or gratitude.

4th. A promise of acceptance in the case of all those who comply with the conditions.—Dr. Hodge.

3. How can it be proved that the external call to salvation is made only through the word of God? The law of God, as impressed upon the moral constitution of man, is natural, and inseparable from man as a moral responsible agent.—Romans 1:19-20; Romans 2:14-15. But the gospel is no part oft that natural law. It is of grace, not of nature, and it can be made known to us only by a special

and supernatural revelation. This is further evident, 1st, because the Scriptures declare that a knowledge of the word is essential to salvation, Romans 10:14-17; Romans 2:1-29 d, because they also declare that those who neglect the word, either written or preached, are guilty of the eminent sin of rejecting all possibility of salvation.—Matthew 11:21-22; Hebrews 2:3.

4. 0n what principle is this external call addressed equally to the non–elect as well as to the elect? That it is addressed indiscriminately to both classes is proved—

1st. From the express declaration of Scripture.—Matthew 22:14.

2nd. The command to preach the gospel to every creature.—Mark 16:15.

3rd. The promise to every one who accepts it.—Revelation 22:17.

4th. The awful judgment pronounced upon those who reject it.—John 3:19; John 16:9.

It is addressed to the non–elect equally with the elect, because it is equally their duty and interest to accept the gospel, because the provisions of salvation are equally suited to their case, and abundantly sufficient for all, and because God intends that its benefits shall actually accrue to every one who accepts it.

5. How can it be proved that there is an internal spiritual call distinct from an external one?

1st. From those passages which distinguish the Spirit's influence from that of the word.—John 6:45; John 6:64-65; 1 Thessalonians 1:5-6.

2nd. Those passages which teach that the Spirit's influence is necessary to the reception of the truth.—Ephesians 1:17.

3rd. Those that refer all good in man to God.—Php 2:13; Ephesians 2:8; 2 Timothy 2:25, e. g., faith and repentance.

4th. The Scripture distinguishes between the two calls; of the subjects of the one it is said, "many are called and few are chosen," of the subjects of the other it is said, "whom he called, them he also justified." Of the one he says, "Because I have called, and ye have refused."—Proverbs 1:24. Of the other he says, "Every man therefore who hath heard and hath learned of the Father cometh unto me."—John 6:45.

5th. There is an absolute necessity for such an internal, spiritual call, man by nature is "blind" and "dead" in trespasses and sins.—1 Corinthians 2:14; 2 Corinthians 4:4; Ephesians 2:1.

6. What is the Pelagian view of the internal call?

Pelagians deny original sin, and maintain that right and wrong are qualities attaching only to executive acts of the will. They therefore assert—

1st. The full ability of the freewill of man as much to cease from sin at any time as to continue in its practice.

2nd. That the Holy Spirit produces no inward change in the heart of the subject, except as he is the author of the Scriptures, and as the Scriptures present moral truths and motives, which of their own nature exert a moral influence upon the soul. They deny "grace" altogether in the Scriptural

sense.

7. What is the Semipelagian view?

These maintain that grace is necessary to enable a man successfully to return unto God and live. Yet that from the very nature of the human will man must first of himself desire to be free from sin, and to choose God as his chief good, when he may expect God's aid in carrying his desires into effect. They deny prevenient grace, but admit co–operative grace.

8. What is the Arminian view? The Arminians admit the doctrine of man's total depravity, and that in consequence thereof man is utterly unable to do any thing aright in the unaided exercise of his natural faculties. Nevertheless, as Christ died equally for every man, sufficient grace, enabling its subject to do all that is required of him, is granted to all. Which sufficient grace becomes efficient only when it is co–operated with and improved by the sinner.—"Apol. Confession Remonstr.," p. 162, b.; Limborch, "Theo. Christ.," 4, 12, 8.

9. What is the doctrine on this subject taught by the Symbols of the Lutheran Church?

They agree absolutely with the Reformed or Calvinists—

1st. That all men are by nature spiritually dead, utterly unable either to commence to turn to God, or to co–operate with his grace to that end prior to regeneration.

2nd. That the gracious operation of the Holy Spirit on the human soul is the sole efficient cause which quickens the dead soul to life. Hence—

3rd. The foundation upon which the salvation of believers rests is the eternal, gracious election of God to salvation. They refuse however to take the next step, and acknowledge that the reason unbelievers are not quickened is due to the equally sovereign withholding of regenerating grace. They insist upon attributing it solely to the criminal resistance to the grace, of the initial stages of which all are the subjects. A and B are alike sinners, A believes and B remains a reprobate. The Pelagian says, because A willed to believe and B to reject. The Semipelagian says, because A commenced to strive and was helper, and B made no effort. The Arminian says, because A co–operated with common grace, and B did not The Lutheran says, both were utterly unable to co–operate, but B persistently resisted grace, and A ultimately yielded. The Calvinist says, because A was regenerated by the new creative power of God's Spirit, and B was not.

10. What is the Synergistic view of this point? The term Synergistic signifies co–operation. The Synergists were Lutheran theologians, who departed from their own system on this one subject, and adopted the position of the Arminians. Melanchthon taught that "there concur three causes of a good action, the word of God, the Holy Spirit, and the human will assenting, not resisting, the word of God.""Loci Communes," p. 90.

11. What is the common doctrine of the Reformed Churches as to the internal call? That it is an exercise of the divine power upon the soul, immediate, spiritual, and supernatural, communicating a new spiritual life, and thus marring a new mode of spiritual activity possible. That repentance, faith, trust, hope, love, etc., are purely and simply the sinner's own acts; but as such are possible to him only in virtue of the change wrought in the moral condition of his faculties by the recreative power of God.—See "Confession of Faith," Chap. 10., Sections 1 and 2.

Common grace preceding regeneration makes a superficial moral impression upon character and action but is generally resisted. The act of grace which regenerates, operating within the spontaneous energies of the soul and changing their character, can neither be co–operated with nor resisted. But the instant the soul is regenerated it begins to co–operate with and sometimes, alas! also to resist subsequent gracious influences prevenient and co–operative. But upon the whole and in the end grace preserves, overcomes, and saves. Regeneration is styled by the Reformed Theologians Conversio habitualis seu passiva(passive conversion), i. e., the change of character in effecting which the soul is the subject, and not the agent of action. Conversion they style Conversio actualis seu activa(active conversion), i. e., the instantly consequent change of action in which the soul still prompted and aided by grace is the only agent.

12. What diversity of opinion prevails among the Romanists upon this subject? The disciples of Augustine in that church, of whom the Jansenists were the most prominent, are orthodox, but these have been almost universally overthrown, and supplanted by their enemies the Jesuits, who are Semipelagians. The Council of Trent attempted to satisfy both parties.—"Council of Trent," Sess. 6, Song of Solomon 3:1-11; Song of Solomon 4:1-16. The doctrines of Quesnel, who advocated the truth on this subject, were condemned in the Bull "Unigenitus," A. D. 1713. Bellarmin taught that the same grace is given to every man, which, by the event only, is proved practically congruous to the nature of one man, and therefore in his case efficacious, and incongruous to the nature of another, and therefore in his case ineffectual.

13. What is meant by "common grace," and how may it be shown that the Spirit does operate upon the minds of those who are not renewed in heart?

"Common grace" is the restraining and persuading influences of the Holy Spirit acting only through the truth revealed in the gospel, or through the natural light of reason and of conscience, heightening the natural moral effect of such truth upon the understanding, conscience, and heart. It involves no change of heart, but simply an enhancement of the natural powers of the truth, a restraint of the evil passions, and an increase of the natural emotions in view of sin, duty, and sell:interest. That God does so operate upon the hearts of the unregenerate is proved, 1st, from Scripture, Genesis 6:3; Acts 7:51; Hebrews 10:29; Hebrews 2:1-18 d, from universal experience and observation.

14. How does common differ from efficacious grace?

1st. As to its subjects. All men are more or less the subjects of the one; only the elect are subjects of the other.—Romans 8:30; Romans 11:7; 2 Thessalonians 2:13.

2nd. As to its nature. Common grace is only mediate, through the truth, and it is merely moral, heightening the moral influence natural to the truth, and exciting only the natural powers of the soul, both rational and moral. But effective grace is immediate and supernatural, since it is wrought directly in the soul by the immediate energy of the Holy Ghost, and since it implants a new spiritual life, and a capacity for a new mode of exercising the natural faculties.

3rd. As to its effects. The effects of common grace are superficial and transient, modifying the action, but not changing the nature, and its influence is always more or less consciously resisted, as opposed to the prevailing dispositions of the soul. But efficacious grace, since it acts not upon but in the will itself, changing the governing desires, and giving a new direction to the active

powers of the soul, is neither resistible nor irresistible, but most free, spontaneous, and yet most certainly effectual.

15. How can it be proved that this efficacious grace is confined to the elect?

1st. The Scriptures represent the elect as the called, and the called as the elect.—Romans 8:28; Romans 8:30; Revelation 17:14.

2nd. This effectual calling is said to be based upon the decree of election, 2 Thessalonians 2:13-14; 2 Timothy 1:9-10.

3rd. Sanctification, justification, and all the temporal and eternal benefits of union with Christ are declared to be the effects of effectual calling.—1 Corinthians 1:2; Ephesians 2:5; Romans 8:30.

16. Prove that it is given on account of Christ?

1st. All spiritual blessings are given on account of Christ. Ephesians 1:3; Titus 3:5-6.

2nd. The Scriptures specifically declare that we are called in Christ.—Romans 8:2; Ephesians 2:4-6, 2 Timothy 1:9.

17. What is meant by saying that this divine influence is immediate and supernatural?

It is meant, 1st, to deny, (1) that it consists simply in the moral influence of the truth; (2) that it consists simply in the moral influence of the Spirit, heightening the moral influence of the truth as objectively presented; (3) that it excites the mere natural powers of the soul. It is meant, 2d, to affirm, (1) that the Holy Spirit acts immediately upon the soul from within; (2) that the Holy Spirit, by an exercise of recreative power, implants a new moral nature or principle of action.

18. What arguments go to show that there is an immediate influence of the Spirit on the soul, besides that which is exerted through the truth?

1st. The influence of the Spirit is distinguished from that of the word.—John 6:45; John 6:64-65; Romans 15:13; 1 Corinthians 2:12-15; 1 Thessalonians 1:5-6.

2nd. A divine influence is declared to be necessary to the reception of the truth.—Psalms 119:18; Acts 16:14; Ephesians 1:17.

3rd. Such an internal operation on the heart is attributed to God.—Php 2:13; 2 Thessalonians 1:11; Hebrews 13:21.

4th. The gift of the Spirit is distinguished from the gift of the word.—John 14:16; 1 Corinthians 3:16; 1 Corinthians 6:19; Ephesians 4:30.

5th. The nature of this influence is evidently different from that effected by the truth.—Ephesians 1:19; Ephesians 3:7. And the effect is called a “new creation,”“new birth,” etc., etc.

6th. Man by nature is dead in sin, and needs such a direct intervention of supernatural power.—Turretin, “Theo. Instits.,” 50. 15., Quaestio 4.

19. What are the different reasons assigned for calling this grace EFFICACIOUS?

1st. The Jesuits and the Arminians, holding that all men receive sufficient grace to enable them to obey the gospel if they will, maintain that this grace becomes efficacious when it is co–operated with by the will of the individual, and in any case is proved to be such only by the event.

2nd. Bellarmin, and others, maintain that the same grace given to all is congruous to the moral nature of one man, and n that case efficacious, and incongruous to the nature of another, and in his case ineffectual.

3rd. Some Romanists have maintained what is called the doctrine of cumulative influence. The consent of the soul is secured by the suasive influence of the spirit, rendered effectual by constant repetition and long continuance.

4th. The orthodox doctrine is that the efficacy of this grace is inherent in its very nature, because it is the exercise of the mighty power of God in the execution of his eternal and unchangeable changeable purpose.

20. In what sense is grace irresistible?

It must be remembered that the true Christian is the subject at the same time of those moral and mediate influences of grace upon the will, common to him and to the unconverted, and also of influences of grace within the will, which are certainly efficacious. The first class of influences Christians may, and constantly do resist, through the law of sin remaining in their members. The second class of influences are certainly efficacious, but are neither resistible nor irresistible, because they act from within and carry the will spontaneously with them. It is to be lamented that the term irresistible grace has ever been used, since it suggests the idea of a mechanical and coercive influence upon an unwilling subject, while, in truth, it is the transcendent act of the infinite Creator, making the creature spontaneously willing.

21. How can this grace tee proved to be certainly efficacious?

1st. By the evidence we have given above, as to its nature, as the immediate operation of the mighty power of God.

2nd. By the description of the work of grace. Men by nature are “blind,”“dead,”“slaves,” etc. The change effected is a “new creation,” etc.

3rd. From the promises of God, which are certain. The means which he uses to vindicate his own faithfulness must be efficacious.—Ezekiel 36:26; Ezekiel 11:19; John 6:45.

4th. From the connection asserted by Scripture between calling and election. The called are the elect. As God’s decrees are certain, the call must be efficacious.—See above, Ques. 15.

5th. Faith and repentance are the gifts of God, and he who truly repents and believes is saved. Therefore, the grace which communicates those gifts is effectual.—Ephesians 2:8; Acts 11:18; 2 Timothy 2:25.

22. How may it be proved that this influence is congruous with our nature?

While discarding utterly the distinction made by Bellarmin (for which see above, Question 19), we say that efficacious grace is congruous to human nature as such, in the sense that the Spirit of

God, while exerting an immediate and recreative influence upon the soul, nevertheless acts in perfect consistency with the integrity of those laws of our free, rational, and moral nature, which he has himself constituted. Even in the miraculous recreation of the new birth, he acts upon our reasons and upon our wills in perfect accordance with the constitution of each. This is certain.

1st. The same God creates and recreates his object is not to destroy, but to restore his own work.

2nd. The Scriptures and our own experience teach that the immediately consequent acts of the soul in the exercise of implanted grace, are pre–eminently rational and free. In fact, the soul never acted normally before.—Psalms 110:3; 2 Corinthians 3:17; Php 2:13.

3rd. This divine influence is described by such terms as “drawing,”

“teaching,”“enlightening.”—John 6:44-45; Ephesians 1:18.

23. What do the Scriptures teach as to the connection of this influence with the truth? In the case of the regeneration of infants the truth, of course, is not used. In tie regeneration of adults the truth is always present. In the act of regeneration the Spirit acts immediately upon the soul, and changes its subjective state, while the truth is the object consciously apprehended, upon which the new faculties of spiritual discernment and the new affections are exercised. The Spirit gives sight, the truth is the light discerned. The Spirit gives feeling, the truth presents the object beloved.—Romans 10:14; Romans 10:17; James 1:18; John 17:17.

24. What reason may be assigned for the belief that the Spirit does not renew those adults to whom the truth is not known?

Negatively. The Bible never leads us to expect such an extension of grace, and neither the Scriptures nor our own experience among the modern heathen ever present us with any examples of such a work.

Positively. The Scriptures always associate all spiritual influence with the truth, and declare the necessity of preaching the truth to the end of saving souls.—Romans 10:14.

25. What are the objections to the Arminian doctrine of sufficient grace?

They hold that God has willed the salvation of all men, and therefore has called all alike, giving to all a grace sufficient, if they will improve it.

We object—

1st. The external call of the gospel has been extended to comparatively few. The heathen are responsible with the light of nature, and under the law of works, yet they have no means of grace.—Romans 1:18-20; Romans 2:12-15.

2nd. This doctrine is inconsistent with God’s purpose of election.—See above, Chapter 11.

3rd. According to the Arminian system it depends upon the free–will of the man to make the sufficient grace of God common to all men efficient in his case. But the Scriptures declare that salvation is altogether of grace, and a gift of God.—Ephesians 2:8; 2 Timothy 2:25; Romans 9:15-16.

4th. The Scriptures expressly declare that not even all who receive the external call have sufficient grace.—Romans 9:16-24; Romans 11:8.

AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS OF DOCTRINE.

ROMAN DOCTRINE.—“Conc. Trent,” Sess. 6, c. 1.—“If any one saith that a man can be justified (by justification they mean the removal of sin and infusion of a gracious habit of soul) by his own works, whether done through the teaching of human nature, or that of the law, without the grace of God through Jesus Christ let him be anathema. a. 2.—If any one saith, that the grace of God, through Jesus Christ, is given only for this, that man may be able more easily to live justly, and to merit eternal life, as if, by free–will without grace, he were able to do both, though hardly indeed and with difficulty, let him be anathema. C. 3.—If any one saith, that without prevenient inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and without his help, man can believe, hope, love, or be penitent as he ought, so as that the grace of justification may be bestowed upon him; let him be anathema. a. 4.—If any one says that man’s free–will moved and excited by God, by assenting to God exciting and calling, nowise co–operates towards disposing and preparing itself for obtaining the grace of justification; that it can not refuse its consent, if it would, but that as something inanimate it does nothing whatever, and is merely passive; let him be anathema. Song of Solomon 5:1-16.—If any one saith that since Adam’s sin, the free–will of man is lost and extinguished; or that it is a thing with only a name, yea a name without a reality, a figment in fine introduced into the world by Satan, let him be anathema.”

DOCTRINE OF THE GREEK CHURCH.—“Jerem. in Act. Witem.”—“Even after the fall nothing hinders man from turning away from the bad, and superinduced upon this, doing good and choosing the right, as one who has free–will. . . . From all these it is plain, that it is our part to awake and to obey, and we have ability to choose the good as well as the bad. We need only one thing, i. e., God’s help, in order to succeed in the good and be saved, and without this help we have no strength to finish the work.”

LUTHERAN DOCTRINE.—“Form. Concordiae,” p. 662.—“But before man is enlightened, converted, regenerated, and drawn by the Holy Spirit, he is not able of himself, and by his own natural powers, in things spiritual and (tending to his own conversion and regeneration, to begin, to produce or to co–operate in any thing, any more than is a stone a stock or a clod.”Ib. p. 589.—“ What Doctor Luther wrote—‘That the will of man holds itself purely passive in conversion,’ must be received rightly and fittingly, to wit, with respect to divine grace enkindling the new movements, that is, it ought to be understood concerning that, when the Spirit of God acts upon the will of man by the word heard, or by the use of the sacraments, and produces in man conversion and regeneration. For after the Holy Spirit has wrought this very thing and has by his own divine energy alone changed and renewed the will of man; then, indeed, this new will is an instrument of the Holy Spirit of God, so that it may not only lay hold of grace, but also co–operate with the Holy Spirit in the works following.”

REFORMED DOCTRINE.—“Confession Faith,” ch. 10., § 1.—“All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only, he is pleased, in his appointed and accepted time, effectually to call, by his word and Spirit, out of that state of sin and death, in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ; enlightening their minds, spiritually and savingly to understand the things of God, taking away their heart of stone, and giving unto them a heart of

flesh; renewing their wills, and by his almighty power determining them to that which is good; and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ; yet so as they come most freely, being made willing by his grace." sect. 2.—"This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from any thing 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.""Larger Catechism," Q. 67, "Shorter Catechism,"Q. 31.—"Canons of Synod of Dort," chs. 3. and 4., "Rejec. Er.," Error 4.—"(They are renounced) who teach that an unregenerate man is not strictly and totally dead in sins, nor void of all power as to spiritual good, but that he is able to hunger and thirst after righteousness, and to offer the sacrifice of a broken and contrite spirit, which is accepted of God." Art. 12.—"(Regeneration) is plainly supernatural, a most powerful and at the same time most gentle operation, wonderful, secret, and inexpressible, not inferior to a creation, nor less than a reviving of the dead; so that all those, in whose hearts God works in this wonderful manner, are surely regenerated infallibly and effectually, and act faith. And then the will, now renewed, is not only acted on and moved by God, but being so moved, also itself acts. Wherefore also man himself is rightly said, through this received grace, to believe and repent. "

REMONSTRANT DOCTRINE.—"Confession Remonstr.," 17, 6.—"Therefore we decide that the grace of God is the beginning, progress, and completion of all good, so that the regenerate person himself, is not able to think, will, or do any saving good, without this previous prevenient, exciting, following, and co–operating grace."

"Apol. Confession Remonstr.," p. 162, b.—"Grace is called efficacious from the result, which, however can be taken in a twofold sense:First, so that grace may be judged to have, of itself, no power to produce consent in the will, but its entire efficacy may depend upon the human will:or, Secondly, so that grace may be judged to have of itself sufficient power to produce consent in the will, but because this power is partial, it can not go out in act without the co–operation of the free human will and hence, that it may have effect, it depends on free–will. The Remonstrants wish the "second" to be taken as their meaning."

02.29. Regeneration.

Chapter 29

Regeneration.

1. What the various Scripture terms by which this work of God is designated?

1st. “Creating anew.”—Ephesians 4:24.

2nd. “Begetting.”—James 1:18.

3rd. “Quickening.”—John 5:21; Ephesians 2:5.

4th. “Calling out of darkness into marvelous light.”—1 Peter 2:9. The subjects of it are said, 1st. To be “alive from the dead.”Romans 6:13.

2nd. To be “new creatures.”—2 Corinthians 5:17.

3rd. To be “born again.”—John 3:3; John 3:7.

4th. To be “God’s workmanship.”—Ephesians 2:10.

2. What is the Pelagian view of regeneration?

They hold that sin can be predicated only of volitions, and that it is essential to the liberty and responsibility of man that he is always as able to cease from as to continue in sin. Regeneration is therefore a mere reformation of life and habit. The man who has chosen to transgress the law, now chooses to obey it.

3. What is the doctrine of the Romish church on this subject? The Romanists, 1st, confound together justification and sanctification, marring these one act of God, whereby, for his own glory, for Christ’s merits’ sake, by the efficient powers of the Holy Ghost, and through the instrumentality of baptism, he at once cancels the guilt of our sins, and delivers us from the inherent power and defilement of original sin.—“Council of Trent,” Sess. 6, Chap. 7.

2nd. They hold the doctrine that regeneration is accomplished only through the instrumentality of baptism. This is effectual in every instance of its application to an infant. In the case of adults its virtue may be either resisted and nullified, or received and improved. In baptism (1) sins are forgiven; (2) the moral nature of the subject is renewed, (3) he is made a son and heir of God.—“Cat. Rom.,” Part 2., Chap. 2.

4. What are the different views as to baptismal regeneration entertained in the Church of England?

1st. The theory of the party styled Puseyite, which is essentially the same with that of the Romish church. They hold in general that the Holy Spirit, through the instrumentality of baptism, implants a germ of spiritual life in the soul, which may long remain latent, and may be subsequently developed, or blasted.

2nd. That of a large party most ably represented by the late Bishop H. U. Underdonk, in his “Essay on Regeneration,” Phila., 1835. He maintained that there are two distinct regenerations; one a change of state or relation, and the other a change of nature. The first is baptismal, the second moral, though both are spiritual in so far as both are wrought by the Holy Ghost. The first or baptismal regeneration is a new birth, since it constitutes us sons of God, as the Jews were made his peculiar people by that covenant, the seal of which was circumcision The second is a new birth, or creation in a higher sense, being a gradual sanctifying change wrought in the whole moral character by the Holy Ghost, and not necessarily connected with baptism.

5. What view of regeneration is held by those in America who maintain the “Exercise Scheme”?

These theologians deny the existence in the soul of any permanent moral habits or dispositions, and admit the existence only of the soul or agent and his acts or “exercises.” In the natural man the series of acts are wholly depraved. In the regenerated man a new series of holy acts are created by the Holy Ghost, and continued by his power.—Emmons, Sermon 64., on the “New Birth.”

6. What is the New Haven view, advocated by Dr. N. W. Taylor, on this subject?

Dr. Taylor agreed with the advocates of the “Exercise Scheme,” that there is nothing in the soul but the agent and his actions; but he differed from them by holding that man and not God is the independent author of human actions. He held that when God and the world is held up before the mind, regeneration consists in an act of the sinner in choosing God as his chief good, thus confounding regeneration and conversion The Holy Spirit, in some unknown way, assists in restraining the active operation of the natural, selfish principle which prefers the world as its chief good. “A mind thus detached from the world as its supreme good instantly chooses God for its portion, under the impulse of that inherent desire for happiness, without which no object could ever be regarded as good, as either desirable or lovely.” This original motive to that choice of God which is regeneration is merely natural, and neither morally good nor bad. Thus—

1st. Regeneration is man’s own act.

2nd. The Holy Spirit helps man, (1) by suspending the controlling power of his sinful, selfish disposition; (2) by presenting to his mind in the clear light of truth the superiority of God as an object of choice.

3rd. Then the sinner chooses God as his chief good under the conviction of his understanding, and from a motive of natural, though not sinful, self–love, which is to be distinguished from selfishness, which is of the essence of sin.—See “Christian Spectator,” December, 1829, pp. 693, 694, etc.

7. What is the common doctrine held by evangelical Christians?

1st. That there are in the soul, besides its several faculties, habits, or dispositions, of which some are innate and others are acquired, which lay the foundation for the soul’s exercising its faculties in some particular way. Thus we intuitively judge a man’s moral disposition to be permanently evil when we see him habitually acting sinfully, or to be permanently good when we see him habitually acting righteously.

2nd. These dispositions are anterior to moral action, and determine its character as good or evil.

3rd. In creation God made the disposition of Adam's heart holy.

4th. In the new creation God recreates the governing disposition of the regenerated man's heart holy.

It is, therefore, properly called a "regeneration," a "new creation," a "new birth."

8. When it is said that regeneration consists in giving a new heart, or in implanting a new principle or disposition, what is meant by the terms "heart,""principle," or "disposition"?

President Edwards says, "By a principle of nature in this place, I mean that foundation which is laid in nature, either old or new, for any particular kind or banner of exercise of the faculties of the soul. So this new 'spiritual sense' is not a new faculty of understanding, but it is a new foundation laid in the nature of the soul for a new kind of exercise of the same faculty of understanding. So that new holy disposition of heart that attends this new sense is not a new faculty of will, but a foundation laid in the nature of the soul for a new kind of exercise of the same faculty of will."—Edwards on "Religious Affections," Pt. 3., sec. 1. The term "heart," signifying that prevailing moral disposition that determines the volitions and actions, is the phrase most commonly used in Scripture.—Matthew 12:33; Matthew 12:35; Matthew 15:19; Luke 6:43; Luke 6:45.

9. How may it be shown that this view of regeneration does not represent it as involving any change in the essence of the soul? This charge is brought against the orthodox doctrine by all those who deny that there is any thing in the soul but its constitutional faculties and their exercises. They hence argue that if anything be changed except the mere exercises of the soul, its fundamental constitution would be physically altered. In opposition to this, we argue that we have precisely the same evidence for the existence of a permanent moral quality or disposition inherent in the will, as the reason why a good man acts habitually righteously, or a bad man viciously, that we have for the existence of the invisible soul itself, or of any of its faculties, as the reason why a man acts at all, or why his actions are such as thought, emotion, volition. It is not possible for us to conceive of the choice being produced in us by the Holy Spirit in more than three ways:"First, his direct agency in producing the choice, in which case it would be no act of ours. Second, by addressing such motives to our constitutional and natural principles of self–love as would induce us to make the choice, in which case there would be no morality in the act. Or, thirdly, by producing such a relish for the divine character, that the soul as spontaneously and immediately rejoices in God as its portion as it rejoices in the perception of beauty."

"If our Maker can endow us, not only with the general susceptibility of love, but also with a specific disposition to love our children; if he can give us a discernment and susceptibility of natural beauty, he may give us a taste for spiritual loveliness. And if that taste, by reason of sin, is vitiated and perverted, he may restore it by means of his spirit in regeneration."—Hodge's Essays.

10. In what sense may the soul be said to be passive in regeneration?

Dr. Taylor maintains that regeneration is that act of the soul in which man chooses God as his portion. Thus, the man himself, and not God, is the agent. But the Christian church, on the contrary, holds that in regeneration the Holy Ghost is the agent, and man the subject. The act of the Holy Spirit, in implanting a new principle, does not interfere with the essential activity of the soul itself, but simply gives to that activity a new direction, for the soul, though active, is

nevertheless capable of being acted upon. And although the soul is necessarily active at the very time it is regenerated, yet it is rightly said to be passive with respect to that act of the Holy Spirit whereby it is regenerated.

1st. The soul under the conviction of the Holy Ghost, and in the exercise of merely natural feelings, regards some aspect of saving truth, and strives to embrace it.

2nd. The Holy Ghost, by an exertion of creative power, changes the governing disposition of the heart in a manner inscrutable, and by an influence not apprehended by the consciousness of the subject.

3rd. Simultaneously the soul exercises new affections and experimentally embraces the truth.

11. What is the difference between regeneration and conversion? The term conversion is often used in a wide sense as including both the change of nature and the exercise of that nature as changed. When distinguished from regeneration, however, conversion signifies the first exercise of the new disposition implanted in regeneration, i. e., in freely turning unto God.

Regeneration is God's act; conversion is ours. Regeneration is the implantation of a gracious principle; conversion is the exercise of that principle. Regeneration is never a matter of direct consciousness to the subject of it; conversion always is such to the agent of it. Regeneration is a single act, complete in itself; and never repeated; conversion, as the beginning of holy living, is the commencement of a series, constant, endless, and progressive. "Draw me, and I will run after thee." Song of Solomon 1:4. This distinction is signalized by the divines of the seventeenth century (Turretin, 50. 15, Ques. 4, §13) by the phrases "conversio habitualis seu passiva(passive conversion),"i. e., the infusion of a gracious habit–of soul by God, in respect to which the subject is passive; and "conversio actualis seu activa(active conversion),"i. e., the consequent acts of faith and repentance elicited by co–operative grace and acted by the subject.

12. How can it be proved that there is any such thing as that commonly called regeneration?

1st. By those Scriptures that declare such a change to be necessary.—John 3:3; 2 Corinthians 5:17; Galatians 6:15.

2nd. By those passages which describe the change.—Ephesians 2:5; Ephesians 4:24; James 1:18; 1 Peter 1:23.

3rd. From the fact that it was necessary for the most moral as well as for the most recklessly sinful.—1 Corinthians 15:10; Galatians 1:13-16.

4th. That this inward change is not a mere reformation is proved by its being referred to the Holy Spirit.—Ephesians 1:19-20; Titus 3:5.

5th. From the comparison of man's state in grace with his state by nature.—Romans 6:13; Romans 8:6-10; Ephesians 5:8.

6th. From the experience of all Christians, and from the testimony of their lives.

13. What is the nature of supernatural illumination? The soul of man is a unit. A radically defective or perverted condition of any faculty will injuriously affect the exercise of all the other faculties. The

essence of sin consists in the perverted moral dispositions and affections of the will. But a perverted condition of these affections must affect the exercises of the intellect, concerning all moral objects, as much as the volitions themselves. We can not love or desire any object unless we perceive its loveliness, neither can we intellectually perceive its loveliness unless its qualities are congenial to our inherent taste or dispositions. Sin, therefore, is essentially deceitful, and mall as a sinner is spiritually blind. This does not consist in any physical defect. He possesses all the faculties requisite to enable him to see the beauty, and to experience the power of the truth, but his whole nature is morally perverted through his evil dispositions. As soon as these are changed he will see, and, seeing, love and obey the truth, although no constitutional change is wrought in his nature, i. e., no new faculty given, but only his perverted faculties morally rectified. This illumination is called supernatural, 1st, because, having been lost, it can be restored only by the immediate power of God.

2nd. In contradistinction to the maimed condition of man's present depraved nature. It, however, conveys no new truths to the mind, nor does it relieve the Christian, in any degree, from the diligent and prayerful study of the Word, nor does it lead to any fanciful interpretations of Scripture foreign to the plain sense of the letter; it only leads to the perception and appreciation of the native spiritual beauty and power of the inspired word, and the truths therein revealed.

14. How may it be proved that believers are the subjects of such illumination?

1st. It is necessary.—1 Corinthians 2:14; 2 Corinthians 3:14; 2 Corinthians 4:3; John 16:3. From the constitution of our nature we must apprehend an object as lovely before we can love it for its own sake.

2nd. The Scriptures expressly affirm it. "To know God is eternal life."—John 17:3; 1 Corinthians 2:12-13; 2 Corinthians 4:6; Ephesians 1:18; Php 1:9; Colossians 3:10; 1 John 4:7; 1 John 5:20; Psalms 19:7-8; Psalms 43:3-4. As the soul is a unit, a change in its radical moral dispositions must simultaneously modify the exercise of all its faculties in relation to moral and spiritual objects. The soul can not love that the loveliness of which it does not perceive, neither can it perceive the loveliness of an object which is totally uncongenial to its own nature. The first effect of regeneration, or a radical change of moral disposition, in the order of nature, therefore, is to open the eyes of our understandings to the excellency of divine truth, and the second effect is the going forth of the renewed affections toward that excellency so perceived. This is what Pres. Edwards ("Religious Affections," Pt. 3., sec. 4) calls "the sense of the heart."

15. What is the nature of that conviction of sin which is the attendant of regeneration?

Spiritual illumination immediately leads to the perception of the righteousness, goodness, and exceeding breadth and exactness of God's law, and by contrast of the exceeding sinfulness of sin in the abstract, Romans 7:7; Romans 7:13; and above all of his own sin—thus revealing, in contrast to the divine purity and righteousness, the pollution of his own heart, his total ill–desert, and his entire helplessness in all his relations to God. Job 13:5-6. This is a practical experimental knowledge,—produced by the wrestling ελεγχος, of the Holy Ghost (John 16:8)—of guilt, of pollution, and of helplessness.

16. What is the nature of that conviction of sin which often occurs before or without regeneration, and how may it be distinguished from the genuine?

Natural conscience is an essential and indestructible element of human nature, including a sense of right and wrong, and painful emotions associated with a sense of the latter. Although this faculty may be for a time perverted, and the sensibility associated with it hardened, yet it may be, and often is, in the case of the unregenerate, quickened to a painful activity, leading to a sense of ill–desert, pollution, helplessness, and danger. In eternity this will constitute a large measure of the sufferings of the lost. On the other hand, that conviction of sin which is peculiar to the regenerate is distinguished by [being accompanied by a sense of the positive beauty of holiness, and an earnest desire to escape not merely the pangs of remorse, but chiefly the pollution and the dominion of sin.

17. What is the nature of those new affections which flow from the renewal of the heart, and how are they distinguished from the exercises of unrenewed men?

Spiritual illumination gives the perception of that loveliness which the renewed affections of the heart embrace and delight in. These are spiritual because they are formed in us, and preserved in healthy exercise by the Spirit of God. They are holy because their objects are holy, and because they delight in their objects as holy. The affections of unrenewed men, on the other hand, however pure or even religious they may be, are merely natural in their source, and attach merely to natural objects. They may be grateful to God for his benefits, but they never love him simply for the perfections of his own nature.

18. What is the nature of that new obedience which results from regeneration, and how does it differ from mere morality? The perfect law is spiritual, and consequently requires perfect conformity of being as well as of action; the central and governing principles of life must be in harmony with it. The regenerate man, therefore, thinks, and feels, and wills, and acts in conformity with the spirit of the whole word of God as far as revealed to him, because it is God's word, from a motive of love to God, and with an eye single to his glory. The sanctified affections are the spring, the heart–searching law the rule, and the glory of God the end, and the Holy Ghost the coworker in every act of Christian obedience.

Morality, on the other hand, has its spring in the merely natural affections; it aims only at the conformity of the outward actions to the letter of the law, while self, in some form of self:righteousness, reputation, safety, or happiness, is the determining end.

19. How may the absolute necessity of regeneration be proved?

1st. The Scriptures assert it.—John 3:3; Romans 8:6; Ephesians 2:10; Ephesians 4:21-24.

2nd. It is proved from the nature of man as a sinner.—Romans 7:18; Romans 8:7-9; 1 Corinthians 2:14; Ephesians 2:1.

3rd. From the nature of heaven.—Isaiah 35:8; Isaiah 52:1; Matthew 5:8; Matthew 13:41; Hebrews 12:14; Revelation 21:27. The restoration of holiness is the grand end of the whole plan of salvation.—Ephesians 1:4; Ephesians 5:5; Ephesians 5:26-27.

20. Are infants susceptible of regeneration; and, if so, what is the nature of regeneration in them?

Infants, as well as adults, are rational and moral agents, and by nature totally depraved. The difference is, that the faculties of infants are in the germ, while those of adults are developed. As

regeneration is a change wrought by creative power in the inherent moral condition of the soul, infants may plainly be the subjects of it in precisely the same sense as adults; in both cases the operation is miraculous, and therefore inscrutable. The fact is established by what the Scriptures teach of innate depravity, of infant salvation, of infant circumcision and baptism.—Luke 1:15; Luke 18:15-16; Acts 2:39. See below, Chapter 42.

AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS.

ROMAN DOCTRINE.—“Conc. Trent,” Sess. 6. Ch. 7.—“Justification (Regeneration) is not only a remission of sins, but also a renewal of the inner man through the voluntary reception of the grace and gifts whereby a man born unjust becomes just, and from an enemy becomes a friend, that so he may be an heir according to the hope of eternal life. The onuses of this justification are–the final cause, the glory of God and of Christ, and eternal life, the efficient cause, the merciful God who gratuitously washes and sanctifies, sealing and anointing with the Holy Spirit of promise, who is the earnest of our inheritance; the meritorious cause, his own moat beloved and only begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, who, when we were enemies, did, on account of the great love wherewith he loved us, merit justification for us by his most holy passion on the wood of the cross; and did for us, make satisfaction to God the Father, also the instrumental cause, the sacrament of baptism, which is the sacrament of faith, without which (faith) justification has never come to any one; and finally the formal cause, is the righteousness of God, not that whereby he is himself righteous, but that whereby he makes us righteous, namely that with which we, being by him endowed, are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and are not only reputed, but are truly called, and are righteous.”

LUTHERAN DOCTRINE. “Formula Concordiae”(Hase), page 679.—“For conversion is such a change of the man through the operation of the Holy Spirit in the understanding, will, and heart of man, that he is able (i. e., by the operation of the Holy Spirit) to embrace the offered grace. Ib. p. 681.—But the understanding and will of the man not as yet renewed are only the subject to be converted, because they are the understanding and will of a man spiritually dead, in whom the Holy Ghost works conversion and renewal, in which work the man to be converted contributes nothing, but is acted upon, until he is regenerated. But afterwards in other good works enduring, he co–operates with the Holy Spirit, doing those things which are well pleasing to God, in that manner which has now been declared by us fully enough in this treatise.”

REFORMED DOCTRINE AND REMONSTRANT DOCTRINE.—See under Chapter 28.

02.30. Faith.

Chapter 30

Faith.

1. What, according to its etymology (linguistic development) and New Testament usage, is the meaning of the wordπιστις “faith,”“belief”?

It is derived from the verb πειθω to persuade, convince. III the New Testament it is used—

1st. To express that state of mind which is induced by persuasion.—Romans 14:22.

2nd. It often signifies good faith, fidelity, sincerity.—Romans 3:3; Titus 2:10 3rd. Assent to the truth.—Php 1:27; 2 Thessalonians 2:13.

4th. Faith towards, on, or in God (επι, εις, προς).—Hebrews 6:1; 1 Thessalonians 1:8; 1 Peter 1:21; Mark 11:22. In Christ, Acts 24:24; Galatians 3:26; and in his blood, Romans 3:22; Romans 3:25; Galatians 2:16; Galatians 2:20.

5th. It is used for the object of faith, viz., the revelation of the gospel.—Romans 1:5; Romans 10:8; 1 Timothy 4:1. Robinson’s “Lex. of New Testament.”

2. State the different meanings of the verbπιστευειν (to believe), and of the phrasesπιστευειν εις orεπι (to believe in or upon).

πιστευειν signifies—

1st. To assent to, to be persuaded of the truth.—Luke 1:20; John 3:12.

2nd. To credit the truth of a person.—John 5:46.

3rd. To trust, to have confidence in.—Acts 27:25. The phrases πιστευειν ειν or γεπι are always used to express trust and confidence terminating upon God, or upon Christ as Mediator. We are often said to believe or credit Moses or other teachers of the truth, but we can believe in or on God or Christ alone. Upon God, John 14:1; Romans 4:24; 1 Peter 1:21; upon Christ.—Acts 16:31; John 3:15-18.

3. How may faith be defined?

Faith is a complex act of the soul, involving the concurrent action of the understanding and the will, and modified in different instances of its exercise by the nature of its object, and of the evidence upon which it rests. The most general definition, embracing all its modifications, affirms faith to be “assent to truth upon the exhibition of the appropriate evidence. But it is evident that its nature must vary with the nature of the truth believed, and especially with the nature of the evidence upon which our assent is founded. Assent to a speculative or abstract truth is a speculative act; assent to a moral truth is a moral act; assent to a promise made to ourselves is an act of trust. Our belief

that the earth moves round its axis is a mere assent; our belief in the excellence of virtue is of the nature of a moral judgment; our belief in a promise is an act of trust." So likewise with respect to the evidence upon which our faith is founded. "The same man may believe the same truth on different grounds. One may believe the Christian system simply because others around him believe it, and he has been brought up to receive it without question; this is the faith of credulity. Another may believe it on the ground of its external evidence, e. g., of miracle, prophecy, history, its logical consistency as a system, or its plausibility as a theory in accounting for the phenomena of creation and providence. This is speculative faith. Another may believe, because the truths of the Bible recommend themselves to his reason and conscience, and accord with his inward experience. This faith is founded on moral evidence. There is another faith founded on the intrinsic excellence, beauty, and suitableness of the truth from a sense and love of its moral excellence. This is spiritual faith, which is the gift of God."—"Way of Life."

Religious faith is belief of the truth on the testimony of God. It includes, (1) Notitia, knowledge; (2) Assensus, assent; (3) Fiducia, trust.

4. To what extent is faith an act of the understanding, and how far an act of the will? The one indivisible soul knows and loves, desires and decides, and these several acts of the soul meet on the same object. The soul can neither love, desire, nor choose that which it does not know, nor can it know an object as true or good without some affection of will towards it. Assent to a purely speculative truth may be simply an act of understanding, but belief in a moral truth, in testimony, in promises, must be a complex act, embracing both the understanding and the will. The understanding apprehends the truth to be believed, and decides upon the validity of the evidence, but the disposition to believe testimony, or moral evidence, has its foundation in the will. Actual trust in a promise is an act of the will, and not a simple judgment as to its trustworthiness. There is an exact relation between the moral judgment and the affections, and the will, as the seat of the moral affections, determines the moral judgments. Therefore, as a man is responsible for his will, he is responsible for his faith. As far as faith includes an act of "cognition" it is, of course, purely an act of the understanding. But as far as it includes "Assent" and "Trust," it involves also the spontaneous and active powers of the soul, that is, "the will," and in its higher exercise it often involves deliberate volition itself.

5. What is the difference between knowledge and faith?

Generally, knowledge is the apprehension of an object as true, and faith is an assent to its truth. It is obvious, therefore, that in this general sense of the term every exercise of faith includes the knowledge of the object assented to. It is impossible to distinguish between the apprehension of the truthfulness of a purely speculative truth and an assent to it as true. In such a case faith and knowledge appear identical. But while the apprehension of the trustworthiness of a promise is knowledge, the actual reliance upon it is faith. The apprehension of the moral truthfulness of an object is knowledge, the assent to it, as good and desirable, is faith.

Sometimes the Scriptures use the word knowledge as equivalent to faith.—John 10:38; 1 John 2:3.

Generally, however, the Scriptures restrict the term knowledge to the apprehension of those ideas which we derive through the natural sources of sensation and reason and human testimony, while

the term faith is restricted to the assent to those truths which rest upon the direct testimony of God alone, objectively revealed in the Scriptures, as discerned through spiritual illumination. Thus, faith is the “evidence of things not seen.”Hebrews 11:1. We are commanded “to walk by faith, and not by sight.”—2 Corinthians 5:7. Here the distinction between faith and knowledge has reference particularly to the mode of knowing The one is natural and discursive, the other supernatural and intuitive.

6. What distinction do the Romanists make between implicit and explicit faith?

Romanists and Protestants agree that it is not essential to faith that its object should be comprehended by the understanding. But, on the other hand, Protestants affirm, and Romanists deny, that it is essential that the object believed should be apprehended by the mind; that is, that knowledge of what we believe is essential to faith. The Romanists, therefore, have invented the distinction between explicit faith, which terminates upon an object distinctly apprehended by the mind, and implicit faith, which a man exercises in the truth of propositions of which he knows nothing. They hold that a man exercises explicit faith in a general proposition, he therein exercises implicit faith in every thing embraced in it, whether he knows what they are or not. If a man, for instance, has explicit faith that the church is an infallible teacher, he thereby exercises virtual or implicit faith in every doctrine taught by the church, although he may be ignorant as to what those doctrines are. They distinguish, moreover, between those truths which it is necessary to regard with explicit faith, and those which may he held implicitly. They commonly teach that it is necessary for the people to hold only three doctrines explicitly, 1st, that God is;

2nd, that he is a rewarder, including future rewards and punishments;

3rd, that he is a redeemer.

“This doctrine has been recently revived by the Puseyites, under the title of reserve. The distinguishing truths of the gospel, instead of being clearly presented, should, it is said, be concealed or kept in reserve. The people may gaze upon the cross as the symbol of redemption, but need not know whether it is the form, or the material, or the great sacrifice once enacted on it, to which the efficacy is due. ‘Religious light is intellectual darkness,’ says Dr. Newman. This theory rests upon the same false assumption that faith can exist without knowledge.”—Dr. Hodge.

7. What is the difference between knowing and understanding a thing, and how far is knowledge essential to faith?

We know a thing when we simply apprehend it as true. We understand it only when we fully comprehend its nature, and the perfect consistency of all its properties with each other and with the entire system of things of which it forms a part. We know the doctrine of the trinity when its several parts are stated to us, but no creature can ever understand it. That knowledge, or simple apprehension of the object believed and confided in, is essential to faith, is evident from the nature of faith itself. It is that state of mind which bears the relation of assent to a certain object, involving that action of understanding and of will which is appropriate to that object. If a man loves, fears, or believes, he must love, fear, or believe some object, for it is evident that these states of mind can exist only in relation to their appropriate objects. If a real object is not present the imagination may present an ideal one, but that very fiction of the imagination must first be apprehended as true (or known) before it can be assented to as true (or believed) Just as it is impossible for a man to enjoy

beauty without perceiving it in some object of the mind, or to exercise complacent love in a virtuous act without perceiving it, so it is, for the same reason, impossible for a man to exercise faith without knowing what he believes. “Implicit faith” is a perfectly unmeaning formula.

8. How can the fact that knowledge is essential to faith be proved from Scripture?

1st. From the etymology (linguistic development) of the word πιστις from πειθω to persuade, instruct. Faith is that state of mind which is the result of teaching.

2nd. From the use of the word knowledge in Scripture as equivalent to faith.—John 10:38; 1 John 2:3.

3rd. From what the Bible teaches as to the source of faith. It comes by teaching.—Romans 10:14-17.

4th. The Scriptures declare that the regenerate are enlightened, have received the unction, and know all things.—Acts 26:18; 1 Corinthians 2:12-15; Colossians 3:10.

5th. The means of salvation consist in the dissemination of the truth. Christ is the great teacher. Ministers are teachers.—1 Corinthians 4:1; 1 Timothy 3:2; 1 Timothy 4:13. Christians are begotten by the truth, sanctified by the truth.—John 17:19; James 1:18. Dr. Hodge.

9. How are those passages to be explained which speak of knowledge as distinguished from faith?

Although every act of faith presupposes an act of knowledge yet both the faith and the knowledge vary very much, both with the nature of the object known and believed, and with the manner ill which the knowledge is received, and with the evidence upon which the faith rests. The faith which the Scriptures distinguish from knowledge is the strong persuasion of things not seen. It is the conviction of the truth of things which do not fall within the compass of our own observation which may entirely transcend the powers of our understanding, and which rest upon the simple testimony of God. This testimony faith relies upon in spite of whatever to human reason appears inconsistent or impossible.

Knowledge though essential to faith may be distinguished from it—

1st. As faith includes also an act of the will assenting, in addition to the act of the understanding apprehending.

2nd. As knowledge derived through a natural is distinguished from knowledge derived through a divine source.

3rd. As present imperfect apprehension of divine things (i. e., faith) differs from that perfect knowledge oft divine things we shall have in heaven.—1 Corinthians 13:12.

10. If faith necessarily includes knowledge how can men be commanded to believe?

1st. No man is ever commanded to believe that which is not revealed to him, either in the light of nature or by the inspired word.

2nd. No man is ever commanded to believe a purely speculative truth. The truths of religion rest on the testimony of God. They are enforced by moral evidence, and faith in them involves a moral

and spiritual knowledge of them, and delight in them. Moral evidence can be appreciated only by a mind possessed of moral sensibility. And such moral insensibility as leads to blindness to the distinction between right and wrong is itself a very aggravated state of depravity. The Scriptures, therefore, luminous with their own self–evidencing light, present the truth to all to whom they come, and demand its instant reception upon the testimony of God. If that evidence is not felt to be conclusive by any one, it must be because of the sinful blindness of his mind. Therefore Christ says, “ye will not come unto me that ye may have life.” And unbelief is uniformly charged to the “evil heart.”

11. What are the ultimate grounds of that assent to the truth which is of the essence of faith? In general, the ultimate ground upon which our assent to the truth of any object of knowledge rests is the veracity of God. The testimony of our senses, the integrity of our consciences, the intuitions of our reasons, all rest upon his veracity as Creator. Practically the mind is moved to this assent through our universal and instinctive confidence in the constitution of our own natures.

Religious faith rests, 1st, upon the faithfulness of, God as pledged in his supernatural revelation, John 3:33;

2nd, upon the evidence of spiritual illumination, personal experience of the power of the truth, and the witness of the Holy Ghost, the Sanctifier, and thus “not in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God.”—1 Corinthians 2:5-12.

12. What are the two kinds of evidence by which we know that God has revealed certain truths as objects of faith?

1st. The evidence which resides in the truth itself. Moral, spiritual, experimental, rational.—John 6:63; John 14:17; John 14:26; Jeremiah 23:29.

2nd. The accrediting evidence of the presence and power of God accompanying the promulgation of the truth, and proving that it is from him. These are miracles, providential dispensations, the fulfillment of prophecy, etc.—John 5:36; Hebrews 2:4.

13. How can it be shown that the authority of the Church is not a ground of faith?

See above, Chapter 5., Question 18.

14. What is the nature of historical faith and upon evidence does it rest? That mode of purely rational faith called historical is that apprehension of and assent to the truth which regards it in its purely rational aspects as mere facts of history, or as mere parts of a logical system of opinion. Its appropriate evidence is purely rational, e. g., the solution afforded by the Scriptures of the acts of history and experience, and the evidence of history, prophecy, miracles, etc.

15. What is the nature of temporary faith, and of the evidence upon which it is founded?

Temporary faith is that state of mind often experienced in this world by impenitent hearers of the gospel, induced by the moral evidence of the truth, the common influences of the Holy Ghost, and the power of religious sympathy. Sometimes the excited imagination joyfully appropriates the promises of the gospel.—Matthew 13:20. Sometimes, like Felix, the man believes and trembles. Oftentimes it is at first impossible to distinguish this state of mind from genuine saving faith. But

not springing from a divine work of recreation it has no root in the permanent principles of the heart. It is always, therefore, 1st, inefficient, neither purifying the heart nor overcoming the world; 2d, temporary.

16. What is the specific evidence upon which saving faith is founded? This is the light let into the soul by the Holy Ghost in his work of spiritual illumination. Thus is the beauty, and excellence, and the suitableness of the truth to the practical wants of the subject apprehended. With this the witness of the Holy Ghost with and by the truth cooperates.—1 Corinthians 2:4-5; Romans 8:16; 2 Corinthians 4:6; Ephesians 2:8.

17. How may it be proved from Scripture and experience that spiritual illumination is the ground of saving faith?

1st. The Scriptures, wherever they come, make a demand unconditional, immediate, and universal upon the most intelligent and the most ignorant alike, that they should be received and believed, and unbelief is always charged as sin, and not as mere ignorance or mental incapacity. The faith which they demand must, therefore, be a moral act, and must depend upon the spiritual congeniality of the believer with the truth.

2nd. By nature men are spiritually blind, and subjects of an “evil heart of unbelief.”—2 Corinthians 3:14; 2 Corinthians 4:4.

3rd. Believers are said to be enlightened, and to discern the things of the Spirit.—Acts 13:48; 2 Corinthians 4:6; Ephesians 1:17-18; 1 John 2:20; 1 John 2:27; 1 John 5:9-10.

4th. Men believe because they are taught of God.—John 6:44-45.

5th. Every Christian is conscious of believing, because he sees the truth believed to be true, lovely, powerful, and satisfying.

6th. This is proved by the effects of faith. “We are said to live by faith, to be sanctified by faith, to overcome by faith, to be saved by faith Blind consent to authority, or rational conviction, produce no such effects; if the effects are spiritual, the source must be also spiritual.”

18. What are the different opinions as to the relation between faith and trust? In consequence of their doctrine of implicit faith, that nothing is required beyond blind assent to the teachings of the church, Romanists necessarily deny that trust enters into the essence of saving faith. The Sandemanians, as the Campbellites, holding that faith is a mere affirmative judgment of the understanding passed upon the truth on the ground of evidence, also deny that trust is an element of saving faith.

Some orthodox theologians have held that trust is rather to be regarded as an immediate and invariable consequent of saving faith, than an element of that faith itself.

Religious faith resulting from spiritual illumination, respects the entire word of God and his testimony, and, as such, is a complex state of mind, varying with the nature of the particular portion of revealed truth regarded in any particular act. Many of the propositions of Scripture are not the proper objects of trust, and then the faith which embraces them is only a reverent and complacent assent to them as true and good. But the specific act of saving faith which unites to

Christ, and is the commencement, root, and organ of our whole spiritual life, terminates upon Christ's person and work as Mediator, as presented in the offers and promises of the gospel. This assuredly includes trust in its very essence, and this is called "saving faith" by way of eminence, since it is the faith that saves, and since only through this as their principle, are any other more general exercises of saving faith possible.

19. How may the fact that saving faith includes trust be proved from the language of Scripture? The uniform and single condition of salvation presented in the Scriptures is expressed in the words believe in or on Christ, εις or επι τον χριστον 7:38; Acts 9:42; Acts 16:31; Acts 2:16. To believe in or on a person necessarily implies trust as well as credit. The same is abundantly proved by the usage with respect to the phrases "by faith in or on Christ."—2 Timothy 3:15; Acts 26:18; Galatians 3:26; Hebrews 11:1. Faith is the substance of things hoped for, but the foundation of hope is trust.

20. How may the same be proved from those expressions which are used in Scripture as equivalent to the phrase "believing in Christ"?

"Receiving Christ."—John 1:12; Colossians 2:6. "Looking to Christ."—Isaiah 14:22; compare Numbers 21:9 with John 3:14-15. "Flying to Christ for refuge."—Hebrews 6:18. "Coming to Christ."—John 6:35; Matthew 11:28. "Committing."—2 Timothy 1:12. All these illustrate as well as designate the act of saving faith, and all equally imply trust as an essential element, for we can "receive," or "come to," or "look to," Christ only in that character of a propitiation, an advocate and a deliverer, in which he offers himself to us.

21. How may the same be proved from the effects which the Scriptures ascribe to faith? The Scriptures declare that by faith the Christian "embraces the promises,""is persuaded of the promises,""out of weakness is made strong,""waxes valiant in fight,""confesses himself a stranger and pilgrim seeking a better country." As faith in a threatening necessarily involves fear, so faith in a promise necessarily involves trust.

Besides, faith rests upon the trustworthiness of God, and therefore necessarily involves trust.—Hebrews 10:23, and the whole of Hebrews 11:1-40.

22. How may it be shown that this view of faith does not confound faith and hope? To our doctrine that saving faith involves trust, the Romanist objects that this confounds faith and hope, which the Scriptures distinguish (1 Corinthians 13:13), since hope is only strong trust. But hope is not merely strong trust. Trust rests upon the grounds of assurance, while hope reaches forward to the object of which assurance is given. Trust is the foundation of hope. Hope is the fruit of trust. The more confiding the trust, the more assured the hope.

23. What are the different opinions as to the relation between faith and love, and the Romish distinction between"fides informis "and"fides formata "?

1st. The Romanists, in order to maintain their doctrine that faith alone is not saving, distinguish between a formed, or perfect, and an unformed faith. They acknowledge that faith is distinct from love, but maintain that love is essential to render faith meritorious and effectual as the instrument of our salvation. Fides informis(uniformed faith) is mere assent, explicit or implicit, to the teachings of the Church. It necessarily precedes "justification" as its condition. Fides formata(informed faith) is the fruit of the first justification, and the condition of those good works which merit further grace.

2nd. Some have regarded love as the root out of which faith springs.

3rd. The true view is that love is the immediate and necessary effect of faith. Faith includes the spiritual apprehension of the beauty and excellence of the truth, and an act of the will embracing it and relying upon it. Yet these graces can not be analytically separated, since they mutually involve one another. There can be no love without faith, nor any faith without love. Faith apprehends the loveliness of the object, the heart spontaneously loves it. Thus “faith works by love,” since these affections are the source of those motives that control the will. The Romish doctrine is inconsistent with the essential principles of the gospel. Faith is not a work, nor can it have, when formed or unformed, any merit; it is essentially a self–emptying act, which saves by laying hold of the merits of Christ. It leads to works, and proves itself by its fruits, but in its relation to justification it is in its very nature a strong protest against the merits of all human works.—Galatians 3:10-11; Ephesians 2:8-9. The Protestant doctrine that love is the fruit of faith, is established by what the Scriptures declare concerning faith, that it “sanctifies,”“works by love,”“overcomes the world.”Galatians 5:6; Acts 26:18; 1 John 5:4. This is accomplished thus—by faith we are united to Christ, Ephesians 3:17, and so become partakers of his Spirit, 1 John 3:24, one of the fruits of the Spirit is love, Galatians 5:22, and love is the principle of all obedience.—Romans 13:10.

24. What is the object of saving faith? The spiritual illumination of the understanding and renewal of the affections, which lays the foundation for the soul’s acting faith in any one portion of the testimony of God, lays the foundation for its acting faith in all that testimony. The whole revealed word of God, then, as far as known to the individual, to the exclusion of all traditions, doctrines of men, and pretended private revelations, is the object of saving faith. That particular act of faith, however, which unites to Christ, called, by way of distinction, justifying faith, has for its object the person and work of Christ as Mediator.—John 7:38; Acts 16:31.

25. What is meant by an article of faith as distinguished from a matter of opinion? The Romanists hold that every dogma decided by the church to be true, whether derived from scripture or tradition, is, upon pain of damnation, to be believed by every Christian as an article of faith, if known to him by an explicit, if not known by an implicit faith. On the other hand, with respect to all subjects not decided by the church, every man is left free to believe or not as a matter of opinion.

26. What is the Anglican or Puseyite criterion for distinguishes those doctrines which must be known and believed in order to salvation?

They agree with the Romanists (see above, Question 6) that knowledge is not essential to faith. As to the rule of faith, however, they differ. The Romanist makes that rule the teaching of the Papal Church. The Puseyites, on the other hand, make it the uniform testimony of tradition running in the line of the succession of apostolic bishops.

27. What is the common Protestant doctrine as to fundamentals in religion, and by what evidence can such fundamentals be ascertained?

Every doctrine taught in the Bible is the object of an enlightened spiritual faith. No revealed principle, however comparatively subordinate, can be regarded as indifferent, to be adopted or rejected at will. Every man is bound to credit the whole testimony of God. Yet the gospel is a logically consistent system of truth, some of whose principles are essential to its integrity, while others are essential only to its symmetry and perfection; and ignorance, feebleness of logical

comprehension, and prejudice may, and constantly do, lead good men to apprehend this system of truth imperfectly. A fundamental doctrine, then, is either one which every soul must apprehend more or less clearly in order to be saved, or one which when known, is so clearly involved with those the knowledge and belief of which is essential to salvation, that the one can not be rejected while the really believed. A fundamental doctrine is ascertained—

1st. In the same way that the essential principles of any other system are determined mined, by their bearing upon the system as a whole.

2nd. Every fundamental doctrine is clearly revealed.

3rd. These doctrines are in Scripture itself declared to be essential.—John 3:18; Acts 16:31; 2 Corinthians 5:17; Galatians 2:21; 1 John 1:8.

28. What is the object of“fides specialis,”or that specific act of faith whereby we are justified? The person and work of the Lord Jesus Christ as Mediator. This is proved—

1st. The Scriptures expressly declare that we are justified by that faith of which Christ is the object.—Romans 3:22; Romans 3:25; Galatians 2:16; Php 3:9.

2nd. We are said to be saved by faith in Christ.—John 3:16; John 3:36; Acts 10:43; Acts 16:31.

3rd. Justifying faith is designated as a “looking to Christ,” a “coming to Christ,” etc.—John 1:12; John 6:35; John 6:37; Isaiah 14:22.

4th. Rejection of Christ; a refusal to submit to the righteousness of God is declared to be the ground of reprobation. John 8:24; John 3:18-19.

29. How is the Romish doctrine on this point opposed to the Protestant? The Romanists, confounding justification and sanctification, hold that faith justifies through the sanctifying power of the truth. As all revealed truth has this sanctifying virtue, it follows that the whole revelation of God as ascertained by the decisions of the church, is the object of justifying faith. This is refuted by all we have established from Scripture concerning justification, sanctification, and faith.

30. Is Christ in all his offices, or only as priest, the immediate object of justifying faith? In this act the believer appropriates and rests upon Christ as Mediator, which includes at once all his functions as such. These may be analytically distinguished, but in fact they are always inseparably united in him. When he acts as prophet he teaches as king and priest. When he reigns he sits as prophet and priest upon his throne. Besides this, his prophetical and kingly work are consciously needed by the awakened soul, and are necessarily apprehended as inseparable from his priestly work in the one act of faith.

It is true, however, that as the substitutionary work which Christ accomplished as priest is the meritorious ground of our salvation, so his priestly character is made the more prominent, both in the teachings of Scripture and in the experience of his people.

31. To what extent is peace of conscience and peace with God a necessary consequence of faith?

Peace with God is reconciliation with him. Peace of conscience may either mean consciousness of that reconciliation, or the appeasement of our own consciences which condemn us. Faith in every

instance secures our peace with God, since it unites us to Christ, Romans 5:1; and in the proportion in which faith in the merits of Christ is clear and constant will be our consciousness of reconciliation with God, and the satisfaction of our own moral sense that righteousness is fulfilled, while we are forgiven. Yet as faith may be obscured by sin, so the true believer may temporarily fall under his Father's displeasure, and lose his sense of forgiveness and his moral satisfaction in the perfection of the atonement.

32. What are the three views entertained as to the relation between faith and assurance?

1st. The Reformers generally maintained that justifying faith consisted in appropriating the promise of salvation through Christ made in the gospel, i. e., in regarding God as propitious to us for Christ's sake. Thus the very act of faith involves assurance.

2nd. Some have held that assurance in this life is unattainable. The Romanists, holding that Christian faith is chiefly implicit assent and obedient conformity to the teachings of an infallible, visible society, called the Church, strenuously denied that private individuals have any scriptural authority to entertain an assured persuasion that they are specially objects of divine favor. They were accustomed to assert that it is neither "obligatory," nor "possible," nor "desirable" that any one should attain such assurance without a special supernatural revelation. See Bellarmin, etc., quoted below.

3rd. The true view is that "although this infallible assurance does not belong to the essence of faith, but that a true believer may wait long and conflict with many difficulties before he partake of it, yet being enabled by the Spirit to know the things which are freely given him by God, he may, without extraordinary revelation, in the right use of ordinary means attain thereunto. And, therefore, it is the duty of each one to give diligence to make his calling and election sure." It is agreed by all that a true faith can not admit of any doubt as to its object. What is believed is assuredly believed. But the object of saving faith is Christ and his work as Mediator guaranteed to us in the promises of the gospel on the condition of faith. True faith does, therefore, essentially include the assurance—

1st. That Christ is able to save us.

2nd. That he is faithful and will save us if we believe It is meant that this is of the essence of faith, not that every true believer always enjoys a state of mind which excludes all doubt as to Christ's power or love; because the spiritual illumination upon which faith rests is often imperfect in degree and variable in exercise. Faith may be weak, or it may be limited by doubt, or it may alternate with doubt. Yet all such doubt is of sin, and is alien to the essential nature of faith. But the condition, if we believe, upon which all assurance of our own salvation is suspended, is a matter not of revelation, but of experience, not of faith, but of consciousness.

Theologians have, therefore, made a distinction between the Assurance','of faith, Hebrews 10:22, and the assurance of hope, Hebrews 6:11. The first is of the essence of saving faith, and is the assurance that Christ is all that he professes to be, and will do all that he promises. The second is the assurance of our own personal salvation, is a fruit of faith, and one of the higher attainments of the Christian life.

33. How may it be proved that assurance of our own personal salvation is not essential to saving faith?

1st. From the true object of saving faith as given above.

2nd. From the examples given in the Scriptures of eminent saints who doubted with regard to themselves.—1 Corinthians 9:27.

3rd. from the exhortations addressed to those who were already believers to attain to assurance as a degree of faith beyond that which they already enjoyed.

4th. From the experience of God's people in all ages.

34. How may it be proved that assurance is attainable in this life?

1st. This is directly asserted.—Romans 8:16; 2 Peter 1:10; 1 John 2:3; 1 John 3:14; 1 John 5:13.

2nd. Scriptural examples are given of its attainment.—2 Timothy 1:12; 2 Timothy 4:7-8.

3rd. Many eminent Christians have enjoyed an abiding assurance, of the genuineness of which their holy walk and conversation was an indubitable seal.

35. On what grounds may a man be assured of his salvation?

"It is an infallible Assurance','of faith, founded, 1st, upon the divine truth of the promises of salvation;

2nd, the inward evidence of those graces unto which those promises are made, and,

3rd, the testimony of the spirit of adoption, Romans 8:15-16, witnessing with our spirits that we are the children of God. Which Spirit, Ephesians 1:13-14; 2 Corinthians 1:21-22, is the earnest of our inheritance whereby we are sealed to the day of redemption. Con. of Faith," Chap. 18. This genuine assurance may be distinguished from that presumptuous confidence which is a delusion of Satan, chiefly by these marks. True assurance, 1st, begets unfeigned humility, 1 Corinthians 15:10; Galatians 6:14;

2nd, leads to ever–increasing diligence in practical religion, Psalms 12:1-8; Psalms 13:1-6; Psalms 19:1-14;

3rd, to candid self–examination, and a desire to be searched and corrected by God, Psalms 139:23-24;

4th, to constant aspirations after neater conformity, and more intimate communion with God.—1 John 3:2-3.

36. How may it be shown that a living faith necessarily leads to good works?

1st. from the nature of faith. It is the spiritual apprehension and the voluntary embrace of the whole truth of God,—the promises, the commands, the threatenings of the Scripture,—viewed as true and as good. This faith occasions, of course, the exercise of the renewed affections, and love acted out is obedience. Each separate truth thus apprehended produces its appropriate effect upon the heart, an) consequently upon the life.

2nd. The testimony of Scripture.—Acts 15:9; Galatians 5:6; James 2:18; 1 John 5:4.

3rd. The experience of the universal church.

AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS.

St. Augustine.—“Quid est fides nisi credere quod non vides?”

ROMISH DOCTRINE.—“Cat. Counc. Trent,” i. 1.—1. “We here speak of that faith, by force of which we yield our entire assent to whatsoever has been divinely delivered, ... by virtue of which we hold that as fixed whatsoever the authority of our holy mother the church teaches us to have been delivered from God.”

Bellarmin, “Justif.,” 1, 4.—“(Catholics) teach that historic faith, both of miracles and of promises, is one and the same thing, and that this one thing is not properly a knowledge or assurance, but a certain and most fixed assent, on the authority of the ultimate verity. . . . The object of justifying faith, which heretics restrict to the single object of special (personal) mercy, Catholics wish to extend as broadly as the word of God extends; nay, they contend that the promise of special mercy belongs not so much to faith as to presumption. Hence they differ (from Protestants) as to the faculty and power of mind which is the seat of faith. Inasmuch as they (Protestants) locate faith in the will, they define it to be assurance (fiducia)(or trust), and so confound it with hope, for trust (or assurance) is nothing more than strong hope, as holy Thomas teaches. Catholics teach that faith has its seat in the intellect. Lastly (they differ) as to the act itself of the intellect (in which faith consists). They (Protestants), indeed, define faith as a form of knowledge, we (Catholics) as assent. For we assent to God, although he proposes things to us to be believed which we do not understand. Ch. 7.—In him, who believes, there are two things, apprehension, and judgment or assent. But apprehension is not faith, but something that precedes faith. Besides apprehension is not properly called knowledge. For it may happen that an unlearned Catholic may only very confusedly apprehend the three names (of the Trinity), and nevertheless may truly believe in them. But judgment or assent is twofold, the one follows reason and the evidence of a thing, the other follows the authority of the propounder, the first is called knowledge, the latter faith. Therefore the mysteries of faith, which transcend the reason, we believe but do not understand, so that faith is distinguished as opposite to science, and is better defined as ignorance than as knowledge.”

“Cans. Counc. Trent,” Sess. 6, ch. 9.—“For even as no pious person ought to doubt of the mercy of God, of the merits of Christ, and of the virtue and efficacy of the sacraments, even so each one, when he regards himself and his own weakness and indisposition, may have fear and apprehension touching his own grace; seeing that no one can know with a certainty of faith, which can not be subject to error, that he has obtained the grace of God.”

Bellarmin, “Justif.,” 3, 3 says, “The question in debate between Romanists and the Reformed was, Whether any one should or could, without a special revelation, be certain with the certainty of a divine faith, to which error can in no way pertain, that his sins are remitted?” THE PROTESTANT DOCTRINE OF FAITH AND ASSURANCE.

Calvin’s “Institutes,” B. 3, ch. 2, sect. 7.—“We shall have a complete definition of faith, if we say that it is a steady and certain knowledge of the divine benevolence towards us, which, being founded on the truth of the gratuitous promise in Christ, is both revealed to our minds and

confirmed to our hearts by the Holy Spirit."

"Heidelberg Cat.," Ques. 21.—"What is true faith? It is not a mere knowledge, by which I firmly assent to all that God has revealed to us in his word, but it is also an assured confidence kindled in my heart by the Holy Ghost through the gospel, whereby I acquiesce in God, certainly knowing, that not to others only, but to me also, remission of sins, eternal righteousness and life, is given gratuitously, of the mercy of God, on account of the merit of Christ alone. "

"Apol. Augb. Confession," p. 68.—"But that faith which justifies is not merely a knowledge of history; but it is assent to the promise of God in which is freely, for Christ's sake, offered the remission of sins and justification. . . . This special faith, therefore, whereby each one believes that his own sins are remitted to him for Christ's sake, and that God is reconciled and propitious through Christ, (is the faith that attains remission of sins, and (that) justifies."

"West. Confession Faith," ch. 18, sect. 2.—"This certainly is not a bare conjectural and probable persuasion, grounded upon a fallible hope, but an infallible Assurance','of faith, founded on (a) the divine truth of the promises (b) the inward evidence of those graces to which the promises are made, and (c) the testimony of the Holy Spirit . . . . Sect. 3.—This infallible assurance doth not so belong to the essence of faith, but that a true believer may wait long and conflict with many difficulties before he partake thereof. . . Yet he may, without extraordinary revelation, in the right use of ordinary means attain thereto. And, therefore, it is the duty of every one to give all diligence to make his calling and election sure."

Turretin, 2. 15, Q. 10.—"The diversity (of expression) which occurs between the orthodox has arisen from a different usage of the word fiducia(confidence), which may be taken in three senses:1. For confident assent, or persuasion, which arises from the practical judgment of the understanding, concerning the truth and goodness of the evangelical promises, and concerning the power, willingness, and faithfulness of God promising. In which sense πεισμονη(persuasion), Galatians 5:8, is used synonymously with it and πληροφορια(full assurance) is attributed to faith, Colossians 2:2, and Hebrews 10:22. (2. For the act of fleeing to, and of receiving Christ, by which the believer, the truth and goodness of the promises being known, flees to Christ, receives and embraces him, and reclines alone on his merits. 3. For confidence, satisfaction, and tranquillity of mind, which arise from the refuge of the mind to Christ and reception of him. For he who firmly reclines on Christ and embraces him, can not fail to acquiesce in him securely and to consider himself to have found and to have received that which he sought. In the first and second sense confidence(fiducia) is of the essence of faith, is rightly said by theologians to be its form because, as afterwards proved against the Papists, it is a confidential (trusting) apprehension of Christ and of all the benefits offered in the word of the gospel. But in the third sense it is by others rightly said not to be the form, but the fruit, of faith, because it is born from it, but does not constitute it."

02.31. Union of Believers Christ.

Chapter 31 Union of Believers Christ.

1. To whom are all men united in their natural estate? To Adam. Our union with him includes, 1st, his federal headship under the covenant of works.—Romans 5:12-19.

2nd. His natural headship, as per force of ordinary generation, the source of our nature, and of its moral corruptions.—Genesis 5:3; 1 Corinthians 15:49. But the law upon which rested the covenant of works, whereby we were held in union with Adam, having been slain by Christ, “that being dead wherein we were held,” we were “married to another,” that is, to Christ.—Romans 7:1-4.

2. What is the general nature of our union with Christ?

It is a single, ineffable and most intimate union, presenting to our view two different aspects, and giving rise to two different classes of consequents.

1st. The first aspect of this union is its federal and representative character, whereby Christ, as the second Adam (1 Corinthians 15:22), assumes in the covenant of grace those broken obligations of the covenant of works which the first Adam failed to discharge, and fulfills them all in behalf of all his “sheep,”“they whom the Father has given him.” The consequences which arise from our union with Christ under this aspect of it are such as the imputation of our sins to him, and of his righteousness to us, and all of the forensic benefits of justification and adoption, etc.—See Chaps. 33., 34.

2nd. The second aspect of this union is its spiritual and vital character, the nature and consequences of which it is our business to discuss under the present head.

3. What is the foundation of this union?

(1.) The eternal purpose of the triune God, expressed in the decree of election (we were chosen in him before the foundation of the world.—Ephesians 1:4), providing for its own fulfillment in the covenant of grace between the Father as God absolute, and the Son as Mediator.—John 17:2-6; Galatians 2:20;

(2.) in the incarnation of the Son, whereby he assumed fellowship with us in community of nature, and became our brother.—Hebrews 2:16-17; and

(3.) in the mission and official work of the Spirit of Christ (1 John 4:13), through the powerful operation of whom in the bodies and souls of his people the last Adam is made a quickening spirit (1 Corinthians 15:45), and they are all constituted the body of Christ and members in particular. 1 Corinthians 12:27.

4. By what analogies drawn from earthly relations is this union of believers with Christ illustrated in Scripture? The technical designation of this union in theological language is “mystical,” because it so far transcends all the analogies of earthly relationships, in the intimacy of its communion, in the

transforming power of its influence, and in the excellence of its consequences. Yet Holy Scripture illustrates different aspects of this fountain of graces by many apt though partial analogies.

As, 1st, foundation of a building and its superstructure.—1 Peter 2:4; 1 Peter 2:6.

2nd. Tree and its branches.—John 15:5.

3rd. Head and members of the body.—Ephesians 4:15-16.

4th. Husband and wife.—Ephesians 5:31-32; Revelation 19:7-9.

5th. Adam and his descendants, ill both their federal and natural relations.—Romans 5:12-19; 1 Corinthians 15:22; 1 Corinthians 15:49.

5. What is the essential nature of this union? On the one hand, this union does not involve any mysterious confusion of the person of Christ with the persons of his people; and, on the other hand, it is not such a mere association of separate persons as exists in human societies. But it is a union which, 1st, determines our legal status on the same basis with his.

2nd. Which revives and sustains, by the influence of his indwelling Spirit, our spiritual lift, from the fountain of his life, and which transforms our bodies and souls into the likeness of his glorified humanity.

It is, therefore—

1st. A spiritual union. Its actuating source and bond is the spirit of the head, who dwells and works in the members. 1 Corinthians 6:17; 1 Corinthians 12:13; 1 John 3:24; 1 John 4:13.

2nd. A vital union, i. e., our spiritual life is sustained and determined in its nature and movement by the life of Christ, through the indwelling of his Spirit.—John 14:19; Galatians 2:20.

3rd. It embraces our entire persons, our bodies through our spirits.—1 Corinthians 6:15; 1 Corinthians 6:19.

4th. It is a legal or federal union, so that all of our legal or covenant responsibilities rest upon Christ, and all of his legal or covenant merits accrue to us.

5th. It is an indissoluble union.—John 10:28; Romans 8:35; Romans 8:37; 1 Thessalonians 4:14; 1 Thessalonians 4:17.

6th. This union is between the believer and the person of the God–man in his office as Mediator. Its immediate organ is the Holy Spirit, who dwells in us, and through him we are virtually united to and commune with the whole Godhead, since he is the Spirit of the Father as well as of the Son.—John 14:23; John 17:21; John 17:23.

6. How is this union between Christ and the Christian established?

It was established in the purpose and decree of God, and in the Covenant of the Father with the Son from eternity.—Ephesians 1:4; John 17:2; John 17:6. Nevertheless, the elect, as to personal character and present relations, before their effectual calling by the Spirit, are born and continued “by nature children of wrath even as others,” and “strangers to the covenants of promise.”Ephesians 2:3; Ephesians 2:12. In God’s appointed time, with each individual of his

chosen, this union is established mutually—

1st. By the commencement of the effectual and permanent workings of the Holy spirit within them (they are quickened together with Christ in the act of the new birth opening the eyes and renewing the will, and thus laying in their natures the foundation of the exercise of saving faith

2nd. Which faith is the second bond by which this mutual union is established, by the continued actings of which their fellowship with Christ is sustained, and its blessed consequences developed.—Ephesians 3:17. Thus we “come to him,”“receive him,”“eat of his flesh and drink of his blood,” etc.

7. What are the consequences of this union to the believer?

1st. They have a community with him in his covenant standing, and rights. forensically they are rendered “complete in him.” His righteousness and his father is theirs. They receive the adoption in him, and are accepted as to both their persons and services in the beloved. They are sealed by his Holy Spirit of promise; in him obtain an inheritance; sit with him on his throne and behold his glory.—Romans 8:1; Colossians 2:10; Ephesians 1:6; Ephesians 1:11; Ephesians 1:13; Php 3:8-9. As Mediator, Jesus is “the Christ,” the anointed one, and the believer is the Christian, or receiver of “the unction.” —Acts 11:26; 1 John 2:20. His mediatorial office embraces three principal functions—

(1.) That of prophet, and in fellowship with him the believer is a prophet.—John 16:13; 1 John 2:27.

(2.) That of priest, and the believer also is a priest in him. Isaiah 61:6; 1 Peter 2:5; Revelation 20:6.

(3.) That of king, and in him the believer is a king.—1 Peter 2:9; Revelation 3:21; Revelation 5:10.

2nd. They have fellowship with him in the transforming, assimilating power of his life, making them like him; every grace of Jesus reproducing itself in them; “of his fullness we have all received, and grace for grace.” This holds true, (I) with regard to our souls, Romans 8:9; Php 2:5; 1 John 3:2; (2) with regard to our bodies, causing them to be now the temples of the Holy Ghost, 1 Corinthians 6:17; 1 Corinthians 6:19; and his resurrection to be the cause of ours, and his glorified body to be the type of ours.—Romans 6:5; 1 Corinthians 15:47; 1 Corinthians 15:49; Php 3:21. And thus believers are made to bear fruit in Christ, both in their bodies and spirits, which are his.—John 15:5; 2 Corinthians 12:9; 1 John 1:6.

3rd. This leads to their fellowship with Christ in their experience, in their labors, sufferings, temptations, and death.—Galatians 6:17; Php 3:10; Hebrews 12:3; 1 Peter 4:13. Thus rendering sacred and glorious even our earthly life.

4th. Also to Christ’s rightful fellowship with them in all they possess. Proverbs 19:17; Romans 14:8; 1 Corinthians 6:19-20.

5th. Also to the consequence that, in the spiritual reception of the holy sacraments, they do really hold fellowship with him. They are “baptized into Christ.”—Galatians 3:27. “The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ; the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ.”—1 Corinthians 10:16; 1 Corinthians 11:26; John 6:51-56.

6th. This leads also to the fellowship of believers with one another through him, that is, to the communion of saints.

8. What is the nature of that “communion of saints” which springs from the union of each saint with the Lord?

See “Confession of Faith,” Chapter 26. Believers being all united to one head are, of course, through him mutually, related in the same community of spirit, life, status, and covenanted privileges with one another. This involves upon the part of all believers—

1st. Reciprocal obligations and offices according to the special grace vouchsafed to each. Like the several organs of the body all have part in the same general life, yet each has his own individual difference of qualification, and consequently of duty; “for the body is not one member but many.”—1 Corinthians 12:4-21; Ephesians 4:11-13.

2nd. They have fellowship in each other’s gifts and complementary graces, each contributing his special loveliness to the beauty of the whole.—Ephesians 4:15-16.

3rd. These reciprocal duties have respect to the bodies and temporal interests of the brethren, as well as to those which concern the soul.—Galatians 2:10; 1 John 3:16-18.

4th. They have fellowship in faith and doctrine.—Acts 2:42; Galatians 2:9.

5th. In mutual respect and subordination.—Romans 12:10; Ephesians 5:21; Hebrews 13:17.

6th. In mutual love and sympathy.—Romans 12:10; 1 Corinthians 12:26.

7th. This fellowship exists unbroken between believers on earth and in heaven. There is one “whole family in heaven and on earth.”—Ephesians 3:15.

8th. In glory this communion of saints shall be perfected, when there is “one fold and one shepherd,” when all saints shall be one as Father and Son are one.—John 10:16; John 17:22.

02.32. Repentance, and the Romish Doctrine of Penance.

Chapter 32 Repentance, and the Romish Doctrine of Penance.

1. What are the words used in the original to express this change of mind and feeling?

1st. μεταμελεσθαι from μελομαι to care for; combined with μετα to change one's care. This is used only five times in the New Testament.

2nd. μετανοειν, from νοεω , to perceive, understand, consider; combined with μετα , to change one's mind or purpose. This is the verb constantly used in, the New Testament to designate this change.

3rd. From the same source comes the noun μετανοια , repentance, change of mind or purpose. In the New Testament usage of these words the idea of sorrow and contrition is included.

2. What is saving repentance?

See "Con. Faith," Chap. 15.; "Larger Cat.," Q. 76; "Shorter Cat.," Q. 87.

It includes—

1st. A sense of personal guilt, pollution, and helplessness.

2nd. An apprehension of the mercy of:God in Christ.

3rd. Grief and hatred of sin, a resolute turning from it unto God, and a persistent endeavor after a new life of holy obedience.

3. Prove that repentance is a grace or gift of God.

1st. This is evident from the nature of repentance itself. It includes, (1) sense of the hatefulness of sin, (2) sense of the beauty of holiness, (3) apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ. It, therefore, presupposes faith, which is God's gift. Galatians 5:22; Ephesians 2:8.

2nd. The Scriptures expressly affirm it.—Zechariah 12:10; Acts 5:31; Acts 11:18; 2 Timothy 2:25.

4. What is the nature of that sense of sin which is an essential element of repentance? That spiritual illumination and renewal of the affections which is effected in regeneration, brings the believer to see and appreciate the holiness of God as revealed alike in the law and the gospel, Romans 3:20; Job 13:6, and in that light to see and feel also the exceeding sinfulness of all sin, and the utter sinfulness of his own nature just as it is in truth. This sense of sin, thus corresponding to the facts of the case, includes,

1st, consciousness of guilt, i. e., exposure to righteous punishment, as opposed to the justice of God.—Psalms 51:4; Psalms 51:9.

2nd. Consciousness of pollution as opposed to the holiness of God, Psalms 5:5; Psalms 5:7; Psalms 5:10; and, 3rd, consciousness of helplessness.—Psalms 5:11; Psalms 109:22. See “Way of Life.”

5. What are the fruits and evidences of this sense of sin? A sense of guilt, especially when coupled with a sense of helplessness, will naturally excite apprehension of danger. This painful feeling is experienced in infinitely various degrees and modifications, as determined by natural temperament, education, and the special dealings of the Holy Spirit. These legal fears, however, are common both to false and to true repentance, and possess no sanctifying influence. A sense of pollution leads to shame when we think of God, and to self–loathing when we think of ourselves.

Confession of sin, both in private to God and before men, is a natural and indispensable mode in which this sense of sin will give genuine expression to itself.—Psalms 32:5-6; Proverbs 28:13; James 5:16; 1 John 1:9. The only unquestionable test of the genuineness of such a sense of sin, however, is an earnest and abiding desire and endeavor to be delivered from it.

6. Show that an apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ is essential to repentance.

1st. The awakened conscience echoes God’s law, and can be appeased by no less a propitiation than that demanded by divine justice itself, and until this is realized in a believing application to Christ, either indifference must dull the senses, or remorse must torment the soul.

2nd. Out of Christ God is a consuming fire, and an inextinguishable dread drives the soul away.—Deuteronomy 4:24; Hebrews 12:29.

3rd. A sense of the amazing goodness of God to us in the gift of his Son, and of our ungrateful requital of it, is necessary to excite in the repentant soul the proper shame and sorrow for sin as committed against God.—Psalms 4:1-8.

4th This is proved by the teachings and examples furnished in Scripture.—Psalms 51:1; Psalms 130:4.

7. What is the nature of that “turning unto God” which constitutes the essence of genuine repentance?

It is a voluntary forsaking of sin as evil and hateful, with sincere sorrow, humiliation, and confession; and a returning unto God, because he has a right to us, and because he is merciful and willing to forgive, together with a determination to live, by the help of his grace, in obedience to his commandments.

8. What are the evidences of genuine repentance?

1st. The agreement of our own internal experience with the teachings of the word of God on this subject. This is to be determined by the prayerful study of the Scriptures in connection with self–examination.

2nd. The permanent effects realized ill the life. These are the hatred and forsaking of secret as well as of open sins, the choice of God’s service as both right and desirable, public confession, and entire practical consecration. “These things must be in us and abound.”—2 Corinthians 7:11.

9. What are the relations which the ideas represented by the terms “faith,”“repentance,”“regeneration” and “conversion” mutually sustain to one another?

Regeneration is the ineffable act of God implanting a news nature. The term conversion is used generally to express the first exercises of that new nature in ceasing from the old life and commencing the new. Faith designates the primary act of the new nature, and also that permanent state or habit of mind which continues the essential condition of all other graces. It is the spiritual apprehension of the truth by the mind, and the loyal embrace of the truth by the will, without which there can be neither love, hope, peace, joy, nor repentance. The common sense attached to the word repentance is very similar to that attached to the word conversion, but it differs from it as to its usage in two particulars—

1st. Conversion is the more general term, and is used to include the first exercises of faith, as well as all those experiences of love, of holiness, and hatred of sin, etc., which are consequent upon it. Repentance is more specific, and expresses that hatred and renunciation of sin, and that turning unto God, which accompanies faith as its consequent.

2nd. Conversion is generally used to designate only the first actings of the new nature at the commencement of a religious life, or at most the first steps of a return to God after a notable backsliding.—Luke 22:32. While repentance is applied to that constant bearing of the cross which is one main characteristic of the believer’s life on earth.—Psalms 19:12-13; Luke 9:23; Galatians 6:14; Galatians 5:24.

10. What doctrine concerning repentance was taught by many of the Reformers?

Some of them defined repentance as consisting, 1st, of mortification, or dying unto sin; and,

2nd, of vivification, or living unto God. This corresponds to our view of sanctification. The Lutherans make repentance to consist in, 1st, contrition, or sorrow for sin; and,

2nd, in faith in the gospel, or absolution.—“Augsburg Confession,” Art 12. This, although a peculiar phraseology, is the true view.

11. What is the Romish doctrine of Penance? In their scheme of salvation the true analogy to the Protestant doctrine of justification is not to be found in the Romish doctrine of justification (so called), but in their doctrine of penance. By justification Protestants understand a change of relation to the divine law, from condemnation to favor with our Judge and King, on the ground of the satisfaction rendered by Christ. By “justification” Romanists mean “not remission of sin merely, but also the sanctification and renewal of the inward man, through the voluntary reception of the grace and of the gifts whereby man of unjust becomes jest, and of an enemy a friend.”“For although no one can be just, but he to whom the merits of the passion of Christ, of our Lord Jesus Christ, are communicated, yet is this done in the said justification of the impious, when by the merit of that same most holy passion, the charity of God is poured forth by the Holy, Spirit in the hearts of those that are justified, and is inherent therein.”“Conc. Trent,” Sess. C, ch. 7. This is effected by baptism, and in all its stages presupposes the satisfaction and merit of Christ. His satisfaction atones form all sins committed before baptism, and for the eternal punishment of all sins of the baptized. His merits secure prevenient grace, baptismal regeneration, and are the basis on which the gracious obedience and the temporal sufferings of the believer merit forgiveness of sins and

continuance, restoration, and increase of grace, and the rewards of heaven.

Having been thus justified and made friends of God, they advance from virtue to virtue, and are renewed from day to day through the observance of the commandments of God and of the Church, which good works truly merit and receive, as a just reward, increase of grace and more and more perfect justification (sanctification). The Christian man's first Justification, effected in baptism, was for Christ's sake without co–operation of his own merit, though by co–operation of his own will (if adult). His continued and increasing justification (sanctification) is for Christ's sake through and in proportion to his own merit, which merit increases in proportion (a) to his holiness, (b) to his obedience to moral and ecclesiastical rules.—"Conc. Trent," Sess. 6, ch. 10, and can. 32. In case of those who have by sin fallen from the received grace of "justification," the grace lost is, through the merits of Christ, restored by the SACRAMENT OF PENANCE, provided as a second plank, after the shipwreck of grace lost. This penance includes (1) sorrow for sin, (2) confession of those sins, (3) sacerdotal absolution, (4) satisfaction rendered (a) in this world by fasts, alms, prayers, etc., and (b) after death by the fires of purgatory.

They distinguish penance—

1st. As a virtue, equivalent to the Protestant doctrine of the grace of repentance.

2nd. As a sacrament Penance, as a virtue, is internal, or a change of mind, including sorrow for sin and turning unto God. External penance, or the outward expression of the internal state, is that which constitutes the SACRAMENT OF PENANCE. The matter of this sacrament is constituted by the acts of the penitent in the way of contrition, of confession, and of satisfaction. Contrition is sorrow and detestation of past sins, with a purpose of sinning no more. Confession is self–accusation to a priest having jurisdiction and the power of the keys. Satisfaction is some painful work imposed by the priest, and performed by the penitent to satisfy justice for sins committed. These effect (a) the expiation of the guilt of past sins, and (b) the discipline and increase of the spiritual life of the soul. The form of the sacrament is the absolution pronounced judicially, and not merely declaratively, by the priest. They hold "that it is only by means of this sacrament that sins committed after baptism can be forgiven."—"Cat. Rom.," Part 2., Chap. 5., Qu. 12 and 13; "Conc. Trent," Sess. 6, chs. 14-16; Sess. 14, chs. 1-9; Sess. 6, can. 30.

12. How may it be proved that it is not a sacrament?

1st. It was not instituted by Christ. The Scriptures teach nothing concerning it.

2nd. It is an essential consequent of the false theory of baptismal regeneration.

3rd. It does not either signify, seal, or convey the benefits of Christ and the new covenant.—See below, Chap. 41., Questions 2–5.

13. What is their doctrine concerning confession?

Confession is self–accusation to a priest having jurisdiction and the power of the keys. All sins must be confessed without reserve, and in all their details and qualifying circumstances. If any mortal sin is not confessed, it is not pardoned, and if the omission is willful, it is sacrilege, and greater guilt is incurred.—"Cat. Rom.," Pt. 2., Chap. 5., Qu. 33, 34 and 42.

14. What are the Protestant arguments against auricular confession?

1st. It has no warrant in Scripture. The command is to “confess one to another.”

2nd. It perverts the whole plan of salvation, by making necessary the mediation of the priest between the Christian and Christ, which has been refuted above, Chap. 24., Questions 8 and 21.

3rd. We are commanded to confess to God immediately. Matthew 11:28; 1 Timothy 2:5; 1 John 1:9.

4th. The practical results of this system have always been evil, and this gross invasion of all the sacred lights of personality is revolting to every refined soul.

15. What is the nature of that absolution which the Romish priests claim the power to grant?

It absolves judicially, not merely declaratively, from all the penal consequences of the sins confessed by the authority of Jesus Christ. They appeal to Matthew 16:19; Matthew 18:18; John 20:22-23. “Cat. Rom.,” Part 2., Chap. 5., Qu. 13 and 17; “Council of Trent,” Sess. 14, De Poenitentia, can. 9.

16. What are the arguments against the possession, upon the part of the Christian ministry, of such a power to absolve?

1st. The Christian ministry is not a priesthood.—See above, Chap. 24., Question 21.

2nd. But even if it were, the conclusion which the Papists draw from it would not follow. Absolution is a sovereign, not a priestly act. This is plain, from the definition of the priesthood given (Hebrews 5:1-6), from the Levitical practice, and from the very nature of the act itself

3rd. The grant of the power of the keys, whatever it was, was not made to the ministry as such, for in Matthew 18:1-18, Christ was addressing the body of the disciples, and the primitive ministers never either claimed or exercised the power in question.

4th. The power of absolute forgiveness is incommunicable in itself, and was not granted as a matter of fact; the words in question will not bear that sense, and were not so understood. The practice of the apostles shows that their understanding of the words was that they conveyed merely the power of declaring the conditions on which God would pardon sin, and in accordance with that declaration, of admitting or excluding men from sealing ordinances.

5th. This one false principle makes Christ of none effect, and perverts the whole gospel.—“ Bib. Rep.,” Jan., 1845.

17. What is the Romish doctrine concerning satisfaction as a part of penance? By satisfaction is meant such works as are enjoined by the priest upon confession, which being set over against the sins confessed, for which contrition has been professed, are supposed to constitute a compensation for the breach of God’s law, and in consideration of which the sins are forgiven.—“ Cat. Rom.,” Part 2., Chap. 5., Qu. 52 and 53. “Council of Trent,” Sess. 14., “De Poenitentia,” Chs. 1.–9.

18. What are the objections to that doctrine?

1st. It is not supported by any Scriptural authority.

2nd. It does dishonor to the one perfect satisfaction offered by our High Priest once for all.—Hebrews 10:10-14.

3rd. The distinction they make between the temporal and eternal punishments of sin is unauthorized. The penalty of sin is the judicial wrath of God—while that lasts there is no peace. When that is propitiated there is no more condemnation (Romans 8:1). The temporal sufferings of believers in Christ are chastisements, not punishments, nor satisfactions.

4th. The pretended “satisfactions” are either commanded or not. If commanded, they are simple duties. Their performance can have no merit. The performance of one duty can never “satisfy” for the neglect or violation of another. If not commanded, they are a form of will–worship which God abhors.—Colossians 2:20-23.

19. What is the Papal doctrine of Indulgences? The Papal doctrine of INDULGENCES—

1st. Rests upon the same principles with their doctrine of PENANCE.

(1.) The distinction between the eternal and the temporal penalties demanded for the satisfactions for sins.

(2.) The superabundant merit acquired by and belonging to the Head of the Church and his members (Christ, the Virgin Mary, and the saints), which constitute a Treasury of Merit, disposable at the discretion of competent authority to the relief of any repentant believer not in mortal sin.

(3.) The dispensing power of the church, whereby a church officer possessing competent jurisdiction has authority to dispense in behalf of God and of the church any or all temporal satisfactions due from the penitent, either on earth or in purgatory, not as yet discharged him personally.

2nd. These indulgences are to be granted for “reasonable causes,”i. e.,“the cause must be pious, that is, not a work which is merely temporal, or vain, or in no respect appertaining to the divine glory, but any work whatsoever which tends to the honor of God, or the service of the church.” They “do not depend for their efficacy on consideration of the work enjoined but on the infinite treasure of the merits of Christ and the saints.” These “causes” are payments of money for pious purposes, special prayers, visit to certain shrines, etc., etc.

3rd. Indulgences are of various kinds.

(1.) General or the whole church, granted only by the pope himself; to all the faithful throughout the world; or particular, granted by due authority to certain persons.

(2.) They may be plenary granting remission from all temporal punishments in this world and ill purgatory; or partial, remitting only some part of the penalty due.

(3.) They may be temporary, for a specified number of days or months.

(4.) Perpetual, without any limitation of time.

(5.) Local, attached to certain churches or other places.

(6.) Real, attached to certain movable things as rosaries, medals, etc. (7.) Personal, granted to particular persons, or communities.—See M'Clintock and Strong's "Encyclopaedia," and below, the "Counc. of Trent," etc.

AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS.

"Counc. Trent," Sess. 14, ch. 1.—"But the Lord then principally instituted the Sacrament of Penance, when being raised from the dead, he breathed upon his disciples saying, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven them, and whose sins ye retain they are retained.' By which action so signal, and words so clear, the consent of all the Fathers has ever understood, that the power of forgiving and retaining sins was communicated to the apostles and their lawful successors, for the reconciling of the faithful who have fallen after baptism."

Ib., ch. 3.—"The holy synod doth furthermore teach, (1) that the FORM of the Sacrament of Penance, wherein its force principally consists, is placed in those words of the minister, 'I ABSOLVE THEE, ETC.' . . . . But (2) the acts of the penitent himself, to wit, contrition, confession, and satisfaction, are as it were the MATTER of this sacrament, which acts, inasmuch as they are, by God's institution, required in the penitent for the integrity of the sacrament, and for the full and perfect remission of sins, are for this reason called the parts of penance. But (3) the thing signified indeed, and the effect of this sacrament, as far as regards its force and efficacy, is reconciliation with God."

Ib., ch. 4.—"Contrition, which holds the first place amongst the aforesaid acts of the penitent, is a sorrow of mind, and a detestation for sin committed, with the purpose of not sinning for the future."

Ib., ch. 5.—"All mortal sins of which, after a diligent examination of themselves, they are conscious, must needs be by penitents enumerated in confession, even though those sins be most hidden, and committed only against the two last precepts of the decalogue. . . Venial sins, whereby we are not excluded from the grace of God, and into which we fall more frequently, although they be rightly and profitably and without presumption declared in confession, yet they may be omitted without guilt, and be expiated by many other remedies. . . . Other sins (mortal) which do not occur to him (the penitent) after diligent thought, are understood to be included as a whole in that same confession; for which sins we confidently say with the prophet. 'From my secret sins cleanse me, O Lord.'"

Ib., ch. 6.—"It also teaches, that even priests, who are in mortal sin exercise through the virtue of the Holy Ghost, which God has bestowed in ordination, the office of forgiving sins. . . . But although the absolution of the priest is the dispensation of another's bounty, yet it is not a bare ministry only, or declarative act but of the nature of a judicial act, whereby sentence is pronounced by the priest as by a judge. . . Neither would faith without penance bestow any remission of sins nor would he be otherwise than most careless of his own salvation, who knowing that a priest but absolved him in jest, should not carefully seek for another who would act in earnest."

Ib., ch. 8.—"Finally, as regards Satisfaction, which as it is, of all the parts of Penance, that which has been at all times recommended to the Christian people by our Fathers. Ch. 9.—We are able through Jesus Christ to make satisfaction to God the Father, not only by pains voluntarily undertaken by ourselves for the punishment of sin, or by those imposed at the discretion of the priest according to the measure of our delinquency,—but also, which is a very great proof of love,

by the temporal scourges inflicted of God and borne patiently by us."

"Counc. Trent," Sess. 6, Can. 29.—"If any one saith, that he, who has fallen after baptism, is not able by the grace of God to rise again; or that he is able indeed to recover the justice which he has lost, but by faith alone without the sacrament of penance. . . . Let him be accursed. Can. 30.—If any one saith that after the grace of Justification (sanctification) has been received, to every penitent sinner the guilt is remitted, and the debt of eternal punishment is blotted out in such wise, that there remains not any debt of temporal punishment to be discharged either in this world, or in the next in Purgatory, before entrance to the kingdom of heaven can be opened (to him); Let him be accursed."

INDULGENCES.—"Conc. Trent," Sess. 25, "De Indulgentiis."

Pope Leo X., "Bull De Indulgentiis"(1518).—"That no one in future may allege ignorance of the doctrine of the Roman Church respecting indulgences and their efficacy . . . the Roman pontiff, vicar of Christ on earth, can, for reasonable causes, by the powers of the keys, grant to the faithful, whether in this life or in Purgatory, indulgences, out of the superabundance of the merits of Christ, and of the saints (expressly called a treasure); and that those who have truly obtained those indulgences are released from so much of the temporal punishment due for their actual sins to the divine justice as is equivalent to the indulgence granted and obtained."

02.33. Justification.

Chapter 33

Justification.

1. What is the sense in which the wordδικαιος , just, is in the New Testament? Its fundamental idea is that of perfect conformity to all the requirements of the moral law.

1st. Spoken of things or actions.—Matthew 20:4; Colossians 4:1.

2nd. Spoken of persons (1.) as personally holy, conformed to the law in character.—Matthew 5:45; Matthew 9:13.

(2.) In respect to their possessing eminently some one quality demanded by the law.—Matthew 1:19; Luke 23:50.

(3.) As forensically just, i. e., as conformed to the requirements of the law as the condition of the covenant of life.—Romans 1:17.

(4.) Spoken of God in respect to his possession of the attribute of distributive justice in administering the provisions of the law and the covenants. Romans 3:26; 1 John 1:9.

(5.) Spoken of Christ in respect to his character as the only perfect man, and to his representative position in satisfying all the demands of the law in behalf of his people.—Acts 3:14; Acts 7:52; Acts 22:14.

2. What is the usage of the verbδικαιοω to justify, in the New Testament?

It means to declare a person to be just.

1st. Personally conformed to the law as to moral character. Luke 7:29; Romans 3:4.

2nd. Forensically, that is, that the demands of the law as a condition of life are fully satisfied with regard to him.—Acts 13:39; Romans 5:1; Romans 5:9; Romans 8:30-33; 1 Corinthians 6:11; Galatians 2:16; Galatians 3:11.

3. How can it be proved that the wordδικαιοω is used in a forensic sense when the Scriptures use it with reference to the justification of sinners under the gospel?

1st. In many instances it can bear no other sense. The ungodly are said to be justified without the deeds of the law, by the blood of Christ, by faith, freely, and of grace, through the agency of an advocate, by means of a satisfaction and of imputed righteousness.—Romans 3:20-28; Romans 4:5-7; Romans 5:1; Galatians 2:16; Galatians 3:11; Galatians 5:4; 1 John 2:2.

2nd. It is used as the contrary of condemnation.—Romans 8:33-34.

3rd. The same idea is conveyed in many equivalent and interchangeable expressions.—John 3:18; John 5:24; Romans 4:6-7; 2 Corinthians 5:19.

4th. If it does not bear this meaning, there is no distinction between justification and sanctification.—Turretin, 50. 16., Quaestio 1.

4. What is the usage of the termδικαιοσυνη righteousness, and of the phrase “righteousness of God,” in the New Testament? The term “just” is concrete, designating the person who is perfectly conformed to the law, or in respect to whom all the demands of the law are completely satisfied. The term “righteousness,” on the other hand, is abstract, designating that quality or that obedience or suffering which satisfies the demands of the law, and which constitutes the ground upon which justification proceeds.

Consequently, it sometimes signifies, 1st, holiness of character , Matthew 5:6; Romans 6:13;

2nd, that perfect conformity to the law in person and life which was the original ground of justification under the covenant of works, Romans 10:3; Romans 10:5; Php 3:9; Titus 3:5;

3rd, the vicarious obedience and sufferings of Christ our substitute, which he wrought in our behalf, and which, when imputed to us, becomes our righteousness, or the ground of our justification Romans 4:6; Romans 10:4; 1 Corinthians 1:30; which is received and appropriated by us through faith, Romans 3:22; Romans 4:11; Romans 10:5-10; Galatians 2:21; Hebrews 11:7. The phrase, “righteousness of God,” occurs in Matthew 6:33; Romans 1:17; Romans 3:5; Romans 3:21-22; Romans 3:25-26; Romans 10:3; 2 Corinthians 5:21; Php 3:9; James 1:20; 2 Peter 1:1. It evidently means that perfect righteousness or satisfaction to the whole law, precept, and penalty alike, which God provides, and which God will accept, in contrast to our own imperfect services or self–inflicted penances which God will reject, if offered as a ground of justification.

5. What is the usage of the termδικαιωσις justification, in the New Testament?

It occurs only in Romans 4:25; Romans 5:16; Romans 5:18. It signifies that relation to the law into which we are brought in consequence of the righteousness of Christ being made legally ours. We are absolved from to the penalty, and the rewards promised to obedience are declared to belong to us.

6. Define justification in its gospel sense.

God, as sovereign, elected his chosen people, and gave them to his Son in the covenant of grace, and as sovereign he executes that covenant when he makes the righteousness of Christ theirs by imputation. Justification, on the other hand, is a judicial act of God proceeding upon that sovereign imputation declaring the law to be perfectly satisfied in respect to us. This involves,

1st, pardon;

2nd, restoration to divine favor, as those with regard to whom all the promises conditioned upon obedience to the commands of the law accrue. It is most strictly legal, although he sovereignly admits and credits to us a vicarious righteousness, since this vicarious righteousness is precisely in all respects what the law demands, and that by which the law is fulfilled.—See below, Question 28.

7. What does the law require in order to the justification of a sinner? The law consists essentially of a rule of duty, and of a penalty attached to take effect in case of disobedience. In the case of the sinner, therefore, who has already incurred guilt, the law demands that, besides the rendering of perfect obedience, the penalty also should be suffered.—Romans 10:5; Galatians 3:10-13.

8. Prove that works can not be the ground of a sinner's justification.

Paul repeatedly asserts this (Galatians 2:16), and declares that we are not justified by our own righteousness, which comes by obedience to the law.—Php 3:9. He also proves the same by several arguments—

1st. The law demands perfect obedience. All works not perfect, therefore, lead to condemnation, and no act of obedience at one time can atone for disobedience at another.—Galatians 3:10; Galatians 3:21; Galatians 5:3.

2nd. If we are justified by works, then Christ is dead in vain. Galatians 2:21; Galatians 5:4.

3rd. If it were of works it would not be of grace.—Romans 11:6; Ephesians 2:8-9.

4th. It would afford cause for boasting.—Romans 3:27; Romans 4:2.

5th. He also quotes the Old Testament to prove that all men are sinners, Romans 3:9-10; that consequently they can not be justified by works.—Psalms 143:2; Romans 3:20. He quotes Habakkuk 2:4, to prove that "the just by faith shall live"; and he cites the example of Abraham.—Galatians 3:6.

9. What are the different opinions as to the kind of works which the Scriptures teach are not sufficient for justification? The Pelagians admit that works of obedience to the ceremonial law are of this nature, but affirm that works of obedience to the moral law are the proper and only ground of justification. The Romanists admit that works wrought in the natural strength, previous to regeneration, are destitute of merit, and unavailable for justification, but they maintain that original sin and previous actual transgressions having been forgiven in baptism for Christ's sake, good works afterwards performed through grace have, in consequence of the merits of Christ the virtue, 1st, of meriting heaven;

2nd, of making satisfaction for sins. We are justified, then, by evangelical obedience.—"Cat. Rom.," Part 2., Chapter 5.; "Council of Trent," Sess. 6. Can. 24., and 32. Protestants deny the justifying efficiency of all classes of works equally.

10. How may it be shown that no class of works, whether ceremonial, moral, or spiritual, can justify?

1st. When the Scriptures deny that justification can be by works, the term "works" is always used generally as obedience to the whole revealed will of God, however made known. Works of obedience rendered to one law, as a ground of justification, are never contrasted with works wrought in obedience to another law, but with grace.—Romans 11:6; Romans 4:4. God demands perfect obedience to his whole will as revealed to any individual man. But since every man is a sinner, justification by the law is equally impossible for all.—Romans 2:14-15; Romans 3:9-10.

2nd. The believer is justified without the deeds of the law, Romans 3:28, and God justifies the ungodly in Christ.—Romans 4:5.

3rd. Justification is asserted to rest altogether upon a different foundation. It is “in the name of Christ,”1 Corinthians 6:11; “by his blood,”Romans 5:9; “freely,”“by his grace,”“by faith.”Romans 3:24; Romans 3:28.

4th. Paul proves that instead of our being justified by good works, such works are rendered possible to us only in that new relation to God into which we are introduced by justification. Ephesians 2:8-10; Romans 6:1-23 and Romans 1:1-25.

11. How can James 2:14-26, be reconciled with this doctrine?

James is not speaking of the meritorious ground of justification, but of the relation which good works sustain to a genuine faith as its fruit and evidence. The meritorious ground of justification is the righteousness of Christ.—Romans 10:4; 1 Corinthians 1:30. Faith is the essential prerequisite and instrument of receiving that righteousness.—Ephesians 2:8. James, in the passage cited, simply declares and argues the truth that the faith which is thus the instrumental cause of justification, is never a dead, but always a living and fruitful principle. Paul teaches the same truth often, “Faith works by love,”Galatians 5:6, and “love is the fulfilling of the law,”Romans 13:10.

12. What do the Scriptures declare to be the true and only ground of justification?

Justification is a declaration on the part of the infinitely wise and holy God that the law is satisfied. The law is, like its Author, absolutely unchangeable, and can be satisfied by nothing else than an absolutely perfect righteousness, at once fulfilling the precept, and suffering the penalty. This was rendered by Christ as our representative, and his perfect righteousness, as imputed to us, is the sole and strictly legal ground of our justification. Thus he is made for us the end of the law for righteousness, and we are made the righteousness of God in him.—Romans 3:24; Romans 5:9; Romans 5:19; Romans 8:1; Romans 10:4; 1 Corinthians 1:30; 1 Corinthians 6:11; 2 Corinthians 5:21; Php 3:9.

13. How can it be proved that Christ’s active obedience to the precepts of the law is included in that righteousness by which we are justified?

1st. The condition of the covenant of works was perfect obedience. This covenant having flailed in the hands of the first Adam must be fulfilled in the hands of the second Adam, since in the covenant of grace Christ assumed all of the undischarged obligations of his people under the covenant of works. His suffering discharges the penalty, but only his active obedience fulfills the condition.

2nd. All the promises of salvation are attached to obedience, not to suffering.—Matthew 19:16-17; Galatians 3:12.

3rd. Christ came to fulfill the whole law.—Isaiah 13:21; Romans 3:31; 1 Corinthians 1:30.

4th. The obedience of Christ is expressly contrasted with the disobedience of Adam.—Romans 5:19.

14. How may it be shown that Christ’s obedience was free?

Although Christ was made under the law by being born of the woman, and rendered obedience to that law in the exercises of his created human nature yet he did not owe that obedience for himself, but rendered it freely that its merits might be imputed to his people, because the claims of law terminate not upon nature, but upon persons; and he was always a divine person. As he suffered, the just for the unjust so he obeyed, the Lawgiver in the place of the law–subject.

15. In what sense is Christ's righteousness imputed to believers?

Imputation is an act of God as sovereign judge, at once judicial and sovereign, whereby

(1.) he makes the guilt and legal responsibilities of our sins really Christ's, and punishes him for them. "He was wounded for our transgression, the punishment of our peace was upon him."—Isaiah 53:5 and Isaiah 53:11. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us."—Galatians 3:13. "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 5:21; John 1:29.

(2.) He makes the righteousness of Christ ours (that is, the legal right to reward, by the gracious covenant conditioned on righteousness), and then treats us as persons legally invested with those rights." Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man to whom the Lord imputeth righteousness without works."—Romans 4:6. "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth."—Romans 10:4; 1 Corinthians 1:30; 2 Corinthians 5:21; Php 3:9.

"Imputation" is the charging or crediting to one's account as the ground of judicial treatment.

"Guilt" is the just obligation to punishment. The reatus poenoe, or "guilt of punishment," is imputed to Christ in our stead. The reatus culpoe , or guilt of fault, remains ours.

"Righteousness imputed" is the vicarious fulfillment of all the covenant demands on which eternal life is conditioned.

"Merit" is that which deserves on the ground of covenant promise a reward. The merit of reward is imputed to us from Christ, the merit of praiseworthiness remains his forever. As Christ is not made a sinner by the imputation to him of our sins, so we are not made holy by the imputation to us of his righteousness. The transfer is only of guilt from us to him. and of merit from him to us. He justly suffered the punishment due to our sins, and we justly receive the rewards due to his righteousness.—1 John 1:1-10. O. For explanation of "Imputation," see above, Chap. 21., Ques. 12, and Chap. 25., Ques. 9.

16. Upon what ground does this imputation proceed?

Upon the union federal, spiritual, and vital, which subsists between Christ and his people. Which union, in turn, rests upon the eternal decree of election common to all the persons of the Godhead, and upon the eternal covenant of grace formed between the Father as God absolute and the Son as Mediator. Thus the ultimate ground of imputation is the eternal nature and imperial will of God, the fountain of all law and all right.

17. How may the fact of this imputation be proved from scripture ?

See Romans 5:12-21. Compare Romans 4:6; Romans 3:21, with Romans 5:19. The doctrine of imputation is essentially involved in the doctrine of substitution. If Christ obeyed and suffered in

our place it can only be because our sins were imputed to him, which is directly asserted in scripture, Isaiah 53:6; 2 Corinthians 5:21; 1 Peter 2:24; and, if so, the merit of that obedience and suffering must accrue to us, Matthew 20:28; 1 Timothy 2:6; 1 Peter 3:18. See above, Chapter 21., Question 12. This doctrine is also taught by those passages which affirm that Christ fulfilled the law, Romans 3:31; Romans 10:4; and by those which assert that we are justified by the righteousness of Christ, 1 Corinthians 6:11; Romans 8:1, etc. This doctrine, moreover, stands or falls with the whole view we have presented of the priesthood of Christ, of the Justice of God, of the covenants of works and of grace, and of the nature of the atonement; to which subjects, under their respective heads, the reader is referred.

18. What are the two effects ascribed to the imputation of Christ's righteousness ?

Christ's righteousness satisfies, 1st, the penalty of the law;

2nd, then the positive conditions of the covenant of works, i. e., obedience to the precepts of the law. The imputation of that righteousness to the believer, therefore, secures, 1st, the remission of the penalty, pardon of sins;

2nd, the recognition and treatment of the believer as one with respect to whom the covenant is fulfilled, and to whom all its promises and advantages legally accrue. See below, Question 28.

19. Are the sins of believers, committed subsequently to their justification, included in the pardon which is consequent to the imputation of Christ's righteousness; and if so, in what way ? The elect, although embraced in the purpose of God, and in his covenant with his Son from eternity, are not effectively united to Christ until the time of their regeneration, when, in consequence of their union with him, and the imputation of his righteousness to them, their relation to the law is permanently changed. Although the immutable law always continues their perfect standard of experience and of action, it is no longer to them a condition of the covenant of life, because that covenant has been fully discharged for them by, their sponsor. God no longer imputes sin to them to the end of judicial punishment. Every suffering which they henceforth endure is of the nature of chastisement, designed for their correction and improvement, and forms in its relation to them, no part of the penalty of the law.

20. What are the different opinions as to the class of sins which are forgiven when the sinner is justified ?

Romanists teach that original sin and all actual transgressions prior to baptisms are forgiven for Christ's sake, through the reception of that sacrament, and that after baptism, sins, as they are committed, are through the merits of Christ forgiven in the observance of the sacrament of penance. See above, Chapter 32., Question 11.

Dr. Pussy has revived an ancient doctrine that in baptism all past sins, original and actual, are forgiven; but his system makes no provision for sins subsequently committed.

Many Protestants have held that only past and present sins are forgiven in the first act of justification, and that sins after regeneration, as they occur, are forgiven upon renewed acts of faith. The true view, however, is, that in consequence of the imputation to him of Christ's righteousness, the believer is emancipated from his former federal relation to the law, and consequently henceforth no sin is charged to him to the end of judicial condemnation. This follows

from the nature of justification, as stated above, and it is illustrated by the recorded experience of Paul, who, while complaining of the law of sin, still warring in his members, yet never doubted of his filial relation to God, nor of the forgiveness of his sins.

21. What are the different opinions as to the relation between faith and justification ?

Sicilians hold that faith, including obedience, is the proper meritorious ground “Cat. Rac.,” Quest. 418–421, and 453.

Armenians teach that although faith has no merit in itself, since it is the gift of God, yet, as a living principle, including evangelical obedience, it is graciously, for Christ’s merits’ sake, imputed to us for righteousness, i.e., accepted as righteousness, upon the ground of which we are declared just. Limborch, “Theol. Christ.,” 6, 4, 22 and 6, 4, 46. The orthodox view is that the active and passive obedience of Christ satisfying both the precept and penalty of the law as a covenant of life, and thus constituting a perfect righteousness, is, upon being appropriated by the believer in the act of faith, actually made his, in a legal sense, by imputation. Faith, therefore, is the mere instrument whereby we partake in the righteousness of Christ, which is the true ground of our justification.

22. Prove from Scripture, that faith is faith the only instrument of justification.

1st. From the nature of faith itself.

(1.) It is not of ourselves, it is the gift of God.—Ephesians 2:8; Php 1:29.

(2.) It is one of the fruits of the Spirit, and, therefore, not the meritorious ground of spiritual blessings.—Galatians 5:22.

(3.) It is an act of the soul, and therefore a work, but though, by means of faith, justification is not by works.–Romans 4:2-5; Romans 11:6.

(4.) Justifying faith terminates on or in Christ, in his blood and sacrifice, and in the promises of God; in its very essence therefore, it involves trust, and, denying its own justifying value, affirms the sole merit of that on which it trusts.—Romans 3:25-26; Romans 4:20; Romans 4:22; Galatians 3:26; Ephesians 1:12-13; 1 John 5:10.

(5.) The law necessarily demands a perfect righteousness, but faith, even when combined with the evangelical obedience which springs from it, is not a perfect righteousness.

2nd. The Scriptures, when referring to the relationship of justification to faith, use the terms εκ πιστεως , by faith, and δια πιστεως, by or through faith, but never, δια πιστιν, on account of faith, Galatians 2:10.

3rd. Faith is distinguished from the righteousness which it apprehends.—Romans 1:17; Php 3:8-11. Turretin, 50. 16, Q. 7.

23. What is the specific object of justification ? The Socinians, denying the divinity of Christ, make the act of justifying faith to terminate “in God through Christ.”—“Rac. Cat.” Sec. 5., Ch. 9. The Romanists, confounding justification and sanctification, make the whole revelation of God the object of the faith that justifies.— “Cat. Rom.,” Part 1, Chap. 1. The Scriptural doctrine is, that while the renewed heart believes equally every ascertained word of God, the specific act of faith,

whereby we are justified, terminates upon the person and work of Christ as Mediator. This is proved, 1st, from express declarations of Scripture. Romans 3:22; Romans 3:25; Galatians 2:16; Php 3:9.

2nd. By the declaration that we are saved by believing in him.—Acts 10:43; Acts 16:31; John 3:16; John 3:36.

3rd. By those figurative expressions which illustrate the act of saving faith as “looking to Christ” etc.—Isaiah 45:22; John 1:12; John 6:35; John 6:37; Matthew 11:28.

4th. Unbeleif is the refusing the righteousness which God provides i. e., Christ.—Romans 10:3-4.

24. What is the nature of that peace which flows from justification ?

1st. Peace with God, his justice being completely satisfied through the righteousness of Christ.—Romans 5:1; 2 Corinthians 5:19; Colossians 1:21; Ephesians 2:14. In witness whereof his Holy Spirit is given to us. –Romans 8:15-16; Hebrews 10:15; Hebrews 10:17. His love shed abroad in our hearts, Romans 5:5, and our habitual fellowship with him established, 1 John 1:3.

2nd. Inward peace of conscience, including consciousness of our reconciliation with God through the operation of his Spirit, as above, and the appeasement of our self–condemning conscience through the apprehension of the righteousness by which we are justified.–Hebrews 9:14; Hebrews 10:2; Hebrews 10:22.

25. What other benefits flow from justification ? Being justified on the ground of a perfect righteousness, our whole relation to God and the law is changed; the gift of the Holy Ghost, adoption, sanctification, perseverance, the working of all things together for good in this life, deliverance in death, the resurrection of the body, and the final glorification, all result.

OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.

26. State and Refute the principal objections made to the Protestant doctrine of justification.

1st. That it is legal, and therefore excludes grace.

We ANSWER–that it is transcendently gracious. 1. The admission of a substitute for guilty sinners was an act of grace. 2. The vicarious obedience and sufferings of the God–man were of infinite grace. 3. The imputation of his righteousness to an individual elected out of the mass of fallen humanity is an act of pure grace. Hence, 4, the entire subsequent regarding and treating the believer as righteous, is a work of grace.

2nd. That it is impious because it declares the sinner to be righteous with the very righteousness of Christ.

WE ANSWER. It is not impious because—1. This righteousness was freely wrought out with the intention it should be ours, and it is freely given to us. 2. It is not Christ’s personal subjective righteousness which is incommunicable, but his vicarious fulfillment of the covenant of life under which we were created which is imputed to us. 3. The merit of praise worthiness is retained by Christ, only its merit of rewardableness is given to us. 4. It is given to us gratuitously, that the praise of glorious grace may redound to Christ alone.

3rd. that gratuitous justification by faith leads to licentiousness.

PAUL ANSWERS. Romans 6:2-7 :

Prop.

1st. Where sin abounded grace did much more abound. Romans 5:20.

Prop.

2nd. Shall we conclude, therefore, that we are to continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid–Romans 6:1-2.

Prop.

3rd. The federal union of the believer with Christ, which secures our justification, is the foundation of, and is inseparable from, that vital spiritual union with him, which secures our sanctification.

Prop.

4th. This method of justification, so far from leading to licentiousness, secures the only conditions under which we could be holy.

(1.) This method of justification, by changing our relation to God, enables us to return to him in a way of a free, loving service.—Romans 6:14; Romans 7:1-6.

(2.) It alone delivers us from the spirit of bondage and fear, and gives us that of adoption and love.–Romans 8:1-17; Romans 13:10; Galatians 5:6; 1 John 4:18; 2 John 1:6.

27. In what respect did the doctrine of Piscator on this subject differ from that of the Reformed Churches?

Piscator, a Protestant divine, Prof. at Herbon (1584–1625), taught,

1st, that, as to his human nature, Christ was under the law in the same sense as any other creature, and that, therefore, he could only obey the law for himself;

2nd, that if Christ had obeyed the law in our place, the law could not claim a second fulfillment of us, and, consequently, Christians would be under no obligations to obey the law of God;

3rd, that if Christ had both obeyed the precept of the law and suffered its penalty, then the law would have been doubly fulfilled since the claims of the precept and the penalty of the law are alternative, not coincident. This doctrine was expressly condemned in the Reformed Churches of Switzerland and Holland, and by the French synods held in the years 1603, 1612, and 1614. In 1615, however, the Synod tacitly allowed these views to pass without condemnation.—Mosheim's "Hist."

28. How may it be shown that justification is not mere pardon ?

Piscator erred, from failing to distinguish—

1st. That the claims of law terminate not upon natures, but upon persons. Christ was a divine person, and, therefore, his obedience was free.

2nd. That there is an evident difference between a federal relation to the law as a condition of salvation, and a natural relation to law as a rule of life. Christ discharged the former as our federal representative. The latter necessarily attaches to the believer as to all moral agents forever.

Justification is more than pardon—

1st. Because the very word “to justify” proves it. To “pardon” is, in the exercise of sovereign prerogative, to waive the execution of the penal sanctions of the law. “To justify” is to declare that the demands of the law are satisfied, not waived. Pardon is a sovereign act —justification is a judicial act.

2nd. As we proved under Chap. 25., Christ did in strict rigor of justice satisfy vicariously for us the demands of the law, both the obedience demanded and the penalty denounced. His satisfaction is the ground of our justification. but pardon is remission of penalty in absence of satisfaction.

3rd If justification were mere pardon it would simply release us from penal suffering, but would provide no further good for us. But “justification through faith in Christ,” secures not pardon only, but also peace, grace, reconciliation, adoption of sons, coheirship, etc., etc.—See above, Ques. l3. Romans 5:1-10; Acts 26:18; Revelation 1:5-6. In the case of justified believers “justification” includes “pardon.” Our justification proceeds on the ground of a “satisfaction,” and, therefore, is not mere pardon. But it is a “vicarious” satisfaction graciously set to the credit of the unworthy, and, therefore, it effects pardon to us sinners who believe in Christ.

29. Did not Calvin often use language to the effect that justification and pardon are the same ?

He did. But his language is to be interpreted—

1st. By the fact that he was arguing with Romanists who taught that “justification consists in remission of sins and infusion of grace.” He argued in opposition that justification consists in the former but does not include the latter.

2nd. By the conclusive fact that his full definitions of justification comprehend the full truth more accurately defined in the Symbols of the Lutheran and Reformed churches

Calvin’s “Institutes, ” Bk. 3, ch. 11, 2.—“A man is said to be justified in the sight of God, when in the judgment of God he is decreed righteous, and is accepted on account of his righteousness. . . . In the same manner a man will be said to be justified by works, if in his life or by the perfection of his works, he can answer and satisfy the divine justice. On the contrary a man will be justified by faith, when excluded from the righteousness of works, he by faith lays hold of the righteousness of Christ, and clothed in it appears in the sight of God not as sinner, but as righteous. Thus we simply interpret justification, as the acceptance with which God receives us into his favor as if we were righteous, and we say that this justification consists in the forgiveness of sins, and the imputation of the righteousness of Christ.”

Calvin’s“Commentary,”1 Corinthians 1:30.—, “‘Christ is made unto us righteousness,’ by which, he (the apostle) understood that we are accepted by God in his name (Christ’s), because he expiated our sins, and his obedience is imputed to us for righteousness. For since the righteousness of faith consists in remission of sins, and in gratuitous acceptance, we obtain both through Christ.”

30. In what respect does the governmental theory of the atonement modify the doctrine of justifcation ?

See above, Chap. 25., Question 27.

1st. It follows, from that theory, that justification is a sovereign not a judicial act of God. Christ has not satisfied the law, but merely made it consistent with the government of God to set aside the law in the case of believing men. It is mere pardon, an act of executive clemency.

2nd. As Christ did not die as a substitute, it follows that his righteousness is not imputed; it is the occasion, not the ground of justification.

3rd. As Christ did not die as a substitute, there is no strictly federal union between Christ and his people, and faith can not be the instrument of salvation by being the means of uniting us to Christ, but only the arbitrary condition of justification, or the means of recommending us to God.

4th. As justification is mere pardon, it only sets aside condemnation, and renders, so far forth, future salvation possible. It does nothing to secure the future standing and relations of the believer, under the covenant of salvation, to God.

Dr. Emmons (1745–1840), one of the ablest theologians of the new England School, says (“Sermons,” Vol. 3., p. 3–67)–

(1.) “Justification, in a gospel sense, signifies no more nor less than pardon or remission of sin.”

(2.) “Forgiveness is the only favor which God bestows upon men on Christ’s account.”

(3.) “The full and final justification of believers, or their title to their eternal inheritance, is conditional. They must perform certain things, which he has specified as terms or conditions of their taking possession of their several legacies.”

(4.) “God does promise eternal life to all who obey his commands or exercise those holy and benevolent affections which his commands require.”

31. How does the Armenian theory as to the nature and design of the satisfaction of Christ modify the doctrine of justification ?

They hold—

1st. As to the nature of Christ’s satisfaction that although it was a real propitiation rendered to justice for us, it was not in the rigor of justice perfect, but was graciously accepted and acted on as such by God.–Limborch, “Apol. Theo.,” 3, 22, 5.

2nd. That it was not strictly the substitution of Christ in place of his elect, but rather that he suffered the wrath of God in behalf of all men, in order to make it consistent with justice for God to offer salvation to all men upon condition of faith.

Therefore they regard justification as a sovereign, not a judicial act—

1st. In accepting the sufferings of Christ as sufficient to enable God consistently to offer to men salvation on the terms of the new covenant of grace, i. e., on the condition of faith.

2nd. In imputing to the believer his faith for righteousness for Christ's sake. This faith they make—

1st. To include evangelical obedience, i. e., the whole principle of religion in heart and life.

2nd. They regard it as the graciously admitted ground, rather than the mere instrument of justification; faith being counted for righteousness, because Christ died. –Limborch, "Theo. Christ.," 6, 4, 22, and 6, 4, 46. This theory, besides being opposed by all the arguments we have above presented in establishing the orthodox doctrine, labors under the further objections–

1st. It fails to render a clear account as to how the satisfaction of Christ makes it consistent with divine justice to save men upon the condition of faith. If Christ did not obey and suffer strictly as the substitute of his people, it is difficult to see how the justice of God, as it respects them, could have been appeased; and if he did so fulfill the demands of justice in their place, then the orthodox view, as above stated, is admitted.

2nd. It fails to render a clear account of the relation of faith to justification—

(1.) Because faith in Christ, including trust, necessarily implies that the merits of Christ upon which the trust terminates is the ground of justification.

(2.) Faith must be either the ground or the mere instrument of justification. If it be the latter then the righteousness of Christ, which is the object of faith, is that ground. If it be the former, then what is made of the merits of Christ upon which faith rests?

32. How do the Romanists define justification ?

They confound justification with sanctification. It is, 1st, the forgiveness of sins;

2nd, the removal of inherent sin for Christ's sake;

3rd, the positive infusion of grace. Of this justification they teach that the final cause is the glory of God and eternal life. The efficient cause is the power of the Holy Ghost. The meritorious cause the work of Christ. The instrumental cause baptism. The formal cause the influence of grace, whereby we are made not merely forensically but inherently righteous.–"Council of Trent," Sess. 6., Chapter 7.

They define faith in its relation to justification to be the beginning of human salvation, the fountain and root of all justification, i. e., of spiritual life. They consequently hold that justification is progressive, and that when a man receives a new nature in baptism, and the work of justification is commenced in him with the forgiveness and the removal of sin, the work is to be carried on by the exercise of the grace implanted, i. e., by good works. Since they confound justification with sanctification, they necessarily deny that men are justified by the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, or by mere faith without works.–Sess. 6, Can. 9th and 11th, "De Justificatione."

They admit that justification is entirely gracious, i. e., of the mere mercy of God, and for the sake of the merits of Jesus Christ, as neither the spiritual exercises nor the works of men previous to justification have any merit whatsoever.—"Council of Trent," Sess. 6., Chapter 8. A careful distinction must be made between (a) that which in the case of an adult prepares for justification, (b) the realization of justification in the first instance, (c) its subsequent progressive realization in the advance of the gracious soul in justification towards perfection, and (d) the restoration to a

state of grace of the baptized Christian after backsliding into sin.

1st. The preparation of the sinner for justification proceeds from the prevenient grace of God, without any merit on the part of the subject. This grace acting through the hearing of the word leads to conviction of sin, repentance, apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ (the church), and hence to a determination to receive baptism and lead a new life ("Conc. Trent," Sess. 6., chaps. 5. and vi).

2nd. The actual justification of the sinner is the infusion of gracious habits, the pollution of sin having been washed away by the power of God, on account of the merits of Christ, through the instrumentality of baptism, which operates its effects by an energy made inherent in it, by the institution of God. After this, inherent sin being removed, remission of guilt necessarily follows as its immediate effect. Guilt is the relation which sin sustains to the justice of God. The thing being removed, the relation ceases, ipso facto(Bellarmin, "De Amiss. Gratiae," etc., 5. 7.

3rd. Having thus been justified and made a friend of God, the baptized Christian advances from virtue to virtue, and is renewed from day to day, through the observance of the commandments of God and of the church, faith co–operating with good works, now made possible in virtue of the previous justification, and which truly merit, and receive as a just reward, increase of grace, and more and more perfect justification. His first justification was for Christ's sake, without any co–operation of his own merit, but by consent of his own will. His second or continued and increasing justification is for Christ's sake, through and in proportion to his own merit, which deserves increase of grace and acceptance in proportion (a) to his personal holiness, and (b) to his obedience to ecclesiastical rules ("Conc. Trent," Sess. 6, Chap. 10. and Can. 32).

4th. In the case of those who having been justified, have sinned, the lost grace of justification is restored, for the merits of Christ, through the sacrament of Penance, which is provided as a second plank to rescue those who have shipwrecked grace. This penance includes (a) sorrow for sin, (b) confession to a priest having jurisdiction, (c) sacerdotal absolution, (d) satisfaction by alms, prayers, fasts, etc., and this justification if not rendered perfect by these means on earth is completed by purgatorial fires. All these satisfactions, earthly and purgatorial, are meritorious satisfactions to divine Justice, cancelling the temporal punishments attaching to the sins for which they are undergone, the eternal punishment whereof has been at once and freely remitted, Bitter through the sacrament itself, or the honest desire for it ("Conc. Trent," Sess. 6, Chaps. 14. and 16., and Can. 30, and Sess. 14, Chaps. 1.–ix).

33. What are the points of difference between Protestants and Romanists on this whole subject ?

1st. As to the nature of justification. We regard it as a judicial act of God, declaring the believer to be forensically just, on the ground of the righteousness of Christ made his by imputation. They regard it as the infusion of inherent grace.

2nd. As to its meritorious ground. Both say the merits of Christ. But they say these merits are made ours by sanctification. We, by imputation, through the instrumentality of faith.

3rd. As to the nature and office of faith. We say that it is the instrument; they the beginning and root of justification.

4th. They say that justification is progressive.

5th. That it may be lost by mortal sin and regained and increased through the sacrament of Penance, and completed in Purgatory.—See above, Chapter 32., on “Repentance and Penance.”

34. What are the leading arguments against the Romanists view on this subject?

1st. This whole doctrine is confused.

(1.) It confounds under one definition two matters entirely distinct, namely, the forensic remission of the condemnation due to sin with the washing away of inherent sin, and the introduction to a state of covenant favor with God with the infusion of inherent grace.

(2.) It renders no sensible account as to the manner in which the merit of Christ propitiates divine justice.

2nd. Their definition is refuted by all the evidence above exhibited, that the terms “justification” and “righteousness” are used in Scripture in a forensic sense.

3rd. Their view, by making our inherent grace wrought in us by the Holy Ghost for Christ’s sake the ground of our acceptance with God, subverts the whole gospel. It is of the very essence of the gospel that the ground of our acceptance with the father is the mediatorial work of the son, who is for us the end of the law for righteousness, and not our own graces.

4th. Their view of the merit of works performed by divine grace after baptism is inconsistent with what Scripture teaches and the Romish Church itself teaches as to original sin and guilt, and as to the essential graciousness of the salvation wrought by Christ. Thomas Aquinas himself (“Summa.,” Q. 114, art. 5) says, “If grace be considered in the sense of a gratuitous gift, all merit is excluded by grace.” Therefore the entire system of Papist justification falls.

5th. It is legal in its spirit and method, and consequently induces either spiritual pride or despair, but never can nourish true evangelical assurance at once humble and confident..

6th. The Scriptures declare that on the ground of the propitiation of Christ God justifies the believer as ungodly, not as sanctified. It certainly could not require an atonement to render God both just and the sanctifier of the ungodly. Romans 4:5.

7th. The phrases to impute, reckon, count sin or righteousness are absolutely consistent only with a forensic interpretation. To impute righteousness without works in the forensic sense, in the 4th chapter of Romans, is reasonable. To impute inherent grace without works is nonsense.

8th. Their definition is refuted by all those arguments which establish the true view with respect to the nature and office of justifying faith.–see above, Questions 21–23.

AUTHORITATIVE STATMENTS

ROMISH DOCTRINE.—For statement of the nature, ground, and means of justification, see above, under Ch. 39. For statement of Romish Doctrine of Good Works and Works of Supererogation, see below, under Ch. 35. and see doctrine of Penance, above, under Ch. 32.

“Counc. Trent,” Sess. 6, ch. 8.—“We are said to be justified by faith, because faith is the beginning of human salvation, the foundation and the root of all justification.”Ib., can. 23.—“If any one saith that a man once justified can sin no more nor lose grace, and therefore he that falls and sins was

never truly justified; or on the other hand, that he is able during his whole life to avoid all sins, even those that are venial, except by a special privilege from God, as the church holds in regard of the Blessed Virgin, let him be accursed." Can. 24.—"If any one say that righteousness received is not preserved and also increased before God through good works; but that the said works are merely the fruits and signs of justification obtained, but not a cause of the increase thereof let him be accursed." Can. 29.— "If any one saith that he, who has fallen after baptism, is not able by the grace of God to rise again, or, that he is able indeed to recover the righteousness which he has lost, but by faith alone, without the sacrament of penance .. . . let him be accursed." can. 30.— "If any one saith, that, after the grace of justification has been received, to every penitent sinner the guilt is remitted and the debt of eternal punishment is blotted out in such wise, that there remains not any debt of temporal punishment to be discharged either in this world, or in the next in purgatory, before he can enter the kingdom of heaven, let him be accursed." Can. 32.–"if any one saith, that the good works of one that is justified are in such manner the gifts of God, as that they are not also the good merits of him that is justified; or that the justified man, by the good works which he performs through the grace of God and the merit of Jesus Christ, whose living member he is, does not truly merit increase of grace, eternal life, and the attainment of eternal life if he die in grace, and also an increase of glory; let him be accursed."

BELLARMIN, "De Justificatione," 5, 1.— "The common opinion of all Catholics holds that all the good works of justified persons are truly and properly meritorious, and deserving not merely of a reward of some sort, but of eternal life itself. 4, 7.—We say that good works are necessary to a justified man in order to his salvation, not only in the way of being present, but also in the way of efficiency, since they effect salvation, and faith without them does not effect it. Ib. 5, 5.–the merits of justified persons do not stand opposed to the merits of Christ, but they spring from these, and whatever praise those merits of the justified have, redounds entire to the praise of the merits of Christ."

Lutheran Doctrine. – "Apologia Confessionis"–"To justify in this place (Romans 5:1), signifies in a forensic sense to absolve an accused person and pronounce him righteous but on account of another's righteousness, i. e., of Christ; which other's righteousness is made over to us through faith."

"Formula Concordioe " (Hase Ed.), p. 685.— "The term justification in this transaction means to pronounce righteous, to absolve from sins, and from the eternal punishment of sinners, on account of the righteousness of Christ, which is imputed by God to faith."Ib. p. 684.—"Man a sinner may be justified before God . . without any merits or worthiness of ours, and apart from any works, preceding, accompanying, or following, out of mere grace."Ib. p.584.— "We confess that faith alone is that means and instrument by which we apprehend Christ our Saviour and in Christ of that righteousness, which can stand the judgment of God." Ib.. p. 689.— "Neither repentance, nor love, nor any other virtue but faith alone, is the single means and instrument by which we are able to apprehend and accept the grace of God, the merit of Christ, and the remission of sins."

REFORMED DOCTRINE.

"Westminster Confession of Faith," Ch. 11.

“Heidelberg Cat.” Ques. 60.— “Nevertheless I may now embrace all these benefits with a true boldness of mind; without any merit of mine, of the mere mercy of God, the perfect satisfaction, righteousness, and holiness of Christ is imputed and given to me, as if I had myself committed no sin, nor incurred any stain, yea, as if I had myself perfectly performed that obedience which Christ performed for me.”

REMONSTRANT DOCTRINE.–Limborch, “Christ. Theol.,” 6, 4, 22.— “Let it be understood that, when we say we are justified by faith, we do not exclude works, which faith requires, and as a fruitful mother produces but we include them . . . nor by faith is a bare faith to be understood, as contradistinguished from the works which faith produces, but together with the faith, all that obedience which God in the New Testament appoints, and which is supplied by faith in Jesus Christ. 31.—But faith is a condition in us and is required of us in order that we may obtain justification. It is therefore an act which, although viewed in itself it is by no means perfect, but in many respects defective, is yet received as full and perfect by God graciously and freely and on account of it God graciously bestows remission of sins and the reward of eternal life. . . 29. The object of faith (justifying) we declare to be Jesus Christ entire, as prophet, priest, and king; not only his propitiation, but his precepts, promises, and threatenings; by it therefore we embrace the entire Christ, his word, and all his saving benefits.”

SOCINIAN DOCTRINE– “Racovian Catechism,” Sec. 5, ch. 9.—“The faith which is by itself followed by salvation, is such an assent to the doctrine of Christ that we apply it to its proper object; that is, that we trust in God through Christ, and give ourselves up wholly to obey his will, whereby we obtain his promises. . . . . If piety and obedience, when life is continued after the acknowledgment of Christ, be required as indispensable to salvation, it is necessary that the faith to which alone and in reality salvation is ascribed, should comprehend obedience. . . Ib. ch. 11.—Justification is, when God regards us as just or so deals with us as if we were altogether just and innocent. This he does in the New Covenant, in forgiving our sins and conferring upon us eternal life.”

02.34. Adoption, and the Order of Grace Application of Redemption, in the Several Parts of ...

Chapter 34

Adoption, and the Order of Grace Application of Redemption, in the Several Parts of Justification, Regeneration, and Sanctification.

1. To what classes of creatures is the term “sons,” or “children of God,” applied in the Scriptures, and on what grounds is that application made?

1st. In the singular it is applied, in a supreme and incommunicable sense, to the Second–Person of the Trinity alone.

2nd. In the plural, to angels, (1) because they are God’s favored creatures, (2) because as holy intelligences they are like him.–Job 1:6; Job 38:7.

3rd. To human magistrates, because they possess authority delegated from God, and in that respect resemble him.–Psalms 82:6.

4th. To good men as the subjects of a divine adoption. This adoption, and the consequent sonship it confers is twofold, (1) general and external, Exodus 4:22; Romans 9:4; (2) special, spiritual and immortal.–Galatians 4:4-5; Ephesians 1:4-6.

2. What is the adoption of which believers are the subjects in Christ; and what relation does the conception which this word represents in Scripture sustain to those represented by the terms justification, regeneration, and sanctification?

Turretin makes adoption a constituent part of justification. He says that in execution of the covenant of grace God sovereignty imputes to the elect, upon their exercise of faith, the righteousness of Christ. The imputing of Christ’s righteousness was the fulfilling of the whole law, precept as well as penalty. Therefore, it is on this legal ground, under the covenant of works, that his people are both remitted of the penalty and legal right to all the promises conditioned upon obedience. Upon the ground of this sovereign imputation God judicially pronounces the law, in its federal relations, to be perfectly satisfied with regard to them, i. e., he justifies them, which involves two things, 1st, the remission of the penalty due to their sins,

2nd, the endowing them with rights and relations which accrue from the positive fulfilment of the covenant of works by Christ in their behalf. This second constituent of justification he calls adoption, which essentially agrees with the definition of adoption given in our “Con. Faith” chapter 12.; “Larger Catechism,” Q. 74; “Shorter Catechism,” Q. 34. Turretin, 50. 16, Q. 4 and 6. The great Amesius (1633), in his “Medulla Theological,” ch. 28 represents Adoption as a new grace in advance of justification, and not an element in it. A gracious sentence of God, whereby a believer, having been justified, is accepted for Christ’s sake into the relation and rights of sonship.

It appears, however, to us that the words “Adoption” and “Sonship,” as used in Scripture, express more than a change of relation, and that they are more adequately conceived of as expressing a complex view, including the change of nature together with the change of relation, and setting forth the new creature in his new relations. The instant a sinner is united to Christ in the exercise of faith, there is accomplished in him simultaneously and inseparably, 1st, a total change of relation to God, and to the law as a covenant, and,

2nd, a change of inward condition or nature. The change of relation is represented by justification; the change of nature is represented by the term regeneration. REGENERATION is an act of God originating by a new creation a new spiritual life in the heart of the subject. The first and instant act of that new creature, consequent upon his regeneration, is FAITH, or a believing, trusting embrace of the person and work of Christ. Upon the exercise of faith by the regenerated subject, JUSTIFICATION is the instant act of God, on the ground of that perfect righteousness which the sinner’s faith has apprehended, declaring him to be free from all condemnation and to have a legal right to the relations and benefits secured by the covenant which Christ has fulfilled in his behalf. SANCTIFICATION is the progressive growth toward the perfected maturity of that new life which was implanted in regeneration. ADOPTION presents the new creature in his new relation; his new relations entered upon with a congenial heart, and his new life developing in a congenial home, and surrounded with those relations which foster its growth, and crown it with blessedness. Justification is wholly forensic, and concerns only relations, immunities, and rights. Regeneration and sanctification are wholly spiritual and moral, and concern only inherent qualities and states. Adoption comprehends the complex condition of the believer as at once the subject of both.

3rd. What is the order of grace in the application of redemption ?

I. The two principles which fundamentally characterize Protestant Soteriology are—

1st. The clear distinction between the change of relation signalized by justification, and the change of character signalized by regeneration and sanctification.

2nd. That the change of relation, the remission of penalty, and the restoration to favor involved in justification, necessarily precedes, and renders possible, the real moral change expressed by regeneration and sanctification. The continuance of judicial condemnation precludes the exercise of grace. Remission of punishment must precede the work of the Spirit. We are pardoned in order that we may be good, never made good in order that we may be pardoned.

“It is evident that God must himself already have been secretly favorable and gracious to a man, and must already have pardoned him forum divinum(Divine pardoning), for the sake of Christ and his relation to human nature, to be able to bestow upon him the grace of regeneration. In fact viewed as actus Dei forensis there was of necessity that it should be regarded as existing prior to man’s consciousness of it, nay prior to faith.”–Dr. J. A. Dorner’s “Hist. Prot. Theo.,” Vol. 2., pp. 156, 160.

II. Hence the apparent circle in the order of grace. The righteousness of Christ is said to be imputed to the believer, and justification to be through faith. Yet faith is an act of a soul already regenerated, and regeneration is possible only to a soul to whom God is reconciled by the application of Christ’s satisfaction.

Thus the satisfaction and merit of Christ is the antecedent cause of regeneration, and on the other hand the participation of the believer in the satisfaction and merit of Christ (his justification) is conditioned on his faith, which is the effect of his regeneration. We must have part in Christ so far forth as to be regenerated, in order to have part in him so far forth as to be justified. This is not a question of order in time, because regeneration and justification are gracious acts of God absolutely synchronous. The question is purely as to the true order of causation; Is the righteousness of Christ imputed to us that we may believe, or is it imputed to us because we believe? Is justification an analytic judgment, that the man is justified as a believer though a sinner, or is it a synthetic judgment, that this sinner is justified for Christ's sake ?

III. The solution is to be sought in the fact that Christ impetrated the application of his salvation to his "own," and all the means, conditions, and stages thereof, and that this was done in pursuance of a covenant engagement with the father, which provided for application to specific persons at certain times and under certain conditions. The relation from birth of an elect person to Adam, and to sin and its condemnation, is precisely the same with that of all his fellow–men. But his relation to the satisfaction and merits of Christ, and to the graces they obtain, is analogous to that of an heir to an inheritance secured to him by will. As long as he is under age the will secures the initial right of the heir de jure. It provides for his education at the expense of the estate in preparation for his inheritance. It determines the previous installments of his patrimony to be given him by his trustees. It determines in some sense his present status as a prospective heir. It determines the precise time and conditions of his being inducted into absolute possession. He possesses certain rights and enjoys certain benefits from the first. But he has absolute rights and powers of ownership only when he reaches the period and fulfills the conditions prescribed therefor in the will. Thus the merits of Christ are imputed to the elect heir from his birth so far forth as they constitute the basis of the gracious dealing provided For him as preparatory to his full possession.

Justification is assigned by Protestant theologians to that final mental act of God as Judge whereby he declares the heir in full possession of the rights of his inheritance, henceforth to be recognized and treated as the heir in possession, although the actual consummation of that possession is not effected until the resurrection. Christ and his righteousness are not given to the believer because of faith. faith is the conscious trusting receiving of that which is already given. Our Catechism, Ques. 33, says, "Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight only for the righteousness of Christ (1) imputed to us, and (2) received by faith alone."

Regeneration and consequently faith are wrought in us for Christ's sake and as the result conditioned on a previous imputation of his righteousness to that end. Justification supervenes upon faith, and implies such an imputation of Christ's righteousness as effects a radical and permanent change of relationship to the law as a condition of life.

4. What is represented in Scripture as involved in being a child of God by this adoption?

1st. Derivation of nature from God.—John 1:13; James 1:18;1 John 5:18.

2nd. Being born again in the image of God, bearing his likeness. –Romans 8:29; 2 Corinthians 3:18; Colossians 3:10; 2 Peter 1:4.

3rd. Bearing his name.—I John 3:1; Revelation 2:17; Revelation 3:12.

4th. Being the objects of his peculiar love.–John 17:23; Romans 5:5-8; Titus 3:4; 1 John 4:7-11.

5th. The indwelling of the Spirit of his Son (Galatians 4:5-6), who forms in us a filial spirit, or a spirit becoming the children of God, obedient, 1 Peter 1:14; 2 John 1:6; free from sense of guilt, legal bondage, fear of death, Romans 8:15; Romans 8:21; 2 Corinthians 3:17; Galatians 5:1; Hebrews 2:15; 1 John 5:14; and elevated with a holy boldness and royal dignity, Hebrews 10:19; Hebrews 10:22; 1 Peter 2:9; 1 Peter 4:14.

6th. Present protection, consolations, and abundant provisions Psalms 125:2; Isaiah 66:13; Luke 12:27-32; John 14:18; 1 Corinthians 3:21; 1 Corinthians 3:23; 2 Corinthians 1:4.

7th. Present fatherly chastisements for our good, including both spiritual and temporal afflictions.–Psalms 51:11-12; Hebrews 12:5-11.

8th. The certain inheritance of the riches of our Father's glory, as heirs with God and joint heirs with Christ, Romans 8:17; James 2:5; 1 Peter 1:4; 1 Peter 3:7; including the exaltation of our bodies to fellowship with him.–Romans 8:23; Php 3:21.

5. What relation do the three .persons of the trinity sustain to this adoption, and into what relation does it introduce us to each of them severally? This adoption proceeds according to the eternal purpose of the Father, upon the merits of the Son, and by the efficient agency of the Holy Ghost.–John 1:12-13; Galatians 4:5-6; Titus 3:5-6. By it God the Father is made our Father. The incarnate God–man is made our elder brother, and we are made–(1) like him; (2) intimately associated with him in community of life, standing, relations, and privileges; (3) joint heirs with him of his glory.—Romans 8:17; Romans 8:29; Hebrews 2:17; Hebrews 4:15. The Holy Ghost is our indweller, teacher, guide, advocate, comforter, and sanctifier. All believers, being subjects of the same adoption, are brethren–Ephesians 3:6; 1 John 3:14; 1 John 5:1.

02.35. Sanctification.

Chapter 35

Sanctification.

1. What sense words do the wordsαψιος , holy andαψιασειν , to sanctify bear in the Scriptures ? The verb αγιασειν is used in two distinct senses in the New Testament:

1st. To make clean physically, or morally.

(1.) ceremonial purification.—Hebrews 9:13.

(2.) To render clean in a moral sense.—1 Corinthians 6:11; Hebrews 13:12. Hence the phrase "them that are sanctified," is convertable with believers.—1 Corinthians 1:2.

2nd. To set apart from a common to a sacred use, to devote, (1) spoken of things, Matthew 23:17; (2) spoken of persons, John 10:36, (3) to regard and venerate as holy, Matthew 6:9;

"Αγιο," as an adjective, pure, holy, as a noun, saint, is also used in two distinct senses, corresponding to those of the verb.

1st. Pure, clean; (1) ceremonially, (2) morally, Ephesians 1:4, (3) as a noun, saints, sanctified ones, Romans 1:7; Romans 8:27.

2nd. Consecrated, devoted.–Matthew 4:5; Acts 6:13; Acts 21:28; Hebrews 9:3. This word is also used in ascriptions of praise to God.—John 17:11; Revelation 4:8.

2. What are the different views entertained as to the nature of sanctification ?

1st. Pelagians denying original sin and the moral inability of man, and holding that sin can be predicated only of acts of:the will, and not of inherent states or dispositions, consequently regard sanctification as nothing more than a moral reformation of life and habits, wrought under the influence of the truth in the natural strength of the sinner himself

2nd. The advocates of the "exercise scheme" hold that we can find nothing in the soul other than the agent and his exercises. Regeneration, therefore, is nothing more than the cessation from a series of unholy and the inauguration of a series of holy exercises; and sanctification the maintenance of these holy exercises. One party, represented by Dr. Emmons, say that God immediately effects these holy exercises. Another party, represented by Dr. Taylor, of New Haven, held that the man himself determines the character of his own by choosing God as his chief good; the Holy Spirit in some unexplained way assisting.—See above, Chap. 29., Questions 5 and 6.

3rd. Many members of the Church of England, as distinguished from the evangelical party, hold that a man conforming to the church, which is the condition of the Gospel covenant, is introduced to all the benefits of that covenant, and in the decent performance of relative duties and observance of the sacraments, is enabled to do all that is now required of him, and to attain to all

the moral good now possible or desirable.

4th. The orthodox doctrine is that the Holy Ghost, by his constant influences upon the whole soul in all its faculties, through the instrumentality of the truth, nourishes, exercises, and develops those holy principles and dispositions which he implanted in the new birth, until by a constant progress all sinful dispositions being mortified and extirpated, and all holy dispositions being fully matured, the subject of this grace is brought immediately upon death to the measure of the stature of perfect manhood in Christ.

“Con. Faith,” Chap. 13.; “L Cat.,” Question 75; “Shorter Catechism,” Question 35.

3. How can it be shown that sanctification involves more than mere reformation?

See above Chap. 29., Question 12.

4. How may it be shown that it involves more than the production of holy exercises ?

See above, Chap. 29., Questions 7–10.

Besides the arguments presented in the chapter above referred to, this truth is established by the evidence of those passages of Scripture which distinguish between the change wrought in the heart and the effects of that change in the actions.–Matthew 12:33-35; Luke 6:43-45.

5. What relation does sanctification sustain to regeneration ?

Regeneration is the creative act of the Holy Spirit, implanting a new principle of spiritual life in the soul. Conversion is the first exercise of that new gracious principle, in the spontaneous turning of the new–born sinner to God. Sanctification is the sustaining and developing work of the Holy Ghost, bringing all the faculties of the soul more and more perfectly under the purifying and regulating influence of the implanted principle of spiritual life.

6. What is the relation which justification and sanctification sustain to each other ? In the order of nature, regeneration precedes justification, although as to time they are always necessarily contemporaneous. , the instant God regenerates a sinner he acts faith in Christ. The instant he acts faith in Christ he is justified, and sanctification, which is the work of carrying on and perfecting that which is begun in regeneration, is accomplished under the conditions of those new relations into which he is introduced by justification. In justification we are delivered from all the penal consequences of sin, and brought into such a state of reconciliation with God, and communion of the Holy Ghost, that we are emancipated from the bondage of legal fear, and endued with that spirit of filial confidence and love which is the essential principle of all acceptable obedience. Our justification, moreover, proceeds on the ground of our federal union with Christ by faith, which is the basis of that vital and spiritual union of the soul with him from whom our sanctification flows.—See above, Chap. 31., Question 3.

7. How can it be shown that this work extends to the whole man, the understanding, will and affections ? The soul is a unit, the same single agent alike, thinking, feeling, and willing. A man can not love that loveliness which he does not perceive, nor can he perceive that beauty, whether moral or natural, which is uncongenial to his own heart. His whole nature is morally depraved, 1st, blind or insensible to spiritual beauty;

2nd, averse, in the reigning dispositions of the will, to moral right, and therefore disobedient. The order in which the faculties act is as follows:The intellect perceives the qualities of the object concerning which the mind is engaged; the heart loves those qualities which are congenial to it; the will chooses that which is loved. This is proved,

1st, by experience. As the heart becomes more depraved the mind becomes more insensible to spiritual light. On the other hand, as the eyes behold more and more clearly the beauty of the truth, the more lively become the affections, and the more obedient the will.

2nd. From the testimony of Scripture. By nature the whole man is depraved. The understanding darkened, as well as the affections and will perverted.–Ephesians 4:18.

If this be so, it is evident that sanctification must also be effected throughout the entire nature.

1st. From the necessity of the case.

2nd. From the testimony of Scripture.—Romans 6:13; 2 Corinthians 4:6; Ephesians 1:18; Colossians 3:1(); 1 Thessalonians 5:23; 1 John 4:7.

8. In what sense is the body sanctified?

1st. As consecrated, (1) as being the temple of the Holy Ghost, 1 Corinthians 6:19; (2) hence as being a member of Christ.– 1 Corinthians 6:15.

2nd. As sanctified, since they are integral parts of our persons, their instincts and appetites act immediately upon the passions of our souls, and consequently these must be brought subject to the control of the sanctified soul, and all its members, as organs of the soul, made instruments of righteousness unto God.–Romans 6:13; 1 Thessalonians 4:4.

3rd. It Will be made like Christ’s glorified body.–1 Corinthians 15:44; Php 3:21.

9. To whom is the work of sanctification referred in Scripture?

1st. To the Father.—l Thess. 6:23; Hebrews 13:21.

2nd. To the Son.–Ephesians 5:25-26; Titus 2:14.

3rd. To the Holy Ghost.–1 Corinthians 6:11; 2 Thessalonians 2:13. In all external actions the three Persons of the Trinity are always represented as concurring, the father working through the Son and Spirit, and the Son through the Spirit. Hence the work of sanctification is with special prominence attributed to the Holy Spirit, since he is the immediate agent therein, and since this is his special office work in the plan of redemption.

10. What do the scriptures teach as to the agency of the truth in the work of sanctification? The whole process of sanctification consists in the development and confirmation of the new principle of spiritual life implanted in the soul in regeneration, conducted by the Holy Ghost in perfect conformity to, and through the operation of the laws and habits of action natural to the soul as an intelligent, moral and free agent. Like the natural faculties both of body and mind, and the natural habits which modify the actions of those faculties, so Christian graces, or spiritual habits, are developed by exercise; the truths of the gospel being the objects upon which these graces act, and by which they are both excited and directed. Thus the divine loveliness of God presented in

the truth, which is his image, is the object of our complacent love; his goodness of our gratitude; his promises of our trust; his Judgments of our wholesome awe, and his commandments variously exercise us in the thousand forms of filial obedience. John 17:19; 1 Peter 1:22; 1 Peter 2:2; 2 Peter 1:4; James 1:18.

11. What efficiency do the Scriptures ascribe in this work to the Sacraments ?

There are three views entertained on this subject by theologians–

1st. The lowest view is, that the sacraments simply, as symbols, present the truth in a lively manner to the eye, and are effective thus only as a form of presenting the gospel objectively.

2nd. The opinion occupying the opposite extreme is that they, of their own proper efficiency, convey sanctifying grace ex opere operato(by the works performed), “because they convey grace by the virtue of the sacramental action itself, instituted by God for this very end, and not through the merit either of the agent (priest) or the receiver.”—Bellarmin, “De Sac.,” 2, 1.

3rd. The true view is, “that the sacraments are efficacious means of grace, not merely exhibiting but actually conferring upon those who worthily receive them the benefits which they represent;” yet this efficacy does not reside properly in them, but accompanies their proper use in virtue of the divine institution and promise, through the accompanying agency of the Holy Ghost, and as suspended upon the exercise of faith upon the part of the recipient, which faith is at once the condition and the instrument of the reception of the benefit.—Matthew 3:11; Acts 2:41; Acts 10:47; Romans 6:3;1 Corinthians 12:13; Titus 3:5;1 Peter 3:21.

12. What office do the Scriptures ascribe to faith in sanctification ?

Faith is the first grace in order exercised by the soul consequent upon regeneration, and the root of all other graces in principle.—Acts 15:9; Acts 26:18. It is instrumental in securing sanctification therefore—

1st. By securing the change of the believer’s relation to God and to the law, as a condition of life and favor.—See above, Question 6.

2nd. By securing his union with Christ.—1 Corinthians 13:1-13; Galatians 2:20; Colossians 3:3.

3rd. It is sanctifying in its own nature, since, in its widest sense, faith is that spiritual state of the soul in which it holds living active communion with spiritual truth. “By this faith a Christian believeth to be true, whatsoever is revealed in the word, for the authority of God himself speaking therein; and acteth differently, upon that which every particular passage thereof containeth; yielding obedience to the commands, trembling to the threatenings, and embracing the promises of God for this life, and that which is to come.”—“Conf:Faith” ch. 14 §2.

13. What, according to Scripture, is necessary to constitute a good work ?

1st. That it should spring from a right motive, i. e., love for God’s character, regard for his authority, and zeal for his glory; love as a fruit of the Spirit, if not always consciously present, yet reigning as a permanent and controlling principle in the soul.

2nd. That it be in accordance with his revealed law.—Deuteronomy 12:32; Isaiah 1:11-12; Colossians 2:16-23.

14. What is the Popish doctrine as to “the counsels” of Christ, which are not included in the positive precepts of the law ? The positive commands of Christ are represented as binding on all classes of Christians alike, and their observance necessary in order to salvation. His counsels, on the other hand, are binding only upon those who, seeking a higher degree of perfection and a more excellent reward, voluntarily, assume them. These are such as celibacy, voluntary poverty, etc., and obedience to rule (monastic).—Bellarmin, “De Monachis,” Cap. 7. The wickedness of this distinction is evident–

1st. Because Christ demands the entire consecration of every Christian:after we have done all we are only unprofitable servants. Works of supererogation, therefore, are impossible.

2nd. All such will worship is declared abhorrent to God.—Colossians 2:18-23; 1 Timothy 4:3.

15. What judgment is to be formed of the good works of unrenewed men?

Unrenewed men retain some dispositions and affections in themselves relatively good, and they do many things in themselves right, and according to the letter of God’s law. Yet–

1st. As to his person, every unrenewed man is under God’s wrath and curse, and consequently can do nothing pleasing to him. The rebel in arms is in every thing a rebel until he submits and returns to his allegiance.

2nd. Love for God and regard to his authority are never his supreme motive in any of his acts. Thus while many of his actions are civilly good as respects his fellow–men, none of them can be spiritually good as it respects God. There is an obvious distinction between an act viewed in itself; and viewed in connection with its agent. The sinner, previous to justification and renewal, is a rebel; each one of his acts is the act of a rebel, though as considered in itself any single act may be either good, bad, or indifferent.

16. In what sense are good necessary salvation? As the necessary and invariable fruits of both the change of relation accomplished in justification, and of the change of nature accomplished in regeneration, though never as the meritorious grounds or conditions of our salvation. This necessity results, 1st, from the holiness of God;

2nd, from his eternal purpose, Ephesians 1:4; Ephesians 2:10;

3rd, from the design and redemptive efficacy of Christ’s death, Ephesians 5:25-27; Ephesians 4:1-32 th, from the union of the believer with Christ, and the energy of his indwelling Spirit, John 15:5; Galatians 5:22; (5th, from the very nature of faith, which first leads to and then works by love, Galatians 5:6; Galatians 6:1-18 th, from the command of God, 1 Thessalonians 4:6; 1 Peter 1:15; (7th, from the nature of heaven, Revelation 21:27.

17. What is the theory of the Antinomians upon this subject ?

Antinomians are, as their name signifies, those who deny that Christians are bound to obey the law. They argue that, as Christ has in our place fulfilled both the preceptive and the penal departments of God’s law, his people must be delivered from all obligation to observe it, either as

a rule of duty or as a condition of salvation.—See above, Question 3, Chap. 25.

It is evident that all systems of Perfectionism, which teach (as the Pelagian and Oberlin theories) that men's ability to obey is the measure of their responsibility, or (as the Papal and Armenian theories) that God, for Christ's sake, has graciously reduced his demand from absolute moral perfection to faith and evangelical obedience, are essentially Antinomian. Because they all agree in teaching that Christians in this life are no longer under obligations to fulfill the Adamic law of absolute moral perfection.

Paul, in Romans 6:1-23, declares that this damnable heresy was charged as a legitimate consequent upon his doctrine in that day. He not only repudiates the charge, but, on the contrary, affirms that free justification through an imputed righteousness, without the merits of works, is the only possible condition in which the sinner can learn to bring forth holy works as the fruits of filial love. The very purpose of Christ was to redeem to himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works, and this he accomplished by delivering them from the federal bondage of the law, in order to render them capable as the Lord's freedmen of moral conformity to it, ever increasingly in this life, absolutely in the life to come.

18. What are the different senses which have been applied to the term "merit"?

It has been technically used in two different senses.

1st. Strictly, to designate the common quality of all services to which a reward is due, by justice, on account of their intrinsic value and dignity.

2nd. Improperly, it was used by the Fathers as equivalent to that which results in or attains to a reward or consequent, without specifying the ground or virtue on account of which it is secured.—Turretin, 50. 17., Quaestio 5.

19. What distinction does the Romish Church, design to signalize by the terms "merit of condignity" and the "merit of congruity"? The "merit of condignity" they teach attaches only to works wrought subsequently to regeneration by the aid of divine grace, and is that degree of merit that intrinsically, and in the way of equal right, not by mere promise or covenant deserves the reward it attains at God's hands. The "merit of congruity" they teach attaches to those good dispositions or works which a man may, previously to regeneration, realize without the aid of divine grace, and which makes it congruous or specially fitting for God to reward the agent by infusing grace into his heart.

It is extremely difficult to determine the exact position of the Romish Church on this subject, since different schools of theologians in her midst differ widely, and the decisions of the Council of Trent are studiously ambiguous. The general belief appears to be that ability to perform good works springs from grace infused into the sinner's heart for Christ's sake, through the instrumentality of the sacraments, but that afterwards these good works merit, that is, lay for us the foundation of a just claim to salvation and glory. Some say, like Bellarmin, "De Justific.," 5, 1, and 4, 7, that this merit attaches to the good works of Christians intrinsically, as well as in consequence of God's promise; others that these works deserve the reward only because God has promised the reward on the condition of the work.—"Coun. Trent," Sess. 6., Cap. 16., and canons 24 and 32.

20. What is necessary that a work should be in the proper sense of the term meritorious ?

Turretin makes five conditions necessary to that end.

1st. That the work be not of debt, or which the worker was under obligation to render.—Luke 17:10.

2nd. That it is our own, 1. e., effected by our own natural energy.

3rd. That it be perfect.

4th. That it be equal to the reward merited.

5th. That the reward be of justice due to such an act.—Turretin, 50. 17., Questio 5.

According to this definition, it is evident, from the absolute dependence and obligation of the creature, that he can never merit any reward for whatever obedience he may render to the commands of his Creator.

1st. Because all the strength he works with is freely given by God.

2nd. All the service he can render is owed to God.

3rd. Nothing he can do can equal the reward of God's favor and eternal blessedness.

Under the covenant of works, God graciously promised to reward the obedience of Adam with eternal life. This was a reward, however, not of merit, but of free grace and promise. Every thing under that constitution depended upon the standing of the person before God. As long as Adam continued without sin, his services were accepted and rewarded according to promise. But from the moment he forfeited the promise, and lost his standing before God no work of his, no matter of what character, could merit any tiling at the hand of God.

21. How can it be Proved that our good works, even after the restoration of our person to God's favor by justification, do not merit heaven ?

1st. Justification proceeds upon the infinite merits of Christ, and on that foundation rests our title to the favor of God and all the infinite consequences thereof:Christ's merit, lying at the foundation and embracing all, excludes the possibility of our meriting any thing.

2nd. The law demands perfect obedience.–Romans 3:23; Galatians 5:3.

3rd. We are saved by grace not by works.—Ephesians 2:8-9.

4th. All good dispositions are graces or gifts of God.—1 Corinthians 15:10; Php 2:13; 1 Thessalonians 2:13.

5th. Eternal life itself is declared to be the gift of God.—1 John 5:11.

22. What do the scriptures teach concerning the good works of believers, and the rewards promised to them ?

Both the work and its reward are branches from the same gracious root. The covenant of grace provides alike for the infusion of grace in the heart, the exercise of this grace in the life, and the rewards of that grace so exercised. It is all of grace, grace for grace, grace added to grace, presented to us in this form of a reward:

1st. That it may act upon us as a rational motive to diligent obedience.

2nd. To mark that the gift of heaven and eternal blessedness is an act of strict legal Justice (1) in respect to the perfect merits of Christ, (2) in respect to God's faithful adherence to his own free promise.—1 John 1:9.

3rd. To indicate that the heavenly reward stands in a certain gracious proportion to the grace given in the obedience on earth; (l)because God so wills it, Matthew 16:27;1 Corinthians 3:8; (3) because the grace given on earth prepares the soul to receive the grace given in heaven, 2 Corinthians 4:17. IS PERFECT SANCTIFICATION ATTAINABLE BY BELIEVERS IN CHRIST IN THIS LIFE ?

23. What, in general terms, is perfectionism? The various theories of perfectionism all agree in maintaining that it is possible for a child of God in this world to become, 1st, perfectly free from sin, 2nd, conformed to the law under which they now live. They differ very variously among themselves, however, 1st, as to what sin is;

2nd, as to what law we are now obliged to fulfill;

3rd, as to the means whereby this perfection may be attained, whether by nature or by grace.

24. How does the Pelagian theory of the nature of man and of grace lead to perfectionism ?

Pelagians maintain,

1st, as to man's nature, that it was not radically corrupted by the fall, and that every man possesses sufficient power to fulfill all the duties required of him, since God can not in justice demand that which man has not full power to do.

2nd. As to God's grace, that it is nothing more than the favorable constitution of our own minds, and the influence exerted on them by the truth he has revealed to us, and the propitious circumstances in which he has placed us. Thus in the Christian church, and with the Christian revelation, men are, in fact, placed in the most propitious circumstances possible to persuade them to perform their duties. It follows from this system directly that every one who wishes may certainly attain perfection by using his natural powers and advantages of position with sufficient care.—"Wigger's Historical View of Augustinianism and Pelagianism."

25. What, according to the Pelagian theory, is the nature of the sin from which man may be perfectly free; what the law which he may perfectly fulfill, and what are the means by which this perfection may be attained?

They deny original and inherent corruption of nature, and hold that sin is only voluntary transgression of known law, from which any man may abstain if he will. As to the law which man in his present state may perfectly fulfill, they hold that it is the single and original law of God, the requirements of which, however, in the case of every individual subject, are measured by the individual's ability, and opportunities of knowledge. As to the means whereby this perfection may be attained, they maintain the plenary ability man's natural will to discharge all the obligations resting upon him, and they admit the assistance of God's grace only in the sense of the influence of the truth, and other favorable circumstances in persuading man to use his own power. Thus the

means of perfect sanctification are, 1st, man's own volition, 2nd, as helped by the study of the Bible, prudent avoidance of temptation, etc.

26. In what sense do Romanists hold the doctrine of perfection? The decisions of the Council of Trent upon the subject, as upon all critical points, are studiously ambiguous. They lay down the principle that the law must be possible to them upon whom it is binding, since God does not command impossibilities. Men justified (sanctified) may by the grace of God dwelling in them satisfy the divine law, pro hujus vitae statu , i. e., as graciously for Christ's sake adjusted to our present capacities. They confess, nevertheless, that the just may fall into venial sins every day, and that while in the flesh no man can live entirely without sin (unless by a special privilege of God); yet that in this life the renewed can fully keep the divine law; and even by the observance of the evangelical counsels do more than is commanded; and thus, as many saints have actually done, lay up a fund of supererogatory merit.—"Council of Trent," Session 6. Compare Chap. 11. and 16., and Canons 18, 23, and 32. See above, Question 14.

27. In what sense do they hold that the renewed may, in this life live without sin; in what sense fully satisfy the law; and by the use of what means do they teach that this perfection may be attained ? As to sin, they hold the distinction between mortal and pardonable sins, and that the strong desire that remains in the bosom of the renewed, as the result of original and the fuel of actual sin, is not itself sin, since sin consists only in the consent of the will to the impulse of strong desire. In. accordance with these views they hold that a Christian in this life may live without committing mortal sins, but that he never can be free from the inward movements of strong desire, nor from liability to fall through ignorance, inattention, or passion, into venial sins. As to the law, which a believer in this life may fully satisfy, they hold that as God is just and can not demand of us what is impossible, his law is graciously adjusted to our present capacities, as assisted by grace, and that it is this law pro hujus vitae statu, which we may fulfil. As to the means whereby this perfection may be attained, they hold that divine grace precedes, accompanies, and follows all of our good works, which divine grace is to be sought through those sacramental and priestly channels which Christ has instituted in his church, and especially in the observance of works of prayer, fasting, and alms deeds, and the acquisition of supererogatory merit by the fulfillment of the counsels of Christ to chastity, obedience, and voluntary poverty.—"Council of Trent," Sess. 14., Chapter 5., Sess. 6., Chapters 11. and 12., Sess. 5., Canon 5; "Cat. Rom.," Part 2., Chapter 2., Question 32, and Part 2., chapter 5., Question 59, and Part 3., Chapter 10., Questions 5—10.

28. In what form was the doctrine taught by the early Arminians ?

Arminius declared that his mind was in suspense upon this subject ("Writings of Arminius," translated by Nichols, Vol. 1., p. 256). His immediate successors in the theological leadership of the remonstrant party, developed a theory of perfectionism apparently identical with that taught by Wesley, and professed by his disciples. "A man can, with the assistance of divine grace, keep all the commandments of God perfectly, according to the gospel or covenant of grace. The highest evangelical perfection (for we are not teaching a legal perfection, which includes sinlessness entire in all respects and in the highest degree, and excludes all imperfection and infirmity, for this we believe to be impossible), embraces two things, 1st, a perfection proportioned to the powers of each individual;

2nd, a desire of making continual progress and increasing one's strength more and more."—Episcopius, quoted by Dr. G. Peck, "Christian Perfection," pp. 135 and 136.

29. What is the Wesleyan doctrine on this subject ?

1st. That although every believer as soon as he is justified is regenerated, and commences the incipient stages of sanctification, yet this does not exclude the remains of much inherent sin, nor the warfare of the flesh against the Spirit, which may continue for a long time, but which must cease at some time before the subject can be fit for heaven.

2nd. This state of progressive sanctification is not itself perfection, which is properly designated by the phrases "entire" or "perfect sanctification." This, sooner or later, every heir of glory must experience; although the majority do not reach it long before death, it is the attainment of some in the midst of life and consequently it is the duty and privilege of all to desire, strive for, and expect its attainment now.

3rd. This state of evangelical perfection does not consist in an ability to fulfill perfectly the original and absolute law of holiness under which Adam was created, nor does it exclude all liability to mistake, or to the infirmities of the flesh, and of natural temperament, but it does exclude all inward disposition to sin as well as all outward commission of it, since it consists in a state in which perfect faith in Christ and perfect love for God fills the whole soul and governs the entire life, and thus fulfills all the requirements of the "law of Christ,"under which alone the Christian's probation is now held.

30. In what sense do they teach that men may live without sin ?

Mr. Wesley did not himself use, though he did not object to, the phrase "sinless perfection." He distinguished between "sin, properly so called, i. e., a voluntary transgression of a known law, and sin, improperly so called, i. e., an involuntary transgression of a divine law, known or unknown," and declared "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." He also declares that the obedience of the perfect Christian "can not bear the rigor of God's justice, but needs atoning blood," and consequently the most perfect "must continually say, 'forgive us our trespasses'," and Dr. Peck says that the holier men are here "the more they loathe and abhor themselves." On the other hand they hold that a Christian may in this life attain to a state of perfect and constant love which fulfills perfectly all the requirements of the gospel covenant. Violations of the original and absolute law of God are not counted to the believer for sin, since for him Christ has been made the end of that law for righteousness, and for Christ's sake he has been delivered from that law and been made subject to the " law of Christ," and that only is sin to the Christian which is a violation of this law of love. See Mr. Wesley's "Tract on Christian Perfection," in the volume of "Methodist Doctrinal Tracts," pp. 294, 31O, 312, and Dr. Peck's "Christian Doc. of Perfection," p. 204.

31. What law do they say the Christian can in this life perfectly obey ?

Dr. Peck says, p. 244, "To fallen humanity, though renewed by grace, perfect obedience to the moral law is impracticable during the present probationary state. And consequently Christian perfection does not imply perfect obedience to the moral law."—Peck, p. 244. This moral law they

hold to be universal and unchangeable, all moral agents are under perpetual obligations to fulfill it, and they are in no degree released therefrom by their loss of ability through sin.—Peck, p. 271. This law sustains, however, a twofold relation to the creature.

1st. It is a rule of being and acting.

2nd. It is a condition of acceptance. In consequence of sin, it became impossible for men to obtain salvation by the law, and therefore Christ appeared and rendered to this law perfect satisfaction in our stead, and thus is for us the end of the law for righteousness. This law, therefore, remaining forever as a rule of duty, is abrogated by Christ as a condition of our acceptance. “Nor is any man living bound to observe the Adamic more than the Mosaic law (I mean it is not the condition either of present or future salvation.)”—“Doctrinal Tracts,” p. 332. “The gospel, which is the law of love, the ‘law of liberty’ offers salvation upon other terms, and yet provides the vindication of the broken law. The condition of justification at first is faith alone and the condition of continued acceptance is faith working by love. There are degrees of faith, and degrees of love. . . . Perfect faith and perfect love is Christian perfection.”“Christian character is estimated by the conditions of the gospel; Christian perfection implies the perfect performance of these conditions and nothing more.”

32. By what means do they teach this perfection is to be attained?

Wesley says, “I believe this perfection is always wrought in the soul by a simple act of faith, consequently in an instant. But I believe there is a gradual work, both preceding and following that instant.”–quoted by Dr. Peck, pp. 47, 48.

They hold that this entire sanctification is not to be effected through either the strength or the merit of man, but entirely of grace, for Christ’s sake, by the Holy Ghost, through the instrumentality of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, which faith involves our believing,

1st, “in the sufficiency of the provisions of the gospel for the complete deliverance of the soul from sin.”

2nd. “That these provisions are made for us.”

3rd. “That this blessing is for us now.”–Peck, “Ch. Doc. Sanc.,” pp. 405–407.

33. What is the Oberlin doctrine of perfection ?

“It is a full and perfect discharge of our entire duty, of all existing obligations to God, and all other beings. It is perfect obedience to the moral law.” This is God’s original and universal law, which, however, always, not because of grace, but of sheer. justice, adjusts its demands to the measure of the present ability of the subject. The law of God can not now justly demand that we should love him as we might have done if, we had always improved our time, etc. Yet a Christian may now attain to a state of “perfect and disinterested benevolence,” may be, “according to his knowledge, as upright as God is,” and as “perfectly conformed to the will of God as is the will of the inhabitants of heaven.” And this, Mr. Finney appears to teach, is essential for even the lowest stage of genuine Christian experience. The amount of the matter appears to be, God has a right to demand only that which we have the power to render therefore, it follows that we have full power to render all that God demands, and, therefore, we may be as perfectly conformed to his will as it regards us, as the inhabitants of heaven are to his will as it regards them.

Pres. Mahan, “Scripture Doctrines of Christian Perfection,”and Prof. Finney, “Oberlin Evangelist,” Vol. 4., No. 19, and Vol. 4., No. 15, as quoted by Dr. Peck.

34. State the points of agreement and disagreement between these several theories, Pelagian, Romish, Armenian, and Oberlin?

1st. They all agree in maintaining that it is possible for men in this life to attain a state in which they may habitually and perfectly fulfill all their obligations, i. e., to be and do perfectly all that God requires them to be or do at present.

2nd. The Pelagian theory differs from all the rest, in denying the deterioration of our natural and moral powers, and consequently, in denying the necessity of the intervention of supernatural grace to the end of making men perfect.

3rd. The Pelagian and Oberlin theories agree in making the original moral law of God the standard of perfection. The Oberlin theologians, however, admitting that our powers are deteriorated by sin, hold that God’s law, as a matter of sheer justice, adjusts its demands to the present ability of the subject. The Romish theory regards the same law as the standard of perfection, but differs from the Pelagian theory in maintaining that the demands of this law are adjusted to man’s deteriorated powers; and on the other hand, it differs from the Oberlin theory, by holding that the lowering of the demands of this law in adjustment to the enfeebled powers of man, instead of being of sheer justice, is of grace for the merits of Christ. The Armenian theory differs from all the rest in denying that the original law is the standard of evangelical perfection; in holding that that law having been fulfilled by Christ, the Christian is now required only to fulfill the requirements of the gospel covenant of grace. This, however, appears to differ more in form than essence from the Romish position in this regard.

4th. The Romish and Armenian theories agree— lst. In admitting that the perfect Christian is still liable to transgress the provisions of the original moral law, and that he is subject to mistakes and infirmities. The Romanists calls them venial sins; the Armenian, mistakes or infirmities.

2nd. In referring all the work of making man perfect to the efficiency of the Holy Ghost, who is given for Christ’s sake. But they differ, on the other hand, 1st, as to the nature of that faith by which sanctification is effected, and, 2nd, as to the merit of good works.

35. What are the arguments upon which perfectionists sustain their theory, and how may they be answered ?

1st. They argue that this perfection is attainable in this life, (1.) From the commands of God, who never will command impossibilities.–Matthew 5:48.

(2.) From the fact that abundant provision has already been made in the gospel for securing the perfect sanctification of God’s people; in fact, all the provision that ever will be made.

(3.) From the promises of God to redeem Israel from all his iniquities, etc.—Psalms 130:8; Ezekiel 36:25-29; 1 John 1:7; 1 John 1:9.

(4.) From the prayers of saints recorded in Scripture with implied approval.–Psalms 51:2; Hebrews 9:21.

2nd. They argue that this perfection has in fact been attained, (1.) From biblical examples, as David.—Acts 9:22. See also Genesis 6:9; Job 1:1; Luke 1:6.

(2.) Modern examples—Peck's "Christian Perfection," pp. 365–396.

WE ANSWER–

1st. The Scriptures never assert that a Christian may in this lift attain to a state in which he may live without sin.

2nd. The meaning of special passages must be interpreted in consistency with the entire testimony of Scripture.

3rd. The language of Scripture never implies that man may here live without sin. The commands of God are adjusted to man's responsibility, and the aspirations and prayers of the saints to their duties and ultimate privileges, and not to their present ability. Perfection is the true aim of the Christian's effort in every period of growth and in every act. The terms "perfect" and "blameless" are often relative, or used to signify simple genuineness or sincerity. This is evident from the recorded fact–

4th. That all the perfect men of the Scriptures sometimes sinned; witness the histories of :Noah, Job, David, Paul, and compare Genesis 6:9, with Genesis 9:21, and Job 1:1, with Job 3:1; Job 9:20; also see Galatians 2:11; Galatians 2:14; Psalms 19:12; Romans 7:1-25 :; Galatians 5:17; Php 3:12-14.

36. What special objections bear against the Pelagian theory of perfection ? This is a part of a wholly Anti–Christian system. Its constituent elements are a denial of the Scripture testimony with regard to original sin, and the work of the Spirit of grace in effectual calling, and an assertion of man's ability to save himself. It involves low views of the guilt and turpitude of sin, and of the extent, spirituality, and unchangeableness of God's holy law. This is the only perfectly consistent theory of perfection ever ventilated, and in the same proportion it is the most thoroughly unchristian.

37. What special objections bear against the Romish theory ? This theory is inconsistent–

1st. With the true nature of sin. It denies that strong desire is sin, and admits as such only those deliberate acts of the will which assent to the impulse of strong desire. It distinguishes between mortal and venial sins. The truth is that every sin is mortal, and concupiscence, "sin dwelling in me,""law in my members," is of the very essence of sin.—Romans 7:8-23.

2nd. It is inconsistent with the nature of God's holy law, which is essentially immutable, and the demands of which have never been lowered in accommodation to the weakened faculties of men.

3rd. It is essentially connected with their theory of the merit of good works, and of the higher merit of works of supererogation which is radically subversive of the essentials of the gospel.

38. What special objections bear against the Oberlin theory ? This theory appears to assimilate more nearly than the others with the terrible self–consistency and the Anti–Christian spirit of the Pelagian view. It differs from that heresy, however, in holding—

1st. That the law of God is, as a matter of sheer justice, accommodated to the weakened faculties of men.

2nd. That the shortcomings of men in the present life, as measured by the original law of God, are not sin, since a man's duty is measured only by his ability.

3rd. In making the principle of this perfection to consist in "perfect and disinterested benevolence." In all these respects, also, this theory is inconsistent with the true nature of God's law, the true nature of sin, and the true nature of virtue.

39. What special objections bear against the Armenian theory? This view, as presented by the Wesleyan standard writers, is far less inconsistent with the principles and spirit of Christianity than either of the others, and consequently it is precisely in the same proportion less self–consistent as a theory, and less accurate in its use of technical language. These Christian brethren are to be honored for their exalted views, and earnest advocacy of the duty of pressing forward to the highest measures of Christian attainment, while it is to be forever lamented that their great founder was so far misled by the prejudices of system as to bind in unnatural alliance so much precious truth with a theory and terminology proper only to radical error. I will make here, once for all, the general explanation, that when stating the Armenian doctrine on any point, I have generally preferred to refer to the form in which the doctrine was explicitly defined by the Dutch Remonstrants rather than to the modified, and, as it seems to me, far less logically definite form in which it is set forth by the authorities of the Wesleyan churches, who properly style themselves Evangelical Arminians. I attribute the peculiar theoretical indefiniteness which appears to render their definitions obscure, especially on the subjects of justification and of perfection, to the spirit of a warm, loving, working Christianity struggling with the false premises of an Armenian philosophy.

1st. While over and over insisting upon the distinction as to the twofold relation sustained by the original law of God to man (1) as a rule of being and acting, (2) as a condition of divine favor, their whole theory is based upon a logical confusion of these two things so distinct. Dr. Peck teaches earnestly, and confirms by many Wesleyan testimonies, excellent Calvinistic doctrine upon the following points:The original law of God is universal and unchangeable, its demands never can be changed nor compromised. Obedience to this law was the condition of the original covenant of works. This condition was broken by Adam, but, in our behalf perfectly fulfilled by Christ, and thus the integrity of God's changeless law was preserved. Therefore, he goes on to argue, the believer is no longer under the law, but under the covenant of grace, i. e., to use Wesley's own qualifying parenthesis "as the condition of either present or future salvation." Certainly, we answer, Christ is the end of the law for us for righteousness, in its forensic sense, that is, to secure our justification, but surely Christ did not satisfy that changeless law, in our place, in such a sense that it does not remain our rule of action, to which it is our duty to be personally conformed. The question of perfection is one which relates to our personal character, not to our relations; it is moral and inherent, and not forensic. To prove, therefore, what we also rejoice to believe, that the original law of God, under the gospel covenant, is no longer our condition of salvation, does not avail one iota towards proving that God, under the gospel, demands an obedience adjusted to any easier standard than was required before.

2nd. This theory is part of the Armenian view of the covenant of grace, which we regard so inconsistent with the gospel, and which Mr. Watson (see "Institutes," Part 2., Chap. 23.) appears to

attempt to avoid while refusing to admit the imputation to the believer of Christ's righteousness. This view is, that by Christ's propitiation, he having fulfilled the original law of God, it is made consistent with divine justice to present salvation upon easier conditions, i. e., faith and evangelical obedience; Christian perfection requiring nothing more than the perfect fulfillment of these new gracious conditions. Now this view, besides confounding the ideas of law, and of covenant, and of rule, and of a condition, of a ground of justification, and of a standard of sanctification, is inconsistent with the broad teachings of the gospel concerning the righteousness of Christ, and the office of faith in justification. It makes the merit of Christ only in some uncertain and distant way the occasion of our salvation, and faith, and evangelical obedience, in the place of perfect obedience under the old covenant, the ground instead of the mere instrument and fruit of our justification. Logically developed, this theory must lead to the Romish doctrine as to the merit of good works.

3rd. This theory denies that mistakes and infirmities resulting from the effects of original sin, are themselves sin, yet admits that they are to be confessed, forgiveness implored for them, and the atonement of Christ's blood applied to them, and that the more perfect a man becomes the more he abhors his own internal state. Surely this is a confusion of language, and abuse of the word sin. What is sin but (1) that which transgressed God's original law, (2) which needs Christ's atonement, (3) which should be confessed, and must be forgiven, (4) which lays a proper foundation for self–abhorrence.

40. What express declarations of Scripture are contradicted by every possible modification of the theory of Christian perfection?

1 Kings 8:46; Proverbs 20:9; Ecclesiastes 7:20; James 3:2; 1 John 1:8.

41. How may it be shown to be in opposition to the experience of saints, as recorded in the scriptures?

See Paul's account of himself, Romans 7:14-25; Php 3:12-14. See case of David, Psalms 19:12; Psalms 51:1-19 :; of Moses, Psalms 90:8; Job 42:5-6; of Daniel 9:20. See Luke 18:13; Galatians 2:11-13; Galatians 6:1; James 5:16.

42. How does it conflict with the ordinary experience of God's people ? The more holy a man is, the more humble, self–renouncing, self–abhorring, and the more sensitive to every sin he becomes and the more closely he clings to Christ. The moral imperfections which cling to him he feels to be sins, laments and strives to overcome them. Believers find that their life is a constant warfare, and they need to take the kingdom of heaven by storm, and watch while they pray. They are always subject to the constant chastisement of their father's loving hand, which can only be designed to correct their imperfections, and to confirm their graces. And it has been notoriously the fact that the best Christians have been those who have been the least prone to claim the attainment of perfection for themselves.

43. What are the legitimate practical effects of perfectionism ? The tendency of every such doctrine must be evil, except in so far as it is modified or counteracted by limiting or inconsistent truths held in connection, which is pre–eminently the case with respect to the Wesleyan view, from the amount of pure gospel which in that instance the figment of perfectionism alloys. But perfectionism, by itself, must tend, 1st, to low views of God's law;

2nd, to inadequate views of the heinousness of sin;

3rd, to a low standard of moral excellence; 4th, to spiritual pride and fanaticism.

AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS OF CHURCH DOCTRINE.

ROMISH DOCTRINE AS TO THE MORAL PERFECTION OF THE REGENERATE AS TO GOOD WORKS, AND WORKS OF SUPEREROGATION. As to their view of the MERIT OF GOOD WORKS, see above, Chap. 33.

“Conc. Trident.,” Sess. 5, Song of Solomon 5:1-16.—“If any one denies, that, by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is conferred in baptism, the guilt of original sin is remitted; or even asserts that the whole of that which has the true and proper nature of sin is not taken away; but says that it is only rased, or not imputed; let him be anathema. . . . . But this holy Synod confesses and is sensible, that in the baptized there remains concupiscence, or an incentive (to sin). . . . This concupiscence, which the Apostle sometimes calls sin, the holy Synod declares that the Catholic Church has never understood it to be called sin, as being truly and properly sin in those born again, but because it is of sin and inclines to sin. If any man is of a contrary sentiment, let him be anathema.”

“Conc. Trident.,” Sess. 6, can. 18.— “If any one says that the commandments of God, even for one that is justified and constituted in grace are impossible to keep, let him be anathema.”

Bellarmin, “De Justific.,” iv 10, sqq.–“If precepts are impossible they oblige no one, and hence the precepts are not precepts. Neither is it possible to devise wherein any one sins in respect to that which it is impossible to avoid.”

Ibid, “De Monachis,” cap. 7.— “A ‘council of perfection’ we call a good work, not commanded us by Christ, but declared; not appointed but commended. But it differs from a precept in respect to its matter subject, form, and end.

(1.) In respect to their matter(the difference) is twofold. First, because the matter of the precept is easier, that of the counsel more difficult, for the former is derived from the principles of nature, while the latter in some sense exceeds nature, e. g., for nature inclines to the preservation of conjugal fidelity, but not to abstaining from the conjugal relation. Secondly, because the matter of the precept is good . . . for the council includes the precept, which relates to the same matter, and adds something beyond the precept.

(2.) In respect to the subject, precepts and counsels differ, because the precept binds all men in common, while the counsel does not.

(3.) In respect to their form they differ, because the precept binds of its own inherent obligation, but the counsel through the will of man.

(4.) In respect to their end or effects they differ, because the precept observed has a reward, but when not observed a penalty, but the counsel when not observed has no penalty, but when observed has the greater reward.” Cap. 8.— “It is the opinion of all Catholics that there are many true and proper evangelical counsels, but especially, viz., celibacy, poverty, and obedience (monastic), which are neither commanded to all, nor matters of indifference but grateful to God

and by him commended (Matthew 19:11; Matthew 21:1-46; 1 Corinthians 7:1-40."

LUTHERAN DOCTRINE.

"Apology for Auburg Confession," p. 91.—"The entire Scripture end the whole church declare that the Law can not be satisfied (by any thing within man's power since the fall). This incomplete fulfilling of the law is accepted, not on its own account, but only through faith in Christ. Otherwise the law always accuses us. . . In this infirmity there is always sin, which may be charged to our account (for condemnation)."

"Formula Concordioe," p. 678.—"The papal and monastic doctrine, that a man after he is regenerated is able perfectly to fulfill the law of God in this life, is to be rejected."

Ib., p. 589.—"Our Confession is, that good works most surely and indubitably follow a true faith, as the fruits of a good tree. We also believe that good works are entirely to be left out of account, not only when we are treating of justification, but even when we are debating concerning our eternal life."

Ib., p. 700.—"Because those are not good works, which any one himself devises with good intention, or which are done according to human traditions, but those which God himself has prescribed and ordered in his own word. Because works truly good can be performed, not by the proper natural powers, but then only when the person is, by faith, reconciled with God, and is renewed by the Spirit, and is created anew to good works in Jesus Christ."

REFORMED DOCTRINE.

"Heidelberg Catechism," Q. 62.—"Our best works in the present life are all imperfect and stained with sin."

"Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England," Art. 12.—"Albeit that Good Works, which are the fruits of faith, and follow after Justification, can not put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith; insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit."

Ib., Art. 14.—"Voluntary works besides, over and above, God's commandments, which they call Works of Supererogation, can not be taught without arrogancy and impiety; for by them men do declare that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do more for his sake, than of bounden duty is required:whereas Christ saith plainly, When ye have done all that are commanded to you, say, we are unprofitable servants."

"Confess. Helvetica posterior," p. 498.—"We teach that God gives an ample reward to those doing good works. Yet we refer this reward that the Lord gives, not to the merit of the men receiving it, but to the goodness, liberality, and truth of God, who promises and bestows it; who, while he owes nothing to any one, yet has promised that he will give a reward to his faithful worshippers."

"West.Confession of Faith," ch. 16, 4.—"They who in their obedience attain to the greatest height which is possible in this life, are so far from being able to supererogate, and to do more than God requires, that they fall short of much, which in their duty they are bound to do" (see the whole

chapter).

Ib., chap. 13, 2.—“This sanctification is throughout in the whole man, yet imperfect in this life:there abideth still some remnants of corruption in every part, whence ariseth a continual and irreconcilable war, the flesh lusting against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh.” 3.—“In which war, although the remaining corruption for a time may much prevail, yet, through the continual supply of strength from the sanctifying Spirit of Christ, the regenerate part doth overcome:and so the saints grow in grace, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.”

02.36. Perseverance Saints.

Chapter 36 Perseverance Saints.

1. What is the Scriptural doctrine as to the perseverance of the saints ?

They whom God hath accepted in his beloved, effectively called and sanctified by his Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved. -“Con. Faith,” Chap. 17.; “Larger Catechism,” Question 79.

2. By what arguments may the certainty of the final perseverance of the saints be established.

1st. The direct assertions of Scripture.-John 10:28-29; Romans 11:29; Php 1:6; 1 Peter 1:5.

2nd. This certainty is a necessary inference, from the Scriptural doctrine (1) of election, Jeremiah 31:3; Matthew 24:22--24; Acts 13:48; Romans 8:30; (2) of the covenant of grace, wherein the Father gave his people to his Son as the reward of his obedience and suffering, Jeremiah 32:40; John 17:2--6; (3) of the union of Christians with Christ, in the federal aspect of which Christ is their surety, and they can not fail (Romans 8:1), and in the spiritual and vital aspect of which they abide in him, and because he lives they must live also, John 14:19; Romans 8:38-39; Galatians 2:20; (4) of the atonement, wherein Christ discharged all the obligations of his people to the law as a covenant of life, and purchased for them all covenanted blessings; if one of them should fail, therefore, the sure foundation of all would be shaken, Isaiah 53:6, Isaiah 53:11; Matthew 20:28; 1 Peter 2:24; (5) of justification, which declares all the conditions of the covenant of life satisfied, and sets its subject into a new relation to God for all future time, so that he can not fall under condemnation, since he is not under the law, but under grace, Romans 6:14; (6) of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, (a) as a seal by which we are marked as belonging to God, (b) as an earnest, or first installment of the promised redemption, in pledge of complete fulfillment John 14:16; 2 Corinthians 1:21-22; 2 Corinthians 5:5; Ephesians 1:14; (7) of the prevalence of Christ’s intercession. John 11:42; John 17:11; John 17:15; John 17:20; Romans 8:34.

3. What is the doctrine of the Romish Church on this subject ?

“Council of Trent,” Sess. 6., Canon 23. “If any one maintain that a man once justified can not lose grace, and, therefore, that he who falls and sins never was truly justified, let him be accursed.”—See below, under Romish doctrine in this chapter, their view as to “venial sins.”

4. What is the Arminian doctrine on this point ?

It is an inseparable part of the Arminian system, flowing necessarily from their views of election, of the design and effect of Christ’s death, and of sufficient grace and free will, that those who were once justified and regenerated may, by neglecting grace and grieving the Holy Spirit, fall into such sins as are inconsistent with true justifying faith, and continuing and dying in the same, may consequently finally fall into perdition.—“Confession of the Remonstrants,” 11. 7. The Lutherans and the Arminians agree on this point. They both believe that the “elect” (those whom God has

chosen to eternal life because he has certainly foreseen their perseverance in faith and obedience to the end) can not finally apostatize. The true question between them and the Calvinists, therefore, is not whether the “elect,”but whether those once truly “regenerate and justified” can finally apostatize and perish.

5. What objection is urged against the orthodox doctrine on the ground of the free agency of man?

Those who deny the certainty of the final perseverance of the saints hold the false theory that liberty of the will consists in indifference, or the power of contrary choice, and consequently that certainty is inconsistent with liberty. This fallacy is disproved above, Chap. 15., see especially Ques. 25, 26. That God does govern the free acts of his creatures, as a matter of fact, is clear from history and prophecy, from universal Christian consciousness and experience, and from Scripture.—Acts 2:23; Ephesians 1:11 Php 2:13; Proverbs 21:1. That he does secure the final perseverance of his people in a manner perfectly consistent with their free agency is also clear. He changes their affections and thus determines the will by its own free spontaneity. He brings them into the position of children by adoption, surrounding them with all of the sources and instruments of sanctifying influence, and when they sin he carefully chastises and restores them. Hence the doctrine of Scripture is not that a man who has once truly believed is secure of ultimate salvation, subsequently feel and act as he may; but, on the contrary that God secures the ultimate salvation of every one who is once truly united to his Son by faith, by securing, through the power of the Holy Ghost, his most free perseverance in Christian feeling and obedience to the end.

6. What objection is urged against the orthodox doctrine upon the ground of its supposed unfavorable influence upon morality ? The objection charged is, that this doctrine “once in grace always in grace,” must naturally lead to carelessness, through a false sense of security in our present position, and of confidence that God will secure our final salvation independently of our own agency.

Although it is certain, on the part of God, that if we are elected and called, we shall be saved; yet it requires constant watchfulness, and diligence, and prayer to make that calling and election sure to us.—2 Peter 1:10. That God powerfully works with us, and therefore secures for us success in our contest with sin, is in Scripture urged as a powerful reason not for sloth but for diligence.—Php 2:13. The orthodox doctrine does not affirm certainty of salvation because we have once believed, but certainty of perseverance in holiness if we have truly believed, which perseverance in holiness, therefore, in opposition to all weaknesses and temptations, is the only sure evidence of the genuineness of past experience, or of the validity of our confidence as to our future salvation, and surely such an assurance of certainty can not encourage either carelessness or immorality.

7. What objection to this doctrine is founded on the exhortations to diligence; and on the warnings of danger in case of carelessness, addressed to believers in the Scriptures ? The objection alleged is, that these exhortations and warnings necessarily imply the contingency of the believer’s salvation, as conditioned upon the believer’s continued faithfulness, and consequently involving liability to apostasy.

We answer–

1st. The outward word necessarily comes to all men alike, addressing them in the classes in which they regard themselves as standing; and as professors, or “those who think they stand,” are many

of them self–deceived, this outward word truly implies the uncertainty of their position (as far as man's knowledge goes), and their liability to fall.

2nd. That God secures the perseverance in holiness of all his true people by the use of means adapted to their nature as rational, moral, and free agents. Viewed in themselves they are always, as God warns them, unstable, and therefore, as he exhorts them, they must diligently cleave to his grace. It is always true, also, that if they apostatize they shall be lost; but by means of these very threatening his Spirit graciously secures them from apostasy.

8. What special texts are relied upon to rebut the arguments of the orthodox upon this subject ?

Ezekiel 18:24; Matthew 13:20-21; 2 Peter 2:20-21, and especially Hebrews 6:4-6; Hebrews 10:26.

All of these passages may be naturally explained in perfect consistency with the orthodox doctrine which is supported upon that wide range of Scripture evidence we have set forth above, Question 2. They present either,

1st, hypothetical warnings of the consequences of apostasy with the design of preventing it, by showing the natural consequences of indifference and of sin, and the necessity for earnest care and effort; or,

2nd, they indicate the dreadful consequences of misimproving or of abusing the influences of common grace, which, although involving great responsibility, nevertheless come short of a radical change of nature or genuine conversion.

9. What argument do the opponents of this doctrine urge from Bible examples and from our own daily experience of apostates ?

They cite from the Scriptures such instances as that of David and Peter, and they refer to the many examples of the apostles of well–accredited professors, with which, alas! we are all familiar.

All these examples, however, fall evidently under one of two classes, either,

1st, they were from the beginning without the real power of Godliness, although bearing so fair an appearance of life in the sight of their fellow–men Romans 2:28; Romans 9:6; 1 John 2:19; Revelation 3:1; or,

2nd, they are true believers who, because of the temporary withdrawal of restraining grace, have been allowed to backslide for a time, while in every such case they are graciously restored, and that generally by chastisement.—Revelation 3:19. Of this class were David and Peter. No true Christian is capable of deliberate apostasy; his furthest departure from righteousness being occasioned by the sudden impulse of passion or fear.—Matthew 24:24; Luke 22:31.

AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS OF CHURCH DOCTRINE ROMISH DOCTRINE.

"Conc. Trident.," Sess. 6, ch. 15.—"It is to be maintained that the received grace of justification is lost, not only by infidelity, whereby even faith itself is lost, but also by any other mortal sin whatever, though faith be not lost."

Ib., can. 23.— "If any one saith, that a man once justified can sin no more, nor lose grace, and that therefore he that falls and sins was never truly justified . . . let him be anathema."

Ib., chap. 11–“For, although, during this mortal life, men how holy and just soever, at times fall at least into light and daily sins, which are also called venial, not therefore do they cease to be just.”

Ib., Sess. 14, ch. 5.— “For venial sins, whereby we are not excluded from the grace of God, and into which we fall more frequently, although they be rightly and profitably, and without any presumption, declared in confession, as the custom of pious persons demonstrates, yet may they be omitted without guilt, and be expiated by many other remedies. But whereas all mortal sins, even those of thought, render men children of wrath, and enemies of God, it is necessary to seek also for the pardon of them all from God, with a modest and open confession.”

Bellarmin, “De Amiss. Gra.,” Sess. 14, cap. 5.— “

(1.) Venial sin is distinguished from mortal sin, as of its own nature, and without any relation to the predestination or the mercy of God, or to the state of the regenerate, deserving a certain but not an eternal punishment.

(2.) These sins are either venial from their own nature, having for their object a thing evil and inordinate, but which does not oppose the love of God and of our neighbor—as an idle word, or they are venial from the imperfection of the action, i. e., (a) such as are not perfectly voluntary (deliberate), as arising from a sudden movement of cupidity or anger, and (b) such as relate to trifles, as the theft of one obolus.”

LUTHERAN DOCTRINE

“Formula concordioe,” p. 705.—“That false opinion is to be earnestly confuted and rejected, which certain feign, that faith, and realized justification, and salvation itself, can not be lost by any sins or crimes whatsoever.”

Ib., p. 591.—“We condemn that dogma, that faith in Christ is not lost, and that the Holy Spirit continues to dwell none the less in a man although he knowingly and willingly sins, and that the sanctified and elect retain the Holy Spirit, although they fall into adulteries or other crimes, and persevere in them.”

“Apol. Aug. Confession,” p. 71.—“Faith can not coexist with mortal sin.”

Ib., p. 86.—“That faith, which receives remission of sins . . does not remain in those who indulge their lusts, neither can it coexist with mortal sin.”

REFORMED DOCTRINE.

“Can. of the Synod of Dort,” ch. 5, c. 3.— “Because of the remains of indwelling sin . . . the converted could not continue in this grace, if they were left to their own strength. But God is faithful, who confirms them in the grace once mercifully conferred on them, and powerfully preserves them in the same, even unto the end. Song of Solomon 4:1-16.—But though that power of God, confirming the truly faithful in grace, and preserving them, is greater than what can be overcome by the flesh, yet the converted are not always so influenced and moved by God, that tines can not depart in certain particular actions, from the leading of grace, and be seduced by the lusts of the flesh, and obey them. They may fall even into grievous and atrocious sins. . . . . Song of Solomon 5:1-16.—But by such enormous sins they exceedingly offend God, they incur the guilt

of death, they grieve the Holy Spirit, they interrupt the exercise of faith, they most grievously wound conscience, and they sometimes lose for a time the sense of grace, until by serious repentance returning into the way, the paternal countenance of God again shines upon them. Song of Solomon 6:1-13. For God, who is rich in mercy, from his immutable purpose of election does not wholly take away his Holy Spirit from his own, even in lamentable falls, nor does he so permit them to glide down that they should fall from the grace of adoption, and the state of justification, or commit the sin unto death, or against the Holy Spirit, that being deserted by him, they should cast themselves headlong into eternal destruction. . .Song of Solomon 8:1-14.—So that not by their own merits or strength, but by the gratuitous mercy of God they (the elect) obtain it, that they neither totally fall from faith and grace, nor finally continue in their falls and perish."

"West. Confession Faith," ch. 17, 1.— "They whom God hath accepted in his Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace, but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved. 2.—This perseverance of the saints depends not upon their own free–will, but upon the immutability of the degree of election, flowing from the free and unchangeable love of God the Father; upon the efficacy of the merit and intercession of Jesus Christ; the abiding of the Spirit and of the seed of God within them, and the nature of the covenant of grace:from all which ariseth also the certainty and infallibility thereof."

02.37. Death and the State of the Soul After Death

Chapter 37 Death and the State of the Soul After Death 1. What department of theology are we now entering, and what subjects are embraced in it ? The department of ESCHATOLOGY or the discussion of last things τα εσχατα. It embraces the subjects of death, the state of the soul after death, the second advent of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, the final judgment, the end of the world, heaven and hell.

2. By what forms of expression is death described in the Bible ? A departure out of this world.—2 Timothy 4:6. A going the way of all the earth.—Joshua 23:14. A being gathered to one's fathers, Judges 2:10; and to one's people, Deuteronomy 32:50. A dissolving the earthly house of this tabernacle.—2 Corinthians 5:1. A returning to the dust.—Ecclesiastes 12:7. A sleep.—John 11:11. A giving up the ghost.—Acts 5:10. A being absent from the body and present with the Lord.—2 Corinthians 5:8. Sleeping in Jesus.—1 Thessalonians 4:14.

3. What is death ? The suspension of the 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.—Ecclesiastes 12:7.

4. How does death stand related to sin ? The entire penalty of the law, including all the spiritual, physical, and eternal penal consequences of sin, is called death in Scripture. The sentence was, "The day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."—Genesis 2:17; Romans 5:12. That this included natural death is proved by Romans 5:13-14; and from the fact that when Christ bore the penalty of the law it was necessary for him to die.—Hebrews 9:22.

5. Why do the justified die ?

Justification changes the entire federal relation of its subject to the law, and raises him forever above all the penal consequences of sin. Death, therefore, while remaining a part of the penalty of the unsatisfied law in relation to the unjust, is like all other afflictions changed, in relation to the justified, into an element of improving discipline. It is made necessary for them from the present constitution of the body, while it is to both body and soul the gateway of heaven. They are made free from its sting and fear.—1 Corinthians 15:55, 1 Corinthians 15:57; Hebrews 2:15. They are now "blessed" in death because they die "in the Lord,"Revelation 14:13, and they shall at last be completely delivered from its power when the last enemy shall be destroyed. 1 Corinthians 15:26.

6. What evidence have we of the immateriality of the soul, and what argument may be derived from that source in proof of its continued existence after death ? For the evidence establishing the immateriality of the soul see Chap. 2., Question 18.

Now although the continued existence of any creature must depend simply upon the will of its Creator, that will may either be made known by direct revelation, or inferred in any particular instance by analogical reasoning from what is known of his doings in other cases. As far as this

argument from analogy goes it decidedly confirms the belief that a spiritual substance is, as such, immortal. The entire range of human experience fails to make us acquainted with a single instance of the annihilation of an atom of matter, i. e., of matter as such. Material bodies, organized or chemically compounded, or mere mechanical aggregations, we observe constantly coming into existence, an in turn passing away, yet never through the annihilation of their elementary constituents or component parts, but simply from the dissolution of that relation which these parts had temporarily sustained to each other. Spirit, however, is essentially simple and single, and therefore incapable of that dissolution of parts to which material bodies are subject. We infer, therefore, that spirits are immortal since they can not be subject to that only form of death of which we have any knowledge.

7. What argument in favor of the immortality of the soul may lie derived from its imperfect development in this world ? In every department of organized life every individual creature, in its normal state, tends to grow toward a condition of complete development, which is the perfection of its kind. The acorn both prophesies and grows toward the oak. Every human being, however, is conscious that in this life he never attains that completeness which the Creator contemplated in the ideal of his type; he has faculties undeveloped, capacities unfulfilled, natural desires unsatisfied; he knows he was designed to be much more than he is, and to fill a much higher sphere. As the prophetic reason of the Creator makes provision for the butterfly through the instinct of the caterpillar, so the same Creator reveals the immortal existence of the soul in a higher sphere bar means of its conscious limitations and instinctive movements in this.

8. What argument on this subject may be derived from the distributive justice of God ?

It is an invariable judgment of natural reason, and a fundamental doctrine of the Bible, that moral good is associated with happiness, and moral evil with misery, by the unchangeable nature and purpose of God. But the history of all individuals and communities alike establishes the fact that this life is not a state of retribution; that here wickedness is often associated with prosperity, and moral excellence with sorrow; we must hence conclude that there is a future state in which all that appears at present inconsistent with the justice of God shall be adjusted.—See Psalms 73:1-28 :

9. How do the operations of conscience point to a future state?

Conscience is the voice of God in the soul, which witnesses to our sinfulness and ill–desert, and to his essential justice. Except in the case of those who have found refuge in the righteousness of Christ, every man feels that his moral relations to God are never settled in this life, and hence the characteristic testimony of the human conscience, in spite of great individual differences as to light, sensibility, etc., has always been coincident with the word of God, that “after death comes the JUDGMENT.”

10. How is this doctrine established by the general consent of mankind ? This has been the universal faith of all men, of all races, and in all ages. Universal consent, like every universal effect, must be referred to an equally universal cause, and this consent, uniform among men differing in every other possible respect, can be referred to no common origin other than the constitution of man’s common nature, which is the testimony of his Maker.

11. Show that the Old Testament teaches the same distinction between soul and body that is taught in the New Testament.

1st. In the account of the creation. The body was formed of the dust of the earth, and the soul in the image of the Almighty.—Genesis 1:26; Genesis 2:7.

2nd. In the definition of death.—Ecclesiastes 12:7. “Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it.”—see also Ecclesiastes 3:21.

12. What does the Old Testament teach concerning Sheol ? and how is it shown, from the usage of that word, that the immortality of the soul was a doctrine of the ancient covenant?

Sheol is derived from the verb ■■■■■■ to ask, expressing the sense of our English proverb, that the “grave crieth give, give.” It is used in the Old Testament to signify, in a vague and general sense, the state of the departed, both the good and bad, intermediate between death and the resurrection of the righteous (Hosea 13:14), generally invested with gloomy associations, and indefinitely referred to the lower parts of the earth. Deuteronomy 32:22; Amos 9:2. Thus it is used for grave as the receptacle of the body after death (Genesis 37:35; Job 14:13), but principally to designate the receptacle of departed spirits, without explicit reference to any division between the stations allotted to the righteous and the wicked. That they were active and conscious in this state appears to be indicated by what is revealed of Samuel.—1 Samuel 28:7-20; Isaiah 14:15-17. With regard to the good, however, the residence in Sheol was looked upon only as intermediate between death and a happy resurrection.—Psalms 49:15. In their treatment of this whole subject, the Old Testament scriptures rather take the continued existence of the soul for granted, than explicitly assert it.—Fairbairn’s “Herm. Manual”; “Josephus, Ant.,” 18, 1.

13. What is the purport of our Saviour’s argument on this subject against the Sadducees?

Luke 20:37-38. Long after the death of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Jehovah designated himself to Moses as their God. Exodus 3:6. But, argues Christ against the Sadducee who denied the resurrection of the dead, “he is the God, not of the dead, but of the living.” This more immediately proves the immortality of their souls, but as God is the covenant God of persons, and as the persons of these patriarchs included alike body and soul, this argument likewise establishes the ultimate immortality of the body also, i. e., of the entire person.

14. What passages of the Old Testament assert or imply the hope of a state of blessedness after death?

Numbers 23:10; Job 19:26-27; Psalms 16:9-11; Psalms 17:15; Psalms 49:14-15; Psalms 73:24-26; Is. 25:8; 26:19; Hosea 13:14; Daniel 12:2-3; Daniel 12:13.

15. What other evidence does the Old Testament afford of the continued existence of the soul ?

1st. The translations of Enoch and Elijah and the temporary reappearance of Samuel.—Genesis 5:24; Hebrews 11:5; 2 Kings 2:11; 1 Samuel 28:7-20.

2nd. The command to abstain from the arts of necromancy implies the prevalent existence of a belief that the dead still continue in being in another state.—Deuteronomy 18:11-12.

3rd. In their symbolical system Canaan represents the permanent inheritance of Christ’s people, and the entire purpose of the whole Old Testament revelation, as apprehended by Old Testament believers, had respect to a future existence and inheritance after death. This is directly asserted in

the New Testament.—Acts 26:6-8; Hebrews 11:10-16; Ephesians 1:14.

16. What does the New Testament teach of the state of the soul immediately after death ?

“The souls of the righteous, being made perfect in holiness, are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies.”—Luke 23:43; 2 Corinthians 5:6; 2 Corinthians 5:8; Php 1:23-24. “And the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torment and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day.”—Luke 16:23-24; Jude 1:6-7. “Confession of Faith,” Chap. 32., §1. This statement represents the doctrine of the Lutheran and Reformed churches.

It includes the following points:

1st. The state of souls between death and the resurrection may properly be called intermediate when viewed with relation to the states which precede and follow.

2nd. Whether there be also an intermediate place or not the Scriptures do not definitely declare, but they suggest it.—See below, Ch. 40., Ques. 3.

3rd. The souls both of the righteous and the lost continue during this state active and conscious.

4th. The moral and spiritual character and destiny of each is irrevocably decided at death either for good or evil 5th. The righteous are immediately made perfect in holiness.

6th. They pass at once and remain during the whole period in the presence of Christ.

7th. This intermediate differs from the final state of the redeemed—

(1.) Because of the absence of the body.

(2.) Because redemption is not yet realized in its final stage.

17. What is the signification and usage of the word αιδης , Hades, in Scripture?

“Αιδης , from α primitive, and ιδειν,” designates generally the invisible world inhabited by the spirits of dead men. Among the ancient classical heathen, this invisible world was regarded as consisting of two contrasted regions, the one called Elysium, the abode of the blessed good, and the other Tartarus, the abode of the vicious and miserable.

It was used by the authors of the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew word Sheol, compare Acts 2:27, and Psalms 16:10. In the New Testament this word occurs only eleven times. Matthew 11:23; Matthew 16:18; Luke 10:15; Luke 16:23; Acts 2:27; Acts 2:31; 1 Corinthians 15:55; Revelation 1:18; Revelation 6:8; Revelation 20:13-14. In every case, except 1 Corinthians 15:55, where the more critical editions of the original substitute the word θανετε in the place of αδη hades is translated hell, and certainly always represents the invisible world as under the dominion of Satan, as opposed to the kingdom of Christ, and as finally subdued under his victorious power. See Fairbairn’s “Herm. Manual.”

18. What is the signification and usage of the words παραδεισος and γεεννα ?

Παραδεισος Paradise, derived from some oriental language, and adopted into both the Hebrew and Greek languages, signifies parks, pleasure gardens.—Nehemiah 2:8; Ecclesiastes 2:5. The

Septuagint translators use this word to represent the garden of Eden.—Genesis 2:8, etc. It occurs only three times in the New Testament, Luke 23:43; 2 Corinthians 12:4; Revelation 2:7; where the context proves that it refers to the “third heavens,” the garden of the Lord, in which grows the “tree of life,” which is by the river which flows out of the throne of God and of the Lamb. Revelation 22:1-2.

Γεεννα is a compound Hebrew word expressed in Greek letters, signifying “Valley of Hinnom, Joshua 15:8, skirting Jerusalem on the south, running westward from the valley of Jehosaphat, under Mount Zion. Here was established the idolatrous worship of Moloch, to whom infants were burned in sacrifice.—1 Kings 11:7. This worship was broken up and the place desecrated by Josiah, 2 Kings 23:10-14, after which it appears to have become the receptacle for all the filth of the city, and of the dead bodies of animals, and of malefactors, to consume which fires would appear to have been from time to time kept up, hence called Tophet, an abomination, a vomit, Jeremiah 7:31.” Robinson’s “Greek Lex.” By a natural figure, therefore, this word was used to designate the place of final punishment, forcibly carrying with it the idea of pollution and misery. It occurs twelve times in the New Testament, and always to signify the place of final torment.—Matthew 5:22; Matthew 5:29-30; Matthew 10:28; Matthew 18:9; Matthew 23:15; Matthew 23:33; Mark 9:43; Mark 9:47; Luke 12:5; James 3:6.

19. What various views are maintained as to the intermediate state of the souls of men between death and the judgment ?

1st. Many Protestants, especially of the Church of England, retaining the classical sense of the word Hades, as equivalent to the Jewish Sheol (as given above, Question 12), hold that there is an intermediate region, consisting of two distinct departments, in one or other of which the disembodied souls, both of the lost and of the redeemed, respectively await the resurrection of their bodies, the award of judgment, and their translation to their final abodes of bliss or misery. They differ from the common Protestant doctrine chiefly—

(1.) In positively asserting that the place as well as the state is intermediate.

(2.) In asserting that it is situated “under” in respect to this world.

(3.) In holding that it is not the “highest heavens” where God manifests his special presence, and where Christ habitually abides.—See the Rev. E. H. Bickersteth’s “Yesterday, To–day, and Forever,” and “Hades and Heaven, or State of the Blessed Dead.”

2nd. For the complete statement of the doctrine of the Romanists, see below, Question 22.

3rd. Materialists and some Socinians hold that the souls of men remain in a state of unconsciousness or suspended life from death until the moment of the resurrection. This opinion is also held by the advocates of the ultimate annihilation of the wicked, and advocated most ably by C. F. Hudson in America, and as probable by the late Archbishop Whately in England (“View of Sc. Concerning a Future State”). The arguments are—

(1.) We have no experience and can form no conception of conscious mental activity in a disembodied state.

(2.) That the Scriptural evidence relied upon for the support of the church doctrine is obscure and inconclusive.

(3.) That the original and simple meaning of the word death is “extinction of being.” God said to Adam “The day thou eatest thereof thou,” not thy body, but thyself, “shall surely die.”Matthew 10:28.

(4.) That the great prominence afforded in the New Testament to the future resurrection of the body, as the effect of redemption, and the object of Christian hope, proves that the only future life the apostles expected was subsequent to and dependent upon that event.—1 Corinthians 15:14.

(5.) They quote many passages to prove that the Scriptures teach that the dead remain at present in a state of bodily and spiritual inactivity.–Psalms 6:5. “For in death there is no remembrance of thee, in the grave who shall give thee thanks.”–Psalms 146:4; Jeremiah 51:57. This doctrine was first taught by certain heretics in Arabia in the time of Origen, called Thnetopsychites. It was revived as an opinion of some theologians in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, but condemned by the University of Paris, 1240, and by Pope Benedict XII., 1366. It was revived by some Anabaptist and refuted by Calvin in his “Psychopannychia, etc.” It has never been held by any church or permanent school of theologians.

Isaac Taylor, in his “Physical Theory of Another Life,” ch. 17, concludes, purely on Biblical grounds, that the intermediate state of redeemed souls is one “not of unconsciousness indeed, but of comparative inaction, or of suspended energy. A transition state during the continuance of which the passive faculties of our nature rather than the active are to awake.”

20. State the Scriptural grounds upon which the Protestant doctrine stated above, Ques. 16, rests.

1st. The reappearance of Samuel in the use of all his faculties.2 Samuel 2:7-20. The appearance of Moses and Elias at the transfiguration of Christ on the mount.—Matthew 17:3. Christ’s address to the thief upon the cross.–Luke 23:43. The parable of the rich man and Lazarus.—Luke 16:23-24. The prayer of dying Stephen.—Acts 7:59. In 2 Corinthians 5:1-8 Paul declares that to be at home in the body is to be absent from the Lord, and to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord, and hence he says (Php 1:21-24) that for him to die is gain, and that he was in a strait betwixt two, “having a desire to depart and be with Christ, which is far better, nevertheless to abide in the flesh is more needful for you.” He declares (1 Thessalonians 5:10) that the sleep of death is a living together with Christ.–See also Ephesians 3:15; Hebrews 6:12-20; Acts 1:25; Jude 1:6-7; Hebrews 12:23; Revelation 5:9; Revelation 6:9-11; Revelation 7:9; Revelation 14:1; Revelation 14:3.

21. How can it be shown that the Intermediate State does not afford a further probation for those who depart from this life out of Christ ? An opinion is becoming prevalent among some classes of Protestants that another opportunity for repentance and faith will be afforded to Christless souls between death and the resurrection. That this is unfounded appears—

1st. From the fact that it is nowhere taught in Scripture. It is a hope at best suggested by the wish, but without any foundation in the word of God. Even if the “preaching to the spirits in prison” (1 Peter 3:19) is rightly referred to Christ’s personal ministry in the sphere of the intermediate state, it certainly did not apply to those who had rejected him on earth, and it would, in that case, probably

apply only to true believers under the Old Testament Dispensation, as the Catholic Church has always taught.

2nd. The assumption is built upon the grossly unchristian principle that God owes to all men a favorable opportunity of knowing and of receiving Christ. If this were true the gospel would be of debt and not of GRACE.

3rd. All the teaching of Christ and his apostles implies the contrary. “It is appointed unto men once to die, but alter this the judgment.”–Hebrews 9:27. “I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins; whither I go ye can not come.”—John 8:21. “And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that they which would pass from hence to you, can not, neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence.”—Luke 16:26; Revelation 22:11.

4th. The law of habit, and of confirmed moral character would, of course, even if conditions of repentance were offered, render the moral state of the sinner far more obdurate and hopeless in the intermediate state, than it was during the earthly life. the “Hope,” is as much unwarranted by reason as it is by revelation.

22. What do Romanists teach with regard to the soul of men after death?

1st. That the souls of unbaptized infants go to a place prepared expressly for them, called the “limbus infantum(borderland of infants),” where they endure no positive suffering, although they do not enjoy the vision of God. This is placed in a higher part of the Infernus which the fires can not reach, and they suffer only a poenam damni(penalty of loss), and have no share in the poenam sensus(penalty of actual suffering), which afflicts adult sinners.

2nd. That all unbaptized adults, and all those who subsequently have lost the grace of baptism by mortal sin, and die unreconciled to the church, go immediately to hell.

3rd. That those believers who have attained to state of Christian perfection go immediately to heaven.

4th. That the great mass of partially sanctified Christians dying in fellowship with the church, yet still encumbered with imperfections, go to purgatory, where they suffer, more or less intensely, for a longer or shorter period, until their sins are both atoned for and purged out, when they are translated to heaven, during which intermediate period they may be efficiently assisted by the prayers and labors of their friends on earth.

5th. That Old Testament believers were gathered into a region called “limbus patrum(borderland of patriarchs)” called “Abraham’s bosom,” where they remained without the beatific vision of God, yet without suffering, until Christ, during the three days in which his body lay in the grave, came and released them.—1 Peter 3:19-20. Cat. Rom. Part L, Chapter 6., Question 3; “Council of Trent,” Sess. 25., de Purgatorio. As to purgatory the Council of Trent settled only two points, 1st, that there is a purgatory;

2nd, that souls therein may be benefited by the prayers and mass of the church on earth.

It is generally held, however, that its pains are both negative and positive. That the instrument of its sufferings is material fire. That these are dreadful and indefinite in extent. That satisfaction may

be rendered in this world on much easier terms. That while there their souls can neither incur guilt nor merit any thing, they can alone render satisfaction for their sins by means of passive sufferings.

They confess that this doctrine is not taught directly in Scripture, but maintain, 1st, that it follows necessarily from their general doctrine of the satisfaction for sins;

2nd, that Christ and the apostles taught it incidentally as they did infant baptism, etc. They refer to Matthew 12:32; 1 Corinthians 3:15.

23. How may the Anti–Christian character of this doctrine be shown ?

1st. It confessedly has no direct, and obviously no real foundation in Scripture. This consideration alone suffices.

2nd. It proceeds upon an entirely unchristian view of the method of satisfying divine justice for sins.

(1.) That while Christ's merits are infinite, they atone only for original sins.

(2.) That each believer must make satisfaction in his own person for sins which he commits after baptism, either in the pains of penance or of purgatory. This is contrary to all the Scriptures teach, as we have above shown under their respective heads, (1) as to the satisfaction rendered to justice by Christ; (2) the nature of justification; (3) nature of sin; (4) relation of the sufferings and good works of the justified man to the law; (5) state of the souls of believers after death, etc., etc.

3rd. It is a heathen doctrine derived from the Egyptians through the Greeks and Romans, and currently received through the Roman empire.—Virgil's "Eneid," 6. 739, 43.

4th. Its practical effects have always been, 1st, the abject subjection of the people to the priesthood;

2nd, the gross demoralization of the people. The church is the self–appointed depository and dispenser of the superabundant merits of Christ, and the supererogatory merits of her eminent saints. On this foundation she dispenses the pains of purgatory to those who pay for past sins, or sells indulgences to those who pay for the liberty to sin in the future. Thus the people sin and pay, and the priest takes the money and remits the penalty. The figment of a purgatory under the control of the priest is the main source of his hold upon the fears of the people.—See Ch. 32., Q. 19 AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS OF CHURCH DOCTRINE.

ROMISH DOCTRINE.

"Cat. of Conc. Trident," Pt. 1, ch. 6, 3.—"There is also the fire of purgatory, in which the souls of the just are purified by punishment for a stated time, to the end that they may be admitted into their eternal country, into which nothing that defileth entereth. And of the truth of this doctrine which holy Councils declare to be confirmed by the testimonies of Scripture and by apostolic tradition, the pastor will have occasion to treat more diligently and frequently, as we are fallen on times when men endure not sound doctrine."

Bellarmin, “Purgator,” 2. 10.—“It is certain that in purgatory, as there is also in hell, there is punishment by fire, whether that fire is understood literally or metaphorically.” His own opinion is that it is corporeal fire.

DOCTRINE OF THE GREEK CHURCH.–“The Longer Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic, Eastern Church,” now the most authoritative standard of The Orthodox Graeco–Russian Church. On the 11th Article, Ques. 372–377.–“From death till the general resurrection the souls of the righteous are in light and rest, with a foretaste of eternal happiness; but the souls of the wicked are in a state the reverse of this. We know this because it is ordained that the perfect retribution according to works shall be received by the perfect man after the resurrection of the body and God’s last judgment.—2 Timothy 2:8 and 2 Corinthians 5:10. But that they have a foretaste of bliss is shown on the testimony of Jesus Christ, who says in the parable that the righteous Lazarus was immediately after death carried into Abraham’s bosom.—Luke 16:22; Php 1:23. But we remark of such souls as have departed with faith, but without having had time to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance, that they may be aided towards the attainment of a blessed resurrection by prayers offered in their behalf, especially such as are offered in union with the oblation of the bloodless sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, and by works of mercy done in faith for their memory.”

PROTESTANT DOCTRINE

“Articles of Smalcald” (Lutheran), p. 307.—“Purgatory, and whatever of religions rites, worship, or business pertains to it, is a mere disguise of the Devil.”

“Thirty–nine Articles of the Church of England,” Art. 22.—“The Romish doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, worshipping and adoration as well as of images as of relics, and also invocation of saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.”

“Shorter Catechism of West. Assembly,” Ques. 37.—“The souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness and do immediately pass into glory; and their bodies being still united to Christ, do rest in their graves till the resurrection.”

02.38. The Resurrection

Chapter 38 The Resurrection

1. What is the meaning of the phrase, “resurrection of the dead,” and “from the dead,” as used in Scripture ?

Αναστασις signifies etymologically (based on earliest known translations) “a rising or raising up.” It is used in Scripture to designate the future general raising, by the power of God, of the bodies of all men from the sleep of death.

2. What Old Testament passages bear upon this subject ?

Job 19:25-27; Psalms 49:15; Is. 26:l9; Daniel 12:1-3.

3. What are the principal passages bearing upon this subject in the New Testament ?

Matthew 5:29; Matthew 10:28; Matthew 27:52-53; John 5:28-29; John 6:39; Acts 2:25-34; Acts 13:34; Romans 8:11; Romans 8:22-23; Php 3:20-21; 1 Thessalonians 4:13-17, and 1 Corinthians 15:1-58,end.

4. What is the meaning of the phrases,σωμα ψυχικον natural body, andσωμα πνευματικον spiritual body, as used by Paul, 1 Corinthians 15:44? The word ψυχη when contrasted with πνευμα always designates the principle of animal life, as distinguished from the principle of intelligence and moral agency, which is the πνευμα. A ,σωμα ψυχικον translated natural body evidently means a body endowed with animal life, and adapted to the present condition of the soul, and to the present physical constitution of the world it inhabits. A σωμα πνευματικον translated spiritual body, is a body adapted to the use of the soul in its future glorified estate, and to the moral and physical conditions of the heavenly world, and to this end assimilated by the Holy Ghost, who dwells in it, to the glorified body of Christ.—1 Corinthians 15:45-48.

5. How does it appear that the same body is to rise that is deported in the grave ? The passages of Scripture which treat of this subject make it plain that the same bodies are to be raised that are deposited in the grave, by the phrases by which they designate the bodies raised:

1st, “our bodies,”Php 3:21;

2nd, “this corruptible”, 1 Corinthians 15:53-54;

3rd, “all who are in their graves,”John 5:28. (4th, “they who are asleep,”1 Thessalonians 4:13-17; 5th, “our bodies are the members of Christ,”1 Corinthians 6:15; 6th, our resurrection is to be because of and like that of Christ, which was of his identical body.–John 20:27.

6. How does it appear that the final resurrection is to be simultaneous and general ?

See below, Chap. 39., Questions 9 and 10.

7. What do the Scriptures teach concerning the nature of the resurrection body?

1st. It is to be spiritual.–1 Corinthians 15:44. See above, Question 4.

2nd. It is to be like Christ's body.—Php 3:21.

3rd. Glorious, incorruptible, and powerful.—1 Corinthians 15:54.

4th. It shall never die.—Revelation 21:4.

5th. Never be given in marriage. Matthew 22:30.

8. How may it be proved that the material body of Christ rose from from the dead ?

1st. Christ predicted it.–John 2:19-21.

2nd. His resurrection is referred to as a miraculous attestation of the truth of his mission, but unless his body rose literally there was nothing miraculous in his continued life.

3rd. The whole language of the inspired narratives necessarily implies this, the rolling away of the stone, the folding up of the garments, etc.

4th. He did not rise until the third day, which proves that it was a physical change, and not a mere continuance of spiritual existence.—1 Cor. 15:4.

5th. His body was seen, handled, and examined, for the space of forty days, in order to establish this very fact.—Luke 24:39. Dr. Hodge.

9. How can the materiality of Christ's resurrection body be reconciled with what is said as to the modes of its manifestation, and of its ascension into heaven ? The events of his suddenly appearing and vanishing from sight, recorded in Luke 24:31; John 20:19; Acts 1:9, were accomplished through a miraculous interference with the ordinary laws regulating material bodies, of the same kind precisely with many miracles which Jesus wrought in his body before his death, e.g., his walking on the sea. – Matthew 14:25; John 6:9-14.

10. How does the resurrection of Christ secure and illustrate that of his people ?

Body and soul together constitute the one person, and man in his entire person, and not his soul separately, is embraced in both the covenants of works and of grace, and in federal and vital union with both the first and the second Adam. Christ's resurrection secures ours—

1st. Because his resurrection seals and consummates his redemptive power; and the redemption of our persons involves the redemption of our bodies.—Romans 8:23.

2nd. Because of our federal and vital union with Christ. 1 Corinthians 15:21-22; 1 Thessalonians 4:14.

3rd. Because of his Spirit which dwells in us (Romans 8:11), making our bodies his members.—1 Corinthians 6:15.

4th. Because Christ by covenant is Lord both of the living and the dead.–Romans 14:9. This same federal and vital union of the Christian with Christ (see above, Chap. 31.) likewise causes the resurrection of the believer to be similar to, as well as consequent upon that of Christ.—1

Corinthians 15:49; Php 3:21; 1 John 3:2.

11. To what extent are objections of a scientific character against the doctrine of the resurrection of the body entitled to weight?

All truth is one, and of God, and necessarily consistent, whether revealed by means of the phenomena of nature or of the words of inspiration. On the other hand, it follows from our partial knowledge and often erroneous interpretation of the data both of science and revelation, that we often are unable to discern the harmonies of truths in reality intimately related. Nothing can be believed to be true which is clearly seen to be inconsistent with truth already certainly established. But, on the other hand, in the present stage of our development, the largest proportion of the materials of our knowledge rests upon independent evidence, and are received by us all as certain on their own respective grounds, although we fail as yet to reconcile each fact with every other in the harmonies of their higher laws. The principles of physical science are to be taken as true upon their own ground, i. e., so far as they are matured, and the testimony of revelation is to be taken as infallible truth on its own ground. The one may modify our interpretation of the other, but the most certain of all principles is that a matured science will always corroborate rightly interpreted revelation.

12. How may the identity of our future untie our present bodies be reconciled with 1 Corinthians 15:42; 1 Corinthians 15:50? In 1 Corinthians 15:42-44 this identity is expressly asserted. The body is to be the same, though changed in these several particulars.

1st. It is now subject to corruption, then incorruptible.

2nd. It is now dishonored, it will then be glorified.

3rd. It is now weak, it will then be powerful.

4th. It is now natural, i. e., adapted to the present condition of the soul and constitution of the world. It will then be spiritual, i. e., adapted to the glorified condition of the soul, and constitution of the “new heavens and new earth.”

1 Corinthians 15:50 declares simply that “flesh and blood,” that is, the present corruptible, weak, and depraved constitution of the body can not inherit heaven. Yet the passage as a whole clearly teaches, not the substitution of a new body, but the transformation of the old.

13. What facts does physiological science establish with respect to the perpetual changes that are going on in our present bodies, and what relation do these facts sustain to this doctrine ? By a ceaseless process of the assimilation of new material and excretion of the old, the particles composing our bodies are ceaselessly changing from birth to death, effecting, as it is computed, a change in every atom of the entire structure every seven years. Thus there will not be a particle in the organism of an adult which constituted part of his person when a boy, nor in that of the old man of that which belonged to him when of middle age. The body from youth to age is universally subject to vast changes in size, form, expression, condition, and many times to total change of constituent particles. All this is certain; but it is none the less certain that through all these changes the man possesses identically the same person from youth to age. This proves that neither the identity of the body of the same man from youth to age, nor the identity of our present with our resurrection bodies, consists in sameness of particles. If we are sure of our identity in the one

case, we need not stumble at the difficulties attending the other.

14. What objection to this doctrine is derived from the known fact of the dispersion and assimilation into other organisms of the particles of our bodies after death ? The instant the vital principle surrenders the elements of the body to the unmodified control of the laws of chemical affinity, their present combinations are dissolved and distributed throughout space, and they are taken up and assimilated by other animal and vegetable organisms. Thus the same particles have formed, at different times, part of the bodies of myriads of men, in the successive periods of the growth of individuals, and in successive generations. Hence it has been objected to the scriptural doctrine of the resurrection of the body, that it will be impossible to decide to which of the thousand bodies which these particles have formed part in turn, they should be assigned in the resurrection; or to reinvest each soul with its own body, when all the constituent elements of every body have been shared in common by many. We answer that bodily identity does not consist in sameness of constituent particles. See above, Question 13. Just as God has revealed to us through consciousness that our bodies are identical from infancy to age, although their constituent elements often change, he has, with equal certainty and reasonableness, revealed to us in his inspired word that our bodies, raised in glory, are identical with our bodies sown in dishonor, although their constituent particles may have been scattered to the ends of the earth.

15. What is essential to identity?

1st. “It is evident that identity depends upon different conditions in different cases. The identity of a stone or any other portion of unorganized matter consists in its substance and form. On the other hand, the identity of a plant from the seed to its maturity is, in a great measure, independent of sameness of substance or of form. Their identity appears to consist in each plant’s being one organized whole and in the continuity of the succession of its elements and parts. The identity of a picture does not depend upon the sameness of the particles of coloring matter of which it is composed, for these we may conceive to be continually changing, but upon the drawing, the tints, the light and shade, the expression, the idea which it embodies,” etc.

2nd. Bodily identity is not a conclusion drawn from the comparison, or combination of other facts, but it is itself a single irresolvable fact of consciousness. The child, the savage, the philosopher, are alike certain of the sameness of their bodies at different periods of their lives, and on the same grounds. This intuitive conviction, as it is not the result of science, so it is no more bound to give an account of itself to science, i. e., we are no more called upon to explain it before we believe it than we are to explain any other of the simple data of consciousness.

3rd. The resurrection of our bodies, although a certain fact of revelation, is to us, as yet, an unrealized experience, an unobserved phenomenon. The physical conditions, therefore, of the identity of our “spiritual bodies” with our “natural bodies,” we can not now possibly comprehend, since we have neither the experience, the observation, nor the revelation of the facts involved in such knowledge. This much, however, is certain as to the result—

1st. The body of the resurrection will be as strictly identical with the body of death, as the body of death is with the body of birth.

2nd. Each soul will have an indubitable intuitive consciousness that its new body is identical with the old.

3rd. Each friend shall recognize the individual characteristics of the soul in the perfectly transparent expression of the new body.—Dr. Hodge.

16. To what extent was the doctrine of the resurrection of the body held by the Jews? With the exception of some heretical sects, as the Sadducees, the Jews held this doctrine in the same sense in which we hold it now. This is evident—

1st. Because it was clearly revealed in their inspired writings, see above, Question 2.

2nd. It is affirmed in their uninspired writings.–Wis 3:6; Wis 3:13; Wis 4:15; 2Ma 7:9; 2Ma 7:14; 2Ma 7:23; 2Ma 7:29.

3rd. Christ in his discourses, instead of proving this doctrine, assumes it as recognized.–Luke 14:14; John 5:28-29.

4th. Paul asserts that both the ancient Jews (Hebrews 11:35), and his own contemporaries (Acts 24:15), believed this doctrine.

17. What early heretical sects in the Christian church rejected this doctrine?

All the sects bearing the generic designation of gnostic, and under various specific names embodying the leaven of oriental philosophy, which infested the church of Christ from the beginning for many centuries, believed, 1st, that matter is essentially vile, and the source of all sin and misery to the soul;

2nd, that complete sanctification is consummated only in the dissolution of the body and the emancipation of the soul;

3rd, that consequently any literal resurrection of:the body is repugnant to the spirit, and would be destructive to the purpose of the whole gospel.

18. What is the doctrine taught by Swedenborg on this subject?

It is substantially the same with that set forth by Professor Bush in his once famous book, “Anastasia.” They teach that the literal body is dissolved, and finally perishes in death. But by a subtle law of our nature an etherial, luminous body is eliminated out of the ψυχη(the seat of the nervous sensibility, occupying the middle link between matter and spirit), so that the soul does not go forth from its tabernacle of flesh a bare power of thought, but is clothed upon at once by this psychical body. This resurrection of the body, they pretend, takes place in every case immediately at death, and accompanies the outgoing soul.—See “Religion and Philosophy of Swedenborg,” Theophilus Parsons.

19. How do modern rationalists explain the passages of Scripture which relate to this subject ?

They explain them away, denying their plain sense, either, 1st, as purely allegorical modes of inculcating the truth of the continued existence of the soul after death; or, 2nd, as concessions to the prejudices and superstitions of the Jews.

02.39. The Second Advent and General Judgment.

Chapter 39 The Second Advent and General Judgment.

1. What is the meaning of the expressions “the coming,” or “the day of the Lord,” as used in both the Old and New Testaments ?

1st. for any special manifestation of God’s presence and power.—John 14:18; John 14:23; Isaiah 13:6; Jeremiah 46:10.

2nd, By way of eminence.

(1.) In the Old Testament, for the coming of Christ in the flesh, and the abrogation of the Jewish economy. Malachi 3:2; Malachi 4:5.

(2.) In the New Testament, for the second and final coming of Christ. The several terms referring to this last great event are,

1st, αποκαλυψσις, revelation.–1 Corinthians 1:7; 2 Thessalonians 1:7; 1 Peter 1:7; 1 Peter 1:13; 1 Peter 4:13.

2nd. παρουσια, presence, advent.—Matthew 24:3; Matthew 24:27; Matthew 24:37; Matthew 24:39;1 Corinthians 15:23;1 Thessalonians 2:1-20; 1 Thessalonians 3:13, 1 Thessalonians 4:15, 1 Thessalonians 5:23; 2 Thessalonians 2:1-9; James 5:7-8; 2 Peter 1:16; 2 Peter 3:4; 2 Peter 3:12; 1 John 2:28.

3rd. επιθανεια, appearance, manifestation.–2 Thessalonians 2:8; 1 Timothy 6:14; 2 Timothy 4:1; 2 Timothy 4:8; Titus 2:13. The time of that coming is designated as “the day of God.”2 Peter 3:12. “The day of the Lord.”—1 Thessalonians 5:2. “The day of the Lord Jesus, and of Jesus Christ.”—1 Corinthians 1:8; Php 1:6; Php 1:10; 2 Peter 3:10. “That day.”—2 Thessalonians 1:10; 2 Timothy 1:12; 2 Timothy 1:18. “The last day.”—John 6:39-54. “The great day,”“the day of wrath,” and “of judgment,” and “of revelation.”–Jude 1:6; Revelation 6:17; Romans 2:5; 2 Peter 2:9.

Christ is called ο ερχομενος, the coming one, with reference to both advents.—Matthew 21:9; Luke 7:19-20; Luke 19:38; John 3:31; Revelation 1:4; Revelation 4:8; Revelation 11:17.

2. Present the evidence that a literal personal advent of Christ still future is taught in the Bible.

1st. The analogy of the first advent. The prophecies relating to the one having been literally fulfilled by a personal coming, we may be certain that the perfectly similar prophecies relating to the other will be fulfilled in the same sense.

2nd. The language of Christ predicting such advent admits of no other rational interpretation. The coming itself, its manner and purpose are alike defined. He is to be attended with the hosts of heaven, in power and great glory. He is to come upon the occasion of the general resurrection and judgment, and for the purpose of consummating his mediatorial work, by the final condemnation

and perdition of all his enemies, and lay the acknowledgment and completed glorification of all his friends.—Matthew 16:27; Matthew 24:30; Matthew 25:31; Matthew 26:64; Mark 8:38; Luke 21:27.

3rd. The apostles understood these predictions to relate to a literal advent of Christ in person. They teach their disciples to form the habit of constantly looking forward to it, as a solemnizing motive to fidelity, and to encouragement and resignation under present trials. They teach that his coming will be visible and glorious, accompanied with the abrogation of the present gospel dispensation, the destruction of his enemies, the glorification of his friends, the conflagration of the world, and the appearance of the "new heaven and new earth." See the passages quoted under the preceding chapter, and Acts 1:11; Acts 3:19-21; 1 Corinthians 4:5; 1 Corinthians 11:26; 1 Corinthians 15:23; Hebrews 9:28; Hebrews 10:37.–Dr. Hodge's "Lecture."

3. What three modes of interpretation have been adopted in reference to Matthew 24:1-51; Matthew 25:1-46. ?

"It is to be remarked that these chapters contain an answer to three distinct questions.

1st. When the temple and city were to be destroyed.

2nd. What were to be the signs of Christ's coming ?

3rd. The third question related to the end of the world. The difficulty consists in separating the portions relating to these several questions. There are three methods adopted in the explanation of these chapters.

1st. The first assumes that they refer exclusively to the overthrow of the Jewish polity, and the establishment and progress of the gospel.

2nd. The second assumes that what is here said has been fulfilled in one sense in the destruction of Jerusalem, and is to be fulfilled in a higher sense at the last day.

3rd. The third supposes that some portions refer exclusively to the former event and others exclusively to the latter. It is plain that the first view is untenable, and whether the second or third view be adopted, the obscurity resting upon this passage can not properly be allowed to lead us to reject the clear and constant teaching of the new Testament with regard to the second personal and visible advent of the Son of God."–Dr. Hodge.

4. In what passages is the time of Christ's second advent declared to be unknown?

Matthew 24:36; Mark 13:32; Luke 12:40; Acts 1:6-7; 1 Thessalonians 5:1-3; 2 Peter 3:3-4; 2 Peter 3:10; Revelation 16:15.

5. What passages are commonly cited in proof that the apostles expected the second advent during their lives ?

Php 1:6; 1 Thessalonians 4:15; Hebrews 10:25; 1 Peter 1:5; James 5:8.

6. How may it be shown that they did not entertain such an expectation ?

1st. The apostles, as individuals, apart from their public capacity as inspired teachers, were subject to the common prejudices of their age and nation, and only gradually were brought to the

full knowledge of the truth. During Christ's life they expected that he would establish his kingdom in its glory at that time, Luke 24:21; and after his resurrection the first question they asked him was, "Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel ?"

2nd. In their inspired writings they have never taught that the second coming of their Lord was to occur in their lifetime, or at any fixed time whatever. They only taught (1) that it ought to be habitually desired, and (2). since it is uncertain as to time, that it should always be regarded as imminent.

3rd. As further revelations were vouchsafed to them, they learned, and explicitly taught, that the time of the second advent was not only uncertain, but that many events, still future, must previously occur, e. g., the anti–Christian apostasy, the preaching of the gospel to every nation, the fullness of the Genthes, the conversion of the Jews the millennial prosperity of the church, and the final defection.–Romans 11:15-32; 2 Corinthians 3:15-16; 2 Thessalonians 2:3. This is clear, because the coming of Christ is declared to be attended with the resurrection of the dead, the general judgment, the general conflagration, and the restitution of all things. See below, Question 9.

7. What is the Scriptural doctrine concerning the millennium ?

1st. The Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, clearly reveal that the gospel is to exercise an influence over all branches of the human family, immeasurably more extensive and more thoroughly transforming than any it has ever realized in time past. This end is to be gradually attained through the spiritual presence of Christ in the ordinary dispensation of Providence, and ministrations of his church.—Matthew 13:31-32; Matthew 28:19-20; Psalms 2:7-8; Psalms 22:27; Psalms 22:29; Psalms 72:8-11; Isaiah 2:2-3, Isaiah 11:6-9, Isaiah 60:12, Isaiah 66:23; Daniel 2:35; Daniel 2:44; Zechariah 9:10; Zechariah 14:9; Revelation 11:15.

2nd. The period of this general prevalency of the gospel will continue a thousand years, and is hence designated the millennium.—Revelation 20:2-7.

3rd. The Jews are to be converted to Christianity either at the commencement or during the continuance of this period. Zechariah 12:10; Zechariah 13:1; Romans 11:26-29; 2 Corinthians 3:15-16.

4th. At the end of these thousand years, and before the coming of Christ, there will be a comparatively short season of apostasy and violent conflict between the kingdoms of light and darkness.—Luke 17:26-30; 2 Peter 3:3-4; Revelation 20:7-9.

5th. Christ's advent, the general resurrection and judgment, will be simultaneous, and immediately succeeded by the burning of the old, and the revelation of the new earth and heavens. "Confession of Faith," Chaps. 32. and 33.

8. What is the view of those who maintain that Christ's coming will be "premillennial," and that he will reign personally upon the earth a thousand years before the judgment ?

1st. Many of the Jews, mistaking altogether the spiritual character of the Messiah's kingdom, entertained the opinion that as the church had continued two thousand years before the giving of the law so it would continue two thousand years under the law, when the Messiah would

commence his personal reign, which should, in turn, continue two thousand years to the commencement of the eternal Sabbath. They expected that the Messiah would reign visibly and gloriously in Jerusalem, as his capital, over all the nations of the earth, the Jews as his especial people, being exalted to pre–eminent dignity and privilege.

2nd. The Apostolical Fathers of the Jewish Christian branch of the church such as Barnabas, Hermes, and Papias, adopted it. It prevailed generally throughout the church from A. D. 150, to A. D. 250, being advocated by Irenaeus and Tertullian. Since that time the doctrine taught in this chapter has been the one generally recognized by the whole church, while Millenarianism or Chilianism has been confined to individuals and transient parties. Its advocates based their doctrine on the literal interpretation of Revelation 20:1-10, and held—

(1.) That after the development of the anti–Christian apostasy, at some time very variously estimated, Christ was suddenly to appear and commence his personal reign of a thousand years in Jerusalem. The dead in Christ (some say only the martyrs) were then to rise and reign with him in the world, the majority of whose inhabitants shall be converted, and live during this period in great prosperity and happiness, the Jews in the mean time being converted, and restored to their own land.

(2.) That after the thousand years there shall come the final apostasy for a little season, and then the resurrection of the rest of the dead, i. e., the wicked and their judgment and condemnation at the last day, the final conflagration, and new heavens and earth.

3rd. Modern premillenarians, while differing among themselves as to the details of their interpretations, agree substantially with the view just stated. Hence they are called premillenarians, because they believe the advent of Christ will occur before the Millennium.

9. What are the principal Scriptural arguments against this view ?

1st. The theory is evidently Jewish in its origin and Judaizing in its tendency.

2nd. It is not consistent with what the Scriptures teach.

(1.) As to the nature of Christ's kingdom, e. g., (a) that it is not of this world but spiritual, Matthew 13:11-44; John 18:36; Romans 14:17; (b) that it was not to be confined to the Jews Matthew 8:11-12; (c) that regeneration is the condition of admission to it, John 3:3; John 3:5; (d) that the blessings of the kingdom are purely spiritual, as pardon, sanctification, etc., Matthew 3:2; Matthew 3:11; Colossians 1:13-14.

(2.) As to the fact that the kingdom of Christ has already come. He has sat upon the throne of his Father David ever since his ascension.—Acts 2:29-36; Acts 3:13-15; Acts 4:26-28; Acts 5:29-31; Hebrews 10:12-13; Revelation 3:7-12. The Old Testament prophecies, therefore, which predict this kingdom, must refer to the present dispensation of grace, and not to a future reign of Christ on earth in person among men in the flesh.

3rd. The second advent is not to occur until the resurrection, when all the dead, both good and bad, are to rise at once. Daniel 12:2; John 5:28-29; 1 Corinthians 15:23; 1 Thessalonians 4:16; Revelation 20:11; Revelation 20:15. Only one passage (Revelation 20:1-10) is even apparently inconsistent with the fact here asserted. For the true interpretation of that passage, see next

question.

4th. The second advent is not to occur until the simultaneous judgment of all men, the good and the bad together. Matthew 7:21; Matthew 7:23; Matthew 13:30-43; Matthew 16:24; Matthew 16:27; Matthew 25:31-46; Romans 2:5; Romans 2:16; 1 Corinthians 3:12-15; 2 Corinthians 5:9-11; 2 Thessalonians 1:6-10; Revelation 20:11-15.

5th. The second advent is to be attended with the general conflagration and the generation of the "new heavens and the new earth."—2 Peter 3:7-13; Revelation 20:11; Revelation 21:1. "Brown on the Second Advent."

10. What considerations favor the spiritual and oppose the literal interpretation of Revelation 20:1-10. The spiritual interpretation of this difficult passage is as follows:Christ has in reserve for his church a period of universal expansion and of pre–eminent spiritual prosperity, when the spirit and character of the "noble army of martyrs" shall be reproduced again in the great body of God's people in an unprecedented measure, and when these martyrs shall, in the general triumph of their cause, and in the overthrow of that of their enemies, receive judgment over their foes and reign in the earth; while the party of Satan, "the rest of the dead," shall not flourish again until the thousand years be ended, when it shall prevail again for a little season. The considerations in favor of this interpretation of the passage are—

1st. It occurs in one of the most highly figurative books of the Bible.

2nd. This interpretation is perfectly consistent with all the other more explicit teachings of the Scriptures on the several poinits involved.

3rd. The same figure, viz., that of life again from the dead, is frequently used in Scripture to express the idea of the spiritual revival of the church.—Isaiah 26:19; Ezekiel 37:12-14; Hosea 6:1-3; Romans 11:15; Revelation 11:11. The considerations bearing against the literal interpretation of this passage are—

1st. That the pretended doctrine of two resurrections, i. e., first of the righteous, and then, after an interval of a thousand years, of the wicked, is taught nowhere else in the Bible, and this single passage in which it occurs is an obscure one. This is a strong presumption against the truth of the doctrine.

2nd. It is inconsistent with what the Scriptures uniformly teach as to the nature of the resurrection body, i. e., that it is to be "spiritual," not "natural," or "flesh and blood."—1 Corinthians 15:44. It is, on the contrary, an essential part of the doctrine associated with the literal interpretation of this passage, that the saints, or at least the martyrs, are to rise and reign a thousand years in the flesh, and in this world as at present constituted.

3rd. The literal interpretation of this passage contradicts the clear and uniform teaching of the Scriptures, that all the dead, good and bad, are to rise and be judged together at the second coming of Christ and the entire revolution of the present order of creation. See the Scripture testimonies collected under the preceding question.

11. Show that the future general conversion of the Jews is taught in Scripture? This Paul, in Romans 11:15-29, both asserts and proves from Old Testament prophecies, e. g., Isaiah 59:20;

Jeremiah 31:1-40. See also Zechariah 12:10; 1 Corinthians 3:15-16.

12. State the argument for and against the opinion that the Jews are to be restored to their own land ? The arguments in favor of that return are—

1st. The literal sense of many old Testament prophecies. Isaiah 11:11-12; Jeremiah 3:17; Jeremiah 16:14-15; Ezekiel 20:40-44; Ezekiel 34:11-31; Ezekiel 36:1-36; Hosea 3:4-5; Amos 9:11-15; Zechariah 10:6-10; Zechariah 14:1-20; Joel 3:1-17.

2nd. That the whole territory promised by God to Abraham has never at any period been fully possessed by his descendants, Genesis 15:18-21; Numbers 34:6-12, and renewed through Ezekiel, Ezekiel 47:1-23.

3rd. The land, though capable of maintaining a vast population, is as preserved unoccupied, evidently waiting for inhabitants.—See Keith's "Land of Israel."

4th. The Jews, though scattered among all nations, have been miraculously preserved a separate people, and evidently await a destiny as signal and peculiar as has been their history. The arguments against their return to the land of their fathers are—

1st. The New Testament is entirely silent on the subject of any such return, which would, be an inexplicable omission in the clearer revelation, if that event is really future.

2nd. The literal interpretation of the Old Testament prophecies concerned in this question would be most unnatural–

(1.) Because, if the interpretation is to be consistent, it must be literal in all its parts. Then it would, follow that David himself in person, must be raised to reign again in Jerusalem. Ezekiel 37:24, etc. Then the Levitical priesthood must be restored, and bloody sacrifices offered to God.—Ezekiel 40:1-49; Ezekiel 41:1-26; Ezekiel 42:1-20; Ezekiel 43:1-27; Ezekiel 44:1-31; Ezekiel 45:1-25; Ezekiel 46:1-24; Jeremiah 17:25,

2nd. Then must Jerusalem be the centre of government, the Jews a superior class in the Christian church, and all worshippers must come monthly and from Sabbath to Sabbath, from the ends of the earth to worship at the Holy City.—Isaiah 2:2-3; Isaiah 66:20-23; Zechariah 14:16-21.

(2.) Because the literal interpretation thus leads to the revival of the entire ritual system of the Jews, and is inconsistent with the spirituality of the kingdom of Christ.—See above, Question 9.

(3.) Because the literal interpretation of these passages is inconsistent with what the New Testament plainly teaches as to the abolition of all distinctions between the Jew and Genthe; the Jews, when converted, are to be grafted back into the same church. Romans 11:19-24; Ephesians 2:13-19.

(4.) Because this interpretation is inconsistent with what the New Testament teaches as to the temporary purpose, the virtual insufficiency, and the final abolition of the Levitical priesthood and their sacrifices, and of the infinite sufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ, and the eternity of his priesthood.-–Galatians 4:9-10; Galatians 5:4-8; Colossians 2:16-23; Hebrews 7:12-18; Hebrews 8:7-13; Hebrews 9:1-14.

3rd. On the other hand, the spiritual interpretation of these Old Testament prophecies—which regards them as predicting the future purity and extension of the Christian church, and as indicating these spiritual subjects by means of those persons, places, and ordinances of the old economy which were typical of them—is both natural and accordant to the analogy of Scripture. In the New Testament, Christians are called Abraham's seed, Galatians 3:29; Israelites, Galatians 6:16; Ephesians 2:12; Ephesians 2:19; comers to Mount Zion, Hebrews 12:22; citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem, Galatians 4:26; the circumcision, Php 3:3; Colossians 2:11, and in Revelation 2:9, they are called Jews. There is also a Christian priesthood and spiritual sacrifice.—1 Peter 2:5, 2 Peter 2:9; Hebrews 13:15-16; Romans 12:1. See Fairbairn's "Typology Appendix," Vol. 1.

13. Who is to be the judge of the world ?

Jesus Christ, in his official character as Mediator, in both natures, as the God–man. This is evident,

1st, because as judge he is called the "Son of Man,"Matthew 25:31-32, and the "man ordained by God."–Acts 17:31.

2nd. Because all judgment is said to be committed to him by the Father.–John 5:22; John 5:27.

3rd. Because it pertains to him as Mediator to complete and publicly manifest the salvation of his people, and the overthrow of his enemies, together with the glorious righteousness of his work in both respects, 2 Thessalonians 1:7-10; Revelation 1:7; and thus accomplish the "restitution of all things."–Acts 3:21. And this he shall do in his own person, that his glory may be the more manifest, the discomfiture of his enemies the more humiliating, and the hope and joy of his redeemed the more complete.

14. Who are to be the subjects of the judgment ?

1st. The whole race of Adam, without exception, of every generation, condition, and character, each individual appearing in the integrity of his person, "body, soul, and spirit." The dead will be raised, and the living changed simultaneously. Matthew 25:31-46; 1 Corinthians 15:51-52; 2 Corinthians 5:10; 1 Thessalonians 4:17; 2 Thessalonians 1:6-10; Revelation 20:11-15.

2nd. All evil angels. 2 Peter 2:4; Jude 1:6. Good angels appearing as attendants and ministers. –Matthew 13:41-42.

15. In what sense is it said that the saints shall judge the world.

See Matthew 19:28; Luke 22:29-30; 1 Corinthians 6:2-3; Revelation 20:4. In virtue of the union of believers with Christ, his triumph and dominion is theirs. They are joint heirs with him, and if they suffer with him they shall reign with him.—Romans 8:17; 2 Timothy 2:12. He will judge and condemn his enemies as head and champion of his church, all his members assenting to his judgment and glorying in his triumph.—Revelation 19:1-5. Hodge's "Commentary on 1st Cor."

16. Upon what principles will his judgment be dispensed ? The judge is figuratively represented (Revelation 20:12), after the analogy of human tribunals, as opening "books" in judgment according to the things written in which the dead are to be judged, and also "another book,""which is the book of life." The books first mentioned doubtless figuratively, represent the law or standard

according to which each one was to be judged, and the facts in his case, or “the works which he had done.” The “book of life” (see also Php 4:3; Revelation 3:5; Revelation 13:8; Revelation 20:15) is the book of God’s eternal electing love. Those whose names are found written in the “book of life” will be declared righteous on the ground of their participation in the righteousness of Christ. Their holy characters and good deeds, however, will he publicly declared as the evidences of their election, of their relation to Christ, and of the glorious work of Christ in them.—Matthew 13:43; Matthew 25:34-40.

Those whose names are not found written in “the book of life” will be condemned on the ground of the evil “deeds they have done in the body,” tried by the standard of God’s law, not as that law has been ignorantly conceived of by each, but as it has been more or less fully and clearly revealed by the Judge himself to each severally. The heathen who has sinned without the written law “shall be Judged without the law,”i. e., by the law written upon his heart, which made him a law unto himself.–Luke 12:47-48; Romans 2:12-15. The Jew, who “sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law.”—Romans 2:12. Every individual dwelling under the light of the Christian revelation shall be judged in strict accordance with the whole will of God as made known to him, all of the special advantages of every kind enjoyed by him individually modifying the proportion of his responsibility.—Matthew 11:20-24; John 2:19. The secrets of all hearts, the inward states and hidden springs of action, will be brought in as the subject matter of judgment, as well as the actions themselves, Ecclesiastes 12:14; 1 Corinthians 4:5; and publicly declared to vindicate the justice of the Judge, and to make manifest the shame of the sinner.—Luke 8:17; Luke 12:2-3; Mark 4:22. Whether the sins of the saints will be brought forward at the judgment or not is a question not settled by the Scriptures, though debated by theologians. If they should be, we are sure that it will be done only with the design and effect of enhancing the glory of the Savior and the comfort of the saved.

17. What do the Scriptures reveal concerning the future destruction of our earth by fire? The principal passages bearing upon this point are Psalms 102:26-27; Isaiah 51:6; Romans 8:19-23; Hebrews 12:26-27; 2 Peter 3:10-13; Revelation 20:1-15; Revelation 21:1-27

Many of the older theologians thought that these passages indicated that the whole existing physical universe was to be destroyed. This view is now universally discarded. Some held that this earth is to be annihilated. The most common and probable opinion is that at “the restitution of all things,”Acts 3:21, this earth, with its atmosphere, is to be subjected to intense heat, which will radically change its present physical condition, introducing in the place of the present an higher order of things, which shall appear as a “new heavens and a new earth,” wherein “the creature itself, also, shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God,”Romans 8:19-23, and wherein the constitution of the new works will be adapted to the “spiritual” or resurrection bodies of the saints, 1 Corinthians 15:44, to be the scene of the heavenly society, and, above all, to be the palace–temple of the God–man forever.—Ephesians 1:14; Revelation 5:9-10; Revelation 21:1-5. See also Fairbairn’s “Typology,” Vol. 1., Part 2., Chap. 2., sec. 7.

18. What should be the moral effect of the Scripture doctrine of Christ’s second advent ?

Christians ought thereby to be comforted when in sorrow, and always stimulated to duty.—Php 3:20; Colossians 3:4-5; James 5:7; 1 John 3:2-3. It is their duty also to love, watch, wait for, and

hasten unto the coming of their Lord.—Luke 12:35; Luke 12:37; 1 Corinthians 1:7-8; Php 3:20; 1 Thessalonians 1:9-10; 2 Timothy 4:8; 2 Peter 3:12; Revelation 22:20.

Unbelievers should be filled with fearful apprehension, and with all their might they should seek place Cor. immediate repentance.—Mark 13:35; Mark 13:37; 2 Peter 3:9-10; Jude 1:14-15. Brown's "Second Advent."

576. AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS OF CHURCH DOCTRINE

Augustine ("De Civitate Dei," 20, 7) states, that he once held the doctrine of a millenarian sabbath, but then rejected it and advocates the doctrine of this chapter, which has thenceforward prevailed in the Roman Church.

"Augsburg Confession," Pt. 1, Art. 17.—"They also teach that Christ will appear at the and of the world for judgment, and that he will resuscitate all the dead, and that he will give to the pious elect eternal life and perpetual joy, but condemn wicked men and devils that they shall be tormented without end. They condemn the Anabaptists, who believe that there will be an end of the future punishment of lost men and devils. And they condemn others who scatter Jewish opinions, to the effect that before the resurrection of the dead the pious will occupy the kingdom of the world, and the wicked be everywhere in subjection."

"The English Confession of Edward VI."—"Those who endeavor to recall the fable of the Millenarians, oppose the sacred Scriptures, 3rd, precipitate themselves into Jewish insanities."

"Belgic Confession," Art, 37.—"Lastly, we believe, from the word of God that our Lord Jesus Christ will return from heaven bodily and visibly, and with the highest glory, when the time predetermined by God, but unknown to all creatures, shall arrive, and the number of the elect be complete. . . . At that time all who have heretofore died on the earth shall arise."

"Westminster Confession Chaps. 32 and 33; "Larger Cat., Ques. 87–89.–These teach—1. At the last day shall be a general resurrection of the dead both of the just and of the unjust. 2. All found alive shall be immediately changed. 3. Immediately after the resurrection shall follow the general and final judgment of all angels and men, good and bad. 4. That the date of this day and hour is purposely kept secret by God. In Ques. 53–56, we are further taught, that Christ's second coming will not occur until "the last day,""the end of the world," and that he will then come "to judge the world in righteousness."

02.40. Heaven and Hell

Chapter 40

Heaven and Hell

1. What is the New Testament usage as to the termsουρανος ,“heaven”, andτα επουρανια , “heavenly places ?”

Ουρανος is used chiefly in three senses.

1st. The upper air where the birds fly.—Matthew 8:20; Matthew 24:30.

2nd. The region in which the stars revolve.—Acts 7:42; Hebrews 11:12.

3rd. The abode of Christ’s human nature, the scene of the special manifestation of divine glory, and of the eternal blessedness of the saints.—Hebrews 9:24; 1 Peter 3:22. This is sometimes called the “third heaven.”—2 Corinthians 12:2 d. The phrases “new heaven” , and “new earth”, in contrast with “first heavens,” and “first earth,”2 Peter 3:7, 2 Peter 3:13; Revelation 21:1, refer to some unexplained change which will take place in the final catastrophe, by which God will revolutionize our portion of the physical universe, cleansing it from the stain of sin, and qualifying it to be the abode of blessedness. For the usage with regard to the phrase “kingdom of heaven,” see above, Chap. 27., Question 5. The phrase τα επουρανια is translated sometimes, “heavenly things,”John 3:12, where it signifies the mysteries of the unseen spiritual world, and sometimes “heavenly places,”Ephesians 1:3; Ephesians 2:6, where it means the state into which a believer is introduced at his regeneration; see also Ephesians 1:20, where it means the “third heavens”; and Ephesians 6:12, where it signifies indefinitely the supermundane universe.

2. What are the principal terms, both literal and figurative, which are used in Scripture to designate the future blessednes of the saints ?

Literal terms:“life, eternal life and life everlasting.—Matthew 7:14; Matthew 19:16; Matthew 19:29; Matthew 25:46. Glory, the glory of God, an eternal weight of glory.—Romans 2:7; Romans 2:10; Romans 5:2; 2 Corinthians 4:17. Peace. Romans 2:10. Salvation, and eternal salvation.—Hebrews 5:9.”

Figurative terms:“Paradise.—Luke 23:43; 2 Corinthians 12:4; Revelation 2:7. Heavenly Jerusalem.—Galatians 4:26; Revelation 3:12. Kingdom of heaven, heavenly kingdom, eternal kingdom, kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world.—Matthew 25:34; 2 Timothy 4:18; 2 Peter 1:11. Eternal inheritance.—1 Peter 1:4; Hebrews 9:15. The blessed are said to sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to be in Abraham’s bosom, Luke 16:22; Matthew 8:11; to reign with Christ, 1 Timothy 2:11-12; to enjoy a Sabbath or rest, Hebrews 4:10-11.”—Kitto’s “Bib. Ency.”

3. What is revealed with respect to heaven as a place?

All the Scripture representations of heaven involve the idea of a definite place, as well as of a state of blessedness. Of that place, however, nothing more is revealed than that it is defined by the local presence of Christ's finite soul and body, and that it is the scene of the pre–eminent manifestation of God's glory. John 17:24; 2 Corinthians 5:9; Revelation 5:6. From such passages as Romans 8:19-23; 2 Peter 3:5-13; Revelation 21:1, it appears not improbable that after the general destruction of the present form of the world by fire, which shall accompany the judgment, this works will be reconstituted, and gloriously adapted to be the permanent residence of Christ and his church. As there is to be a "spiritual body," there may be in the same sense a spiritual world, that is, a world, adapted to be the theatre of the glorified spirits of the saints made perfect. As nature was cursed for man's sake, and the creature, through him, made subject to vanity, it may be that they shall share in his redemption and exaltation.—See Fairhairn's "Typology," Part 2., Chap. 2., sec. 7.

4. Wherein does the blessedness of heaven consist as far as revealed ?

1st. Negatively, in perfect deliverance from sin, and from all its evil consequences, physical, moral, and social.—Revelation 7:16-17; Revelation 21:4; Revelation 21:27.

2nd. Positively.

(1.) In the perfection of our nature, both material and spiritual; the full development and harmonious exercise of all our faculties, intellectual and moral, and in the unrestrained progress thereof to eternity.—1 Corinthians 13:9-12; 1 Corinthians 15:45-49; 1 John 3:2.

(2.) In the sight of our blessed Redeemer, communion with his person, and fellowship in all his glory and blessedness, and through him with saints and angels. John 17:24; 1 John 1:3; Revelation 3:21; Revelation 21:3-5.

(3.) In that "beatific vision of God," which, consisting in the ever increasingly clear discovery of the divine excellence lovingly apprehended transforms the soul into the same image, from glory unto glory.—Matthew 5:8; 2 Corinthians 3:18. In meditating upon what is revealed of the conditions of heavenly existence two errors are to be avoided:

1st, the extreme of regarding the mode of existence experienced by the saints in heaven as too nearly analogous to that of our earthly life;

2nd, 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 conception 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 conceptions 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.

1st. The following must be changed:(1) 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.

2nd. The following elements are essential, and therefore unchangeable.

(1.) Man will continue ever to exist, as compounded of two natures, 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 only mediately, i. e., 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 fulness 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 preceding 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 far as they are necessarily modified (not lost) by the change.

(7.) Man's life is essentially an eternal progress towards 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 (1 Corinthians 12:5-28), 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.—Matthew 16:27; Romans 2:6; 1 Corinthians 12:4-28.

5. What are the principal terms, literal and figurative, which are applied in Scripture to the future condition of the reprobate? As a place, it is sometimes literally designated by αιδης, Hades, and sometimes by γεεννα, both translated hell.—Matthew 5:22; Matthew 5:29-30; Luke 16:23. Also by the phrase, "place of torment."—Luke 16:28. As a condition of suffering, it is literally designated by the phrases, "wrath of God,"Romans 2:5, and "second death,"Revelation 21:8.

Figurative terms.—Everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.—Matthew 25:41. The hell of fire, where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.—Mark 9:44. The lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.—Revelation 21:8. Bottomless pit.—Revelation 9:2. The dreadful nature of this abode of the wicked is implied in such expressions as "outer darkness," the place "where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth,"Matthew 8:12; "I am tormented in this flame,"Luke 16:24; "unquenchable fire,"Luke 3:17; "furnace of fire,"Matthew 13:42; "blackness of

darkness,”Jude 1:13; “torment in fire and brimstone,”Revelation 14:10; “the smoke of their torment ascendeth forever and ever, and they have no rest day nor night,”Revelation 14:11.—Kitto’s “Bib. Ency.”

6. What do the Scriptures teach as to the nature of future punishments ? The terms used in Scripture to describe these sufferings are evidently figurative, yet they certainly establish the following points. These sufferings will consist—

1st. In the loss of all good, whether natural, as granted through Adam, or gracious, as offered through Christ.

2nd. In all the natural consequences of unrestrained sin, judicial abandonment, utter alienation from God and the awful society of lost men and devils.—2 Thessalonians 1:9.

3rd. In the positive infliction of torment, God’s wrath and curse descending upon both the moral and physical nature of its objects. The Scriptures also establish the fact that these sufferings must be—

1st. Inconceivably dreadful in degree.

2nd. Endless in duration.

3rd. Various in degree, proportionately to the deserts of the subject.—Matthew 10:15; Luke 12:48.

7. What is the usage of the words,αιων , eternity, andαιωνιος , eternal, in the New Testament, and the argument thence derived establishing the endless duration of future punishment ?

1st. The Greek language possesses no more emphatic terms with which to express the idea of endless duration than these.

2nd. Although they are sometimes employed in the New Testament to designate limited duration, yet, in the vast majority of instances, they evidently designate unlimited duration.

3rd. They are used to express the endless duration of God.

(1.) αιων is thus used, 1 Timothy 1:17, and as applied to Christ, Revelation 1:18.

(2.). αιωνιος is thus used, Romans 16:26, and as applied to the Holy Ghost.–Hebrews 9:14.

4th. They are used to express the endless duration of the future happiness of the saints.

(1.) αιων is thus used.—John 6:57-58; 2 Corinthians 9:9.

(2.) αιωνιος is thus used.—Matthew 19:29; Mark 10:30; John 3:15; Romans 2:7.

5th. In Matthew 25:46, the very same word is used in a single clause to define at once the duration of the future happiness of the saints, and the misery of the lost. Thus the Sciiptures do expressly declare that the duration of the future misery of the lost is to be in precisely the same sense unending, as is either the life of God, or the blessedness of the saints. See the learned independent, and conclusive critical examination of the New Testament usage of these words by the late Prof. Moses Stuart, “Stuart’s Essays on Future Punishment,” published Presby. Board of Publication.

8. What evidence for the truth on this subject is furnished by the New Testament usage of the word αιδιος ? This word, formed from αει, always, forever, signifies, in classical Greek, eternal. It occurs only twice in the New Testament Romans 1:20, “even his eternal power and Godhead,” and Jude 1:6, “Angels reserved in everlasting chains.” But lost men share the fate of lost angels.—Matthew 25:41, Revelation 20:10. Thus the same word expresses the duration of the Godhead and of the sufferings of the lost.

9. What other evidence do the Scriptures furnish on this subject ?

1st. There is nothing in the Scriptures which even by the most remote implication, suggests that the sufferings of the lost shall ever end.

2nd. The constant application to the subject of such figurative language as, “fire that shall not be quenched,”“fire unquenchable,”“the worm that never dies,”“bottomless pit,” the necessity of paying the “uttermost farthing,”“the smoke of their torment arising forever and ever,”Luke 3:17; Mark 9:45-46; Revelation 14:10-11, is consistent only with the conviction that God wills us to believe on his authority that future punishments are literally endless. It is said of:those who commit the unpardonable sin that they shall never be forgiven, “neither in this world, nor in that which is to come.”—Matthew 12:32.

It is argued that this language is figurative, and the dictum is quoted “Theologia symbolica non est demonstrativa ” (Symbolical theology is not demonstrative). This is true. But of what are these the figures? What does God intend to signify by such symbols? They may unquestionably he pulled to pieces severally, and their meaning brought into doubt in detail. But it must be remembered—

(1.) That this language is characteristic of all God’s revelations to us of the future of those who die impenitent. Such descriptions color uniformly the whole presentation.

(2.) The Bible was intended for popular instruction. Hence the obvious meaning must have been the one intended to be conveyed, and hence the one to which the divine veracity is pledged. This is especially a weighty consideration in the case of this doctrine, because–(a.) It is a practical one of personal concernment. (b.) The language occurs frequently, and strikes the eye of every reader. (c.) The entire historical church (with only individual exceptions) have, as a matter of fact, interpreted it in the sense of endless suffering. And this in spite of the constant and tremendous pressure of human desires toward the opposite conclusion.

10. What presumption on this subject is afforded by reason and experience ? The Scriptures teach us—

(1.) That man is dead in sin and morally impotent.

(2.) That repentance and faith are wrought in the soul by the Holy Ghost. Experience teaches us that repentance and faith are as duties exceedingly difficult under the most favorable conditions. Reason and experience unite in teaching us that they become more difficult and unusual the longer a person lives and the more definitely his moral character and habits are fixed.

1st. The most favorable possible conditons are afforded in this life. Youth, immature character, the word and the Spirit, and the providence of God and the Christian Church. Supernatural demonstrations and purgatorial sufferings would have no equal moral effect. “If they hear not

Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."—Luke 16:31.

2nd. The law of habit and fixed moral character leads to the conclusion, that the hope of a favorable change must rapidly decrease in proportion as it is delayed.

11. What two views on this subject have been held by different parties in opposition to the faith of the whole Christian Church, and the clear teaching of God's word ?

I. That of the total extinction of the being of the finally reprobate, as the sentence of the "second death," after the last Judgment. This doctrine is styled popularly "The Annihilation of the Wicked," and by its advocates "Conditional Immortality." It has been advocated ably in "Debt and Grace as elated to the Doctrine of a Future Life," by C. F. Hudson, and in "The Duration and Nature of Future Punishment," by Henry Constable, and "View of Scripture Revelation concerning a Future State," by Archb. Whately, and in "Life in Christ," by Edward White.

They argue that the word "death" means always "cessation of being", and "eternal destruction" means always the "putting out of existence."

We answer—

(1.) They fail utterly in their attempt to show that the words and phrases cited ever have, and much more that they always have, the sense contended for.

(2.) Their doctrine is in plain contradiction of the uniform representation of Scripture as to the ultimate state of the finally impenitent as illustrated above, Ques. 9.

(3.) Their doctrine is in contradiction of the natural and universal instinct of immortality witnessed to by the religions and literatures of all nations, whether heathen, Jewish or Christian.

II. The opinion of those who agree in general in teaching the future restoration of sinners after an indefinite period of purifying discipline subsequent to death, whether in the intermediate state or after the judgment (see above, Ch. 37., Ques. 21). This view rests,

(1.) upon a class of texts presumed to teach the restitution of all things as Acts 3:21; Ephesians 1:10; Colossians 1:19-20, etc.

(2.) Upon what they claim to be a moral intuition that endless punishment would, be unworthy of God.

We ANSWER—

1st. The passages of Scripture upon which the argument is based would be consistent with this view of ultimate universal salvation, if there were no explicit statements of Scripture to the contrary. Each class of Scripture must be interpreted in view of the other. And it is self–evident that the general and indefinite must be ruled by the definite and explicit. It is an axiom that the phrase "all" and "all things" include more or less according to the subject. We gladly admit

(1) that ALL in Christ shall be made alive, and (2). that he will be made head of ALL THINGS absolutely without exception, in the sense that the entire universe, including friends and foes, shall be subjected to his royal supremacy, all revolt subdued, and each class put into its own

sphere.—See below, Ques. 14.

2nd. The “intuitions” upon which the doctrine is founded are shown below, Ques. 12 and 13, not to be trustworthy.

3rd. See above, Ques. 10, as the hope of moral reformation in another life is not accordant with the representations of Scripture, so it is not confirmed by the lessons of reason and experience.

12. What objections are urged against this doctrine derived from the justice of God ? The justice of God requires—

(1.) That none should suffer for that for which they are not responsible.

(2.) That punishment should in every case be exactly proportioned to the guilt of the subject. But it is objected—

1st. Multitudes in Christian as well as in heathen lands are not responsible for their impenitency, because they have never in their whole lives had an opportunity of knowing or of receiving Christ.

We ANSWER—that the direct statements of the Bible, the whole analogy of the Christian system, and the experience of all Christians, unite in affirming that all human nature is guilty and deserving of the wrath and curse of God anterior to the gift or the rejection of Christ. If it were not so Christ need not have been given to expiate guilt. If it were not so Christ would be “dead in vain,” and salvation would, be of debt and not of GRACE.

It is objected—

2nd. No sin of a finite creature can deserve an infinite punishment, but all endless punishment is infinite.

We ANSWER—that the word infinite in this connection is misleading. It is plain that endless sin deserves endless punishment and that is all the Scriptures or the Church teach. One sin deserves the wrath and curse of God. He is under no obligation in justice to provide a redemption. The instant a soul sins it is cut off from the communion and life of God. As long as it continues in that state it will continue to sin. As long as it continues to sin, it will continue to deserve his wrath and curse. It is obvious that the sinful tempers and conduct indulged in hell will deserve and receive punishment as strictly as those previously indulged in this life. Otherwise the monstrous principle would, be true that the worst a sinner becomes the less is he worthy of blame or punishment.

It is objected—

3rd. The infinite does not admit of degrees, yet the guilt of different sinners is various.

We ANSWER—this is a dishonest cavil. It is plain that sufferings alike endless may vary indefinitely in degree.

It is objected—

4th. That the moral difference between the lowest saint saved and the most amiable sinner lost may be imperceptible, yet the difference of destiny is infinite.

We ANSWER—that this is all true, but the ground of the treatment of the most unworthy believer is the righteousness of Christ, and the ground of the treatment of the least unworthy unbeliever is his own character and conduct.

13. What objection drawn from the benevolence of God is urged against this doctrine?

It is claimed—

1st. That the benevolence of God prompts him to do all in his power to promote their happiness. And as we have no right to limit that power, we are warranted to hope that he will ultimately secure the happiness of all.

We ANSWER—

(1.) God's benevolence prompts him to secure the happiness of all his creatures as far as that is consistent with his other attributes of wisdom, holiness, and justice.

(2.) We have constant experience that he does inflict upon his creatures evils which have no tendency and no influence in promoting the ultimate happiness of the individuals concerned. (3) The benevolence of the supreme Moral Governor, as concerned for the peace and purity of the universe, concurs with his justice in demanding the execution of the full penalty of the law upon all law–breakers, especially upon all who have aggravated their guilt by the rejection of his crucified Son.

It is claimed—

2nd. That the cultivated intuitions of Christian men assure them that it is inconsistent with the moral perfections of God first to bring into existence immortal beings under conditions common to the majority of men, and then to doom them to an after–life of endless misery.

We ANSWER—

(1.) The permission of sin in general is a mystery. The before birth forfeiture of human beings in Adam is a mystery. But every enlightened human being knows himself to be without excuse, and worthy of God's wrath.

(2.) God has shown his sense of the terrible guilt of men by the penalty he executed upon his own Son, when he suffered in our place.

(3.) It is absurd for us to claim that our intuitions are adequate to determine what it will be right for the Moral Governor of all the universe to do with finally impenitent sinners. Doubtless righteousness in him is precisely what righteousness is in a perfectly righteous man. But we do not know all the conditions of the case, and our "intuitions" are darkened by sin (Hebrews 3:13). Hence our only source of reliable knowledge is the word of God, and that, as we have seen, gives us no ground to hope for repentance beyond the grave.

Second. It is absolutely cruel to follow the example of the devil with Eve in persuading the people that after all God may be more benevolent than the language of his word implies (Genesis 3:3-4).

14. What argument for the future restoration of all rational creatures to holiness and happiness is founded upon Romans 5:18-19; 1 Corinthians 15:22-28; Ephesians 1:10; Colossians 1:19-20? In

regard to Romans 5:18, it is argued that the phrase “all men” must have precisely the same extent of application in the one clause as in the other. We answer,

1st, the phrase “all men” is often used in Scripture in connections which necessarily restrict the sense.—John 3:26; John 12:32.

2nd. In this case the phrase “all men” is evidently defined by the qualifying phrase, ver. 17, who have received abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness.

3rd. This contrast between the “all men” in Adam and the “all men” in Christ is consistent with the analogy of the whole gospel In regard to 1 Corinthians 15:22, the argument is the same as that drawn from Romans 5:18. From 1 Corinthians 15:25-28 it is argued that the great end of Christ’s mediatorial reign must be the restoration of every creature to holiness and blessedness. To this we answer,

1st, this is a strained interpretation put upon these words, which they do not necessarily bear, and which is clearly refuted by the many direct testimonies we have cited from Scripture above.

2nd. It is inconsistent with the scope of Paul’s subject in this passage. He says that from eternity to the ascension God reigned absolutely. From the ascension to the restitution of all things God reigns in the person of the God–man as Mediator. From the restitution to eternity God will again reign directly as absolute God. The ultimate salvation of all creatures is argued also from Ephesians 1:10; Colossians 1:19-20. In both passages, however, the “all things” signify the whole company of angels and redeemed men, who are gathered under the dominion of Christ. Because, 1st, in both passages the subject of discourse is the church, not the universe;

2nd, in both passages the “all things” is limited by the qualifying phrases, “the predestinated,”“we who first trusted in Christ,”“the accepted in the beloved,”“if ye continue in the faith,” etc., etc. See Hodge’s “Commentaries on Romans, 1st Corinthians, and Ephesians.”

15. What opinions have prevailed among extreme Arminians on this subject ? From their fundamental principles as to the relation of ability to responsibility, they must hold that none can perish who have not in some form and degree or another had an opportunity of availing themselves of salvation through Christ. In order to avoid the obvious inferences from the broad facts of the case, some have supposed that God may extend the probation of some beyond this life.—Scot’s “Christian Life.”

Limborch (Lib. 4., 100. 11.) says, that probably all who make a good use of their light in this world will be saved, but if we reject this, rather than believe that the divine goodness could condemn to hell fire these(the ignorant) it appears better to hold that as there is a threefold estate of mankind in this life,—believers, of unbelievers, and of the ignorant,—so there is also a threefold estate after this life:of eternal life for believers, of infernal sufferings for unbelievers, and besides these the status ignorantium(state of the ignorant).

02.41. Sacraments

Chapter 41

Sacraments

1. What is the etymology (linguistic development) and what the classical and patristic usage of the word “sacramentum ?”

1st. It is derived from sacro, are, to make sacred, dedicate to Gods or sacred uses.

2nd. In its classical usage it signified—

(1.) That by which a person binds himself to another to perform any thing.

(2.) Thence a sum deposited with the court as pledge, and which if forfeited, was devoted to sacred uses.

(3.) Also an oath, especially a soldier’s oath of faithful consecration to his country’s service.—Ainsworth’s “Dic.”

3rd. The Fathers used this word in a conventional sense as equivalent to the Greek μυστηεριον, a mystery, i. e., something unknown until revealed, and hence an emblem, a type, a rite having some latent spiritual meaning known only to the initiated, or instructed. The Greek fathers applied the term μυστηεριον to the Christian ordinances of baptism and the Lord’s Supper, inasmuch as these rites had a spiritual significance, and were thus a form of revelation of divine truth. The Latin fathers used the word “sacramentum ” as a Latin word, in its own proper sense, for any thing sacred in itself or having the power of binding, or consecrating men, and in addition they used it as the equivalent of the Greek word μυστηεριον, i. e., in the entirely different sense of a revealed truth, or a sign or symbol revealing a truth otherwise hidden. This fact has given to the usage of this word “sacramentum,” in the scholastic theology, an injurious latitude and indefiniteness of meaning. Thus in Ephesians 3:3-4; Ephesians 3:9; Ephesians 5:32; 1 Timothy 3:16; Revelation 1:20, the word μυστηεριον truly bears the sense of “the revelation of a truth undiscoverable by reason,” and it is translated in such passages in the English version, mystery, and in the Latin vulgate, “sacramentum.” Thus the Romish church uses the same word in two entirely different senses, applying it indifferently to baptism and the Lord’s Supper “as binding ordinances”, and to the union of believers with Christ as a revealed truth.—Ephesians 5:32. And hence they absurdly infer that matrimony is a sacrament.

2. What is the definition of a sacrament as given by the Fathers the Schoolmen, the Romish Church, the Church of England, and in our own Standards?

1st. Augustine’s definition is “Signum rei sacrae,”or “Sacramentum est invisibilis gratiae visibile signum, ad nostram justificationem institutum;”“accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum.”

2nd. Victor of St. Hugo:“Sacramentum est visibilis forma invisibilis gratiae in eo collatae.”

3rd. The Council of Trent:“A sacrament is something presented to the senses, which has the power, by divine institution, not only of signifying, but also of efficiently conveying grace.”–“Cat. Rom.” Part 2., Chap. 1., Q. 6.

4th. The Church of England, in the 25th article of religion, affirms that “Sacraments instituted by Christ are not only the badges and tokens of the profession of Christian men, but rather they be certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace, and of God’s good will towards us, by the which he doth work inwardly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.”

5th. The “Westminster Assembly’s Larger Cat.”, Q. 162 and 163, affirms that a “Sacrament is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ in his church, to signify, seal, and exhibit to those who are within the covenant of grace the benefits of his mediation, to increase their faith and all other graces, to oblige them to obedience, to testify and cherish their love and communion with one another, and to distinguish them from those that are without.” The parts of a sacrament are two, the one an outward and sensible sign used according to Christ’s own appointment; the other an inward spiritual grace thereby signified.

3. On what principles is such a definition to be constructed ?

1st. It is to be remembered that the term “sacrament” does not occur in the Bible.

2nd. From the extreme latitude with which this term has been used, both in the sense proper to it as a Latin word, and in that attributed to it as the conventional equivalent of the Greek word μυστηριον it is evident that no definition of a gospel ordinance can be arrived at by a mere reference either to the etymology (linguistic development) or ecclesiastical usage of the word “sacramentum.”

3rd. The definition of a class of gospel ordinances can be properly formed only by a comparison of all the Scriptures teach concerning the origin, nature, and design of those ordinances universally recognized as belonging to that class, and thus by determining those essential elements which are common to each member of the class, and which distinguish them as a class from all other divine ordinances.

4th. Those ordinances which are “universally recognized” as sacraments are baptism and the Lord’s Supper. Thomas Aquinas agreed with other theologians, “Summa” P. 3., Qu. 62, Art. 5, in regarding baptism and the Lord’s Supper as “potissima sacramenta.” —Hagenbach. The true question then is, Are there any other divine ordinances having the essential characteristics which are common to baptism and the Lord’s Supper ?

4. How many sacraments do Romanists make, and how may the controversy between then, and the Protestants be decided ? The Roman church teaches that there are seven sacraments, viz., baptism, confirmation, the Lord’s Supper, penance, extreme unction, orders, marriage.

We maintain, however, that only baptism and the Lord’s Supper can be properly embraced under either the Protestant or the Catholic definitions of a sacrament, as given above, Question 2.

1st. Confirmation, penance, and extreme unction are not divine institutions, having no warrant whatever in Scripture.

2nd. That marriage instituted by God in Paradise, and ordination to the gospel ministry instituted by Christ, although both divine institutions, are evidently not ordinances of the same kind with baptism and the Lord's Supper, and do not meet the conditions of either definitions of a sacrament, since they neither signify nor convey any inward grace.

5. What two things are included in every sacrament ?

1st. "An outward visible sign used according to Christ's own appointment;

2nd, an inward spiritual grace thereby signified."—"Larger Catechism," Q. 163. See below, "Apol. Aug. Confession" (Hase), p. 267. The Romanists, in the language of the Schoolmen, distinguish between the matter and the form of a sacrament. The matter is that part of the sacrament subjected to the senses, and significant of grace, e. g., the water, and the act of applying the water in baptism, and the bread and wine, and the acts of breaking the bread, and pouring out the wine in the Lord's Supper. The form is the divine word used by the minister in administering the elements, devoting them thus to the office of signifying grace.

6. What, according to the Romanists, is the relation between the sign and the grace signified ?

They hold that in consequence of the divine institution, and in virtue of the "power of the Omnipotent which exists in them," the grace signified is contained in the very nature of the sacraments themselves, so that it is always conferred, ex opere operato(i. e., ex vi ipsius actionis sacramentalis), upon every receiver of them who does not oppose a positive obstacle thereto. Thus they understand the "sacramental union," or relation between the sign and the grace signified to be physical or that which subsists between a substance and its properties, i. e., the virtue of conferring grace is, in the sacraments, as the virtue of burning is in fire.—"Council of Trent", Sess. 7, Cans. 6 and 8. "Cat. Rom.," Part 2., Chap. 1., Q. 18. Bellarmin, "De Sacram.," 2, 1.

7. What is the Zwinglian doctrine on this subject ?

Zwingle, the reformer of Switzerland, held a position at the opposite extreme to that of the Romish church, viz., that the sign simply represents by appropriate symbols, and symbolical actions, the grace to which it is related. Thus the sacraments are only effective means of the objective presentation of the truth symbolized.

8. In what sense is the word "exhibit" used in our standards in reference to this subject ?

Compare "Con. of Faith," Chap. 27., Sec. 3, and Chap. 28. Sec. 6, and "Larger Catechism," Q. 162. This word is derived from the Latin word "exhibeo," which bore the twofold sense of conveying and of disclosing. It is evident that the term "exhibit" has retained in our standards the former sense of conveying, conferring. As in medical language, "to exhibit a remedy" is to administer it.

9. What is the common doctrine of the Reformed churches as to the relation of the sign to the grace signified ? The Reformed confessions agree in teaching that this relation is,

1st, simply moral, i. e., it is established only by the■ institution and promise of Christ, and it depends upon the right administration of the ordinance, and upon the faith and of the recipient. And,

2nd, that it is real, that is, when rightly administered, and when received by the recipient with knowledge and faith they do really, because of the promise of Christ, seal the grace signified, and convey it to the recipient, i. e., the recipient does receive the grace with the sign. This doctrine, therefore, includes, 1st, the Zwinglian view, that the outward visible sign truly signifies the grace. And,

2nd, that they are, as ordinances of God's appointment, seals attached to the promise to authenticate it, as the natural phenomenon of the rainbow was made a seal of God's promise to Noah in virtue of the divine appointment.

3rd. That as seals thus accompanying a divine promise by divine authority, they do actually convey the grace they signify to those for whom that grace is intended, and who are in a proper spiritual state to receive it, "as a key conveys admission, a deed an estate, the ceremony of marriage the rights of marriage." See Turretin, L. 19., Question 4; "Confession of Faith," Chap. 27.; "Larger Catechism" Questions 162, 163; "Cat. Gene.," sec. 5th, "de Sacramentis;""Confession Faith of the French Church," article 34; "Old Scotch Confession," section 21.

10. What is the design of the sacraments ?

1st. That they should signify, seal, and exhibit to those within the covenant of grace the benefits of Christ's redemption, and thus as a principal means of grace edify the church. Matthew 3:11; Genesis 17:11; Genesis 17:13; 1 Corinthians 10:2-21; 1 Corinthians 11:23-26; 1 Corinthians 12:13; Romans 2:28; Romans 2:23; Romans 4:11; Romans 6:3-4; Galatians 3:27; 1 Peter 3:21.

2nd. That they should be visible badges of membership in the church, to put a visible difference between the professed followers of Christ and the world, Genesis 34:14; Exodus 12:48; Ephesians 2:19; "Confession Faith," Chap. 27:, section 1. THE ROMISH DOCTRINE AS TO THE EFFICACY OF THE SACRAMENTS.

11. What is the Romish doctrine as to the efficacy of the Sacraments ?

1st. As shown above, under Question 6, they hold that the sacraments contain the grace which they signify. That this grace conferring energy is inseparable from a genuine sacrament, and that as an objective fact, they contain it at all times, and present it alike to all subjects irrespective of character.

2nd. In every case of their application, except when positively opposed and nullified, they effect the grace they signify, as an opus operatum, i.e., by the mere inherent power of the sacramental action itself:

12. Upon what conditions on the part of the administrator do they believe that the efficacy of the sacrament depends? The genuineness of a sacrament on the part of the administrator, depends, according to the Romanists—

1st. On his being canonically authorized. In case of the sacraments of orders and confirmation he must be a bishop in communion with the pope. In the case of the other sacraments he must be a regular popish priest. The personal character of the bishop or priest, even though he be in mortal sin, does not prevent the effect.— “Con. Trident,” Sess. can. 12.

2nd. The administrator must, in the act, exercise the positive intention of effecting what the church intends to be effected by each sacrament.

Dens (Vol. 5., p. 127) says, “To the valid performance of the sacrament is required the intention upon the part of the officiating minister of doing that which the church does. The necessary intention in the minister consists in an act of his will, by which he wills the external action with the intention of doing what the church does;” that is, of performing a valid sacrament. Otherwise, although every external action may be regularly performed, the whole is void. See “Con. Trent,” Sess. 7, canon 11. This leaves the recipient entirely at the mercy of the minister, since the validity of the whole service depends upon his secret intention, and is evidently one of the devices of that anti–Christian church to make the people dependent upon the priesthood.

13. What is the sense in which Protestants admit “intention” to be necessary ?

They admit that in order to render the outward service a valid sacrament, it must be performed with the ostensible professed design of complying thereby with the command of Christ, and of doing what he requires to be done by those who accept the gospel covenant.

14. What condition do the Romanists hold to be essential to the efficacy of a sacrament, on the part of the subject ?

1st. In the case of infant baptism no condition upon the part of the subject is necessary.

2nd. On the part of adults, the only condition is that they shall not positively oppose them by absolute infidelity or resistance of will (non ponentibus obicem). Faith and repentance, as these are possible to the unregenerate soul, are also required as necessary to the effect of baptism (“Cat. Rom.,” Pt. 2., Chap. 2., Ques. 39). Bellarmin, “De Sacramentis,” 2, 1, says that the will to be baptized, faith, and penitence, are necessary dispositions enabling the sacrament to produce its effect, just as dryness on the part of wood is the condition of the fire burning it when applied, but never the cause of the burning.

15. What according to the Papal Church are the effects produced by the sacraments?

1st. Justifying (sanctifying) grace.

2nd. Three of the sacraments, baptism, confirmation, and orders, also impress upon the subject “a character” This “sacramental character” (from the Greek word χαρακτηπ, a mark, or device, engraved or impressed by a seal) is a distinctive and indelible impression stamped on the soul, “the twofold effect of which is, that it qualifies us to receive or perform something sacred, and distinguishes one from another.” It is upon this account that baptism and confirmation are never repeated, and that the authority and privileges of the priesthood can never be alienated.—“Cat. Rom.” Part 2., Chap. 1., Q. 21—25; “Council Trent,” Sess. 7, can. 9.

16. How may this doctrine be disproved ? That the sacraments have not the power of conveying grace to all, whether they are included within the covenant of grace or not, or whether they possess faith or not, is certain, because—

1st. They are seals of the gospel covenant (see below, Question 14). But a seal merely ratifies a covenant as a covenant. It can convey the grace promised only on the supposition that the conditions of tide covenant are fulfilled. But salvation and every spiritual blessing is by that covenant declared to depend upon the condition of faith.

2nd. Knowledge and faith are required as the prerequisite conditions necessary to be found in all applicants, as the essential qualification for receiving the sacraments.—Acts 2:41; Acts 8:37; Acts 10:47; Romans 4:11.

3rd. Faith is essential to render the sacraments efficacious. Romans 2:25-29; 1 Corinthians 11:27-29; 1 Peter 3:21.

4th. Many who receive the sacraments are notoriously without the grace they signify. Witness the case of Simon Magus, Acts 8:1-40, and of many of the Corinthians and Galatians, and of the majority of nominal Christians in the present day.

5th. Many have had the grace without the sacraments. Witness Abraham, the thief upon the cross, and Cornelius the centurion, and a multitude of eminent Christians among the Society of Friends.

6th. This doctrine blasphemously ties down the grace of the ever living and sovereign God, and puts its entire disposal into the hands of fallible and often wicked men.

7th. This doctrine is an essential element of that ritualistic and priestly system which prevailed among the Pharisees, and against which the whole New Testament is a protest.

8th. The uniform effect of this system has been to exalt the power of the priests, and to confound all knowledge as to the nature of true religion. As the baptized, as a matter of fact, do not always nor generally bear the fruits of the Spirit, all ritualizes agree in regarding these fruits as not essential to salvation. Where this system prevails vital Godliness expires.

DOCTRINE OF PROTESTANT CHURCHES AS TO THE EFFICACY OF THE SACRAMENTS 17. What is the Lutheran doctrine as to the efficacy of the sacraments ?

1st. They reject the popish doctrine that the sacraments effect grace ex opere operato(through works).

2nd. They maintain that their grace–conferring efficacy resides in the sacraments intrinsically.

3rd. That as an objective fact it is communicated to every recipient, whether he have faith or not.

4th. But it takes effect only in those who have true faith to receive it. As the healing virtue resided in Christ whether the woman touched or not (Matthew 9:20), yet it would not have availed her unless she had believed and touched.

5th. They hold that this efficacy resides not in the sign or ceremony, but in the Word which accompanies the sign and constitutes it a sacrament. The efficacy is not due to the mere moral power of the truth, nor to the faith of the recipient, but it is supernatural, residing in the power of the

Holy Ghost. But not the power of the Holy Ghost as extrinsic to the truth, but as dwelling in it, and inseparable from it—the virtus Spirits Sancti intrinsicus accedens. See Krauth's "Conservative Reformation," pp. 825—830.

18. What is the Zwinglian and Remonstrant view as to the same ? The tendency of thought on this subject first developed by Zwingle was afterward carried out more fully by the Remonstrants of the next century, and to a greater extent by the Socinians. Low views as to the nature and efficacy of the sacraments have also largely prevailed in this century among all evangelical churches, in reaction from the extreme views of the Romanists and Ritualists. For a general statement of this mode of thought see above, Ques. 7.

19. State the doctrine of the Reformed churches on this subject. As to their doctrine of the relation of the sign to the grace signified, see above, Ques.9.

Hence as to the efficacy of the sacraments the Reformed–

1st. Deny that they confer grace as an opus operatum(works performed).

2nd. They affirm that they convey no grace to the unworthy recipient.

3rd. That their efficacy is not of the mere moral power of the truth they symbolize.

4th. That they do really confer grace upon the worthy recipient.

5th. But they do this instrumentally, because the supernatural efficiency is not due to them, nor to him that administers them, but to the Holy Spirit who as a free personal agent uses them sovereignly as his instruments to do his will (virtus Spiritus Sancti extrinsicus accedens).

6th. That as seals of the covenant of grace they convey and confirm grace to those to whom it belongs, i. e., that is to those who are within that covenant, and in the case of adults, only through a living faith.

7th. That the grace conferred by the sacraments often is conferred upon true believers before and without their use.

20. By what evidence is the truth of the Reformed Doctrine established ? The truth of the Reformed doctrine is established on the one hand by the evidence disproving the truth of the Romish doctrine, set forth under Ques. 16. Its truth as opposed to the meagre Zwinglian view, on the other hand, is established as follows:

(1.) That the sacraments are not only signs of the grace of Christ, but also seals of the gospel covenant offering us that grace upon the condition of faith, "is evident from the fact that Paul says that circumcision is the seal of the righteousness of faith.—Romans 4:11. And that the apostle regarded baptism in the same light is evident from Colossians 2:11. In reference to the Lord's Supper, the Savior said, 'this cup is the new covenant in my blood'i. e., the new covenant was ratified by his blood. Of that blood the cup is the appointed memorial, and it is, therefore, both the memorial and the confirmation of the covenant itself. . . . . The gospel is represented under the form of a covenant. The sacraments are the seals of that covenant. God, in their appointment, binds himself to the fulfillment of his promises; his people, by receiving them, bind themselves to trust and serve him. This idea is included in the representation given (Romans 6:3-4) in the

formula of baptism, and in all those passages in which a participation of:, Christian ordinances is said to include a profession of the gospel”

(2.) As seals attached to the covenant, it follows that they actually convey the grace signified, as a legal form of investiture, to those to whom, according to the terms of:, the covenant, it belongs. Thus a deed, when signed and sealed, is said to convey the property it represents, because it is the legal form by which the intention of the original possessor is publicly expressed, and his act ratified. It is on this ground that in Scripture, as in common language, the names and attributes of the graces sealed are ascribed to the sacraments by which they are sealed and conveyed to their rightful possessors.—“Confession of Faith,” Chap. 27., section 2. They are said to wash away sin, to unite to Christ, to save, etc.—Acts 2:38; Acts 22:16; Romans 6:2; Romans 6:6; 1 Corinthians 10:16; 1 Corinthians 12:13; Galatians 3:27; Titus 3:5. “Way of Life.” THE NECESSITY OF THE SACRAMENTS 21. What doctrine do the Romanists maintain as to the necessity of the Sacraments ? The Romanists distinguish,

1st, between a condition absolutely necessary to attain an end, and one which is only highly convenient and helpful in order to it. And,

2nd, between the necessity which attaches to essential means, and that obligation which arises from the positive command of God. Accordingly, they hold that the several sacraments are necessary in different respects.

BAPTISM they hold to be absolutely necessary, either its actual reception, or the honest purpose to receive it, alike for infants and adults, as the sole means of attaining salvation.

PENANCE they hold to be absolutely necessary in the same sense, but only for those who have committed mortal sin subsequently to their baptism.

ORDERS they hold to be absolutely necessary in the same sense, yet not for every individual, as a means of personal salvation, but in respect to the whole church as a community.

CONFIRMATION, the EUCHARIST, and EXTREME UNCTION are necessary only in the sense of having been commanded, and of being eminently helpful.

MARRIAGE they hold to be necessary only in this second sense, and only for those who enter into the conjugal relation.—“Cat. Rom.,” Part 2., Chap. 1., Q. 13.

Puseyites and high churchmen generally, hold the dogma of baptismal regeneration, and of course the consequence that baptism is absolutely necessary as the sole means of salvation.

22. What is the Protestant doctrine as to the necessity of the sacraments ?

1st. That the sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s Supper were instituted by Christ, and that their perpetual observance is obligatory upon the church upon the ground of the divine precept. This is evident (1) from the record of their institution, Matthew 28:19; 1 Corinthians 11:25-26; (2) from the example of the apostles.—Acts 2:41; Acts 8:37; 1 Corinthians 11:23-28; 1 Corinthians 10:16-21.

2nd. That nevertheless the grace offered in the gospel covenant does not reside in these sacraments physically, nor is it tied to them inseparably, so that, although obligatory as duties, and helpful as means to those who are prepared to receive them, they are in no sense the essential

means, without which salvation can not be attained. This is proved by the arguments presented above, under Q. 16. THE VALIDITY OF THE SACRAMENTS This includes whatever is essential to the genuineness of a sacrament, in order that it may avail to the end of its institution.

23. What are the various opinions on this subject ?

All church parties agree that there must be—

1st. The right. “matter,” the proper elements, and actions.

2nd. The right “form,” the prescribed words which attend its administration, and added to the “form” constitute the sacrament. The right “intention,” the serious design of doing what Christ commanded in the institution of the rite.

Different churches differ as to what are the proper “matter,”“form,” and “intention.” It appears certain that no one not sincerely believing in the supreme deity of Christ and in his office as Redeemer, and in the personality of the Holy Ghost, can possibly have the right “intention”, Hence the General Assembly, 1814 (“Moore’s Digest.,” p. 660), decided, “It is the deliberate and unanimous opinion of the Assembly, that those who renounce the fundamental doctrines of the Trinity, and deny that Jesus Christ is the same in substance, equal in power and glory with the Father, can not be recognized as ministers of the gospel, and that their ministrations (baptism, etc.) are wholly invalid.” All churches agree that “the efficacy of a sacrament does not depend upon the piety of him that doth administer it.”—“Confession of Faith,” Ch. 27., 3, “Can. Conc. Trident,” Sess. 7, can. 11. And the “Gallic Confession,” Art. 28, states the common opinion and practice of all the Protestant churches with respect to Romish baptism. “Because, nevertheless, that in the papacy some scant vestiges of the true church remain, and especially the substance of baptism, the efficacy of which does not depend on him that administers it, we acknowledge those baptized by them, not to need to be rebaptized, although on account of the corruptions adhering, no one can offer his infants to be baptized by them, without suffering pollution himself.” In respect to the qualifications of the person administrating the Papists maintain that it is essential to the validity of a sacrament that it should be administered by a canonically ordained minister. For orders and confirmation a bishop, for the rest a priest. But on account of the absolute necessity (as they hold) of baptism for salvation, they admit “all, even from among the laity, whether men or women, whatever sect they profess (to baptize). for this is permitted, fit necessity compels, even to Jews, infidels or heretics, provided, however, they intend to perform what the Catholic Church performs in that act of her ministry.”——“Cat. of Conc. Trident,” and “Conc. Trident”, Sess. 7, “On Bapt.,” Song of Solomon 4:1-16.

Protestants regard the sacraments both as a preaching of the Word, and as authoritative seals, and badges of church membership Their administration consequently must be confined to those church officers who possess by divine commission the office of teaching and ruling, “neither of which (sacraments) may be dispensed by any, but by a minister of the Word, lawfully ordained.”—“Confession of Faith”, Ch. 27. § 4. Not regarding baptism as essential to salvation, Protestants generally make no exception in favor of lay–baptism.—“Directory for Worship,” Ch. 7., § 1, Calvin’s “Instit.,” Bk. 4., Ch. 15., § 20. THE AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS OF VARIOUS CHURCHES.

ROMISH DOCTRINE.——“Cat. Conc. Trident,” Pt. 2, ch. 1., Ques. 8.— “A sacrament is a thing lying open to the senses, which from the institution of God, has the power both of signifying and of effecting holiness and righteousness.”

“Conc. Trident,” Sess. 7, Song of Solomon 1:1-17.— “If any one saith that the sacraments of the New Law, were not all instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord or that they are more or less than seven, to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony, or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament; let him be anathema.”

Song of Solomon 4:1-16.— “If any one saith that the sacraments of the New Law are not necessary unto salvation, but superfluous; and that, without them. or without the desire thereof men obtain of God, through faith alone, the grace of justification (though all the sacraments are not necessary for every individual) , let him be anathema.”

Song of Solomon 6:1-13.— “If any one saith that the sacraments of the New Law do not contain the grace which they signify; or that they do not confer that grace on those who do not place an obstacle thereunto; as though they were merely outward signs of grace or justice received through faith and certain marks of the Christian profession, whereby believers are distinguished amongst men from unbelievers; let him be anathema.”

Song of Solomon 8:1-14.— “If any one saith that by the sacraments of the New Law grace is not conferred ex opere operato, but that faith alone in the divine promise suffices for the obtaining of grace, let him be anathema.”

Can. 9.— “If any one says that in the three sacraments, of Baptism Confirmation, and Orders, there is not imprinted in the soul a character, that is a certain spiritual and indelible sign, on account of which they can not he repeated; let him be anathema.”

Can. 11.— “If any one saith that in ministers, when they effect and confer the sacraments, there is not required the intention, at least, of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema.”

“Cat. Conc. Trident,” Pt. 2, ch. 1., Ques. 24, 25.— “The other effect of Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders is the character which they impress on the soul. This character is, as it were, a certain distinctive mark impressed on the soul, which inhering as it does perpetually, can never be blotted out . . . it has a twofold effect:it both renders us fit to undertake and perform something sacred, and it serves to distinguish us one from another by some mark.”

Bellarmin“De Sac.”2, 1.—“That which actively, proximately, and instrumentally effects the grace of justification is that sole external action which is called a sacrament, and this is called an opus operatum, being received passively (operatum), so that it is the same for a sacrament to confer grace ex opere operato, that it is to confer grace by virtue of the sacramental action itself instituted by God for this end, and not from the merit either of the agent or of the receiver. . . . The will of God, which uses the sacrament, concurs indeed actively, but is the principal cause. The sufferings of Christ concur, but is the meritorious cause, not however the efficient (cause), since it is not in the act but has passed away, although it remains objectively in the mind of God. The power and will of the minister necessarily concur, but they are remote causes, for they are required to effect the sacramental action itself which afterwards acts immediately. . . . Will, faith, and repentance in the adult recipient are necessarily required as dispositions on the part of the subject, not as active

causes, for not even faith and repentance can either effect sacramental grace, or give efficacy to the sacrament, but only remove obstacles, which would hinder the sacraments from exercising their own efficacy, hence in the case of children, where disposition is not required, justification is effected without these things. If in order to burn wood, the wood is first dried, the fire struck out from the flint, and then applied to the wood, and then combustion ensues, no one would say that the immediate cause of the combustion was either the dryness, or the striking of fire from the flint, or its application to the wood, but that the primary cause is the fire alone, and the instrumental cause is the heating alone." THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE. "Aug. Confession," p. 13. (Hase).— "Sacraments have been instituted not only that they might be marks of profession among men, but more that they may be signs and testimonies of the will of God toward set forth to excite and confirm faith in those who use them."

"Apol. Augs. Confession," p. 267.— "And because that in a sacrament there are two things, the sign and the word; the word is the New Testament promise of the remission of sin . . . and the ceremony is as it were a picture of the word or a seal showing the promise. Therefore as the promise is ineffective if it be not accepted by faith, so the ceremony is ineffective unless faith accedes. And as the word is given to excite this faith, so the sacrament is instituted, that this representation meeting the eyes may move the heart to believe."

Ib., p. 203.— "We condemn the whole class of scholastic doctors, who teach that to one presenting no obstacle the sacraments confer grace ex opere operato, without any good movement of the partaker. But sacraments are signs of promises, therefore in the use of them faith should be present. . . We here speak of the special faith which trusts a present promise, which not only believes in general that God is, but believes that remission of sins is offered."

Quenstedt(Wittenburg 1688), Vol. 1., p. 169.— "The word of God has, from the will and ordination of God himself, even before and beyond all legitimate use, an intrinsic power divine and common to all men, and sufficient for producing immediately and properly spiritual and divine effects, both gracious and punitive."

"Aug. Confession," Art. 9.— "They condemn the Anabaptists who disapprove of the baptism of children, and who affirm that children can be saved without baptism."

"Apol. Aug. Confession," p. 156.— "The ninth article is approved in which we confess, that Baptism is necessary for salvation, and that children are to be baptized, and that the baptism of children is not void, but necessary and efficacious to salvation."

"Art Smalcald," pars. 3, ch. 8.— "And in respect to these things which concern the spoken and outward word, it is steadfastly to be maintained, that God grants to no one his Spirit or grace, unless through the word and with the word outward and preceding. . . Wherefore in this we must constantly persevere, because God does not wish to act otherwise with us than through the spoken word and sacraments, and because whatever is boasted of, as the Spirit, without the word and sacraments, is the devil himself." THE REFORMED DOCTRINE. "Catech. Genev.," p. 519.— "A sacrament. is an outward attestation of the divine benevolence towards us, which by a visible sign figures spiritual graces, for sealing the promises of God to our hearts, whereby their virtue may be the better confirmed. Do you think that the power and efficacy of the sacrament are embraced not in the outward element, but flow only from the Spirit of God ? I think so truly, as it

would be pleasing to the Master to exercise his own force through his own instrumentalities, to whatever design."

"Cat. Heidelb.," Fr. 66.— "Sacraments are visible, sacred signs and seals appointed by God that in their use we may have the promise of the gospel made clearer and sealed; to wit, that God, for the sake of the one oblation of Christ bestows on us forgiveness of sins and eternal life."

"Thirty–nine Articles," Art. 25.—"Sacraments ordained of Christ be only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession but rather they be certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us and doth not only quicken but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him . . . . And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation; but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith."

"West. Confession of Faith," ch. 27; "Larger Catechism" Ques. 161–168; "Shorter Catechism," Ques. 91–93. See above, page 589.

ZWINGLIAN AND REMONSTRANT DOCTRINE. Limborch, "Christ. Theo.," 5, 66, 31.—"It remains to say that God, through the sacraments, exhibits to us his grace, not by conferring it in fact through them, but by representing it and placing it before our eyes through them as clear and evident signs. . . And this efficacy is no other than objective, which requires a cognitive faculty rightly disposed that it may be able to apprehend that which the sign offers objectively to the mind. . . They operate upon us, as signs representing to the mind the thing whose sign they are. No other efficacy ought to be sought for in them."

Chapter 82

02.42. Baptism:its Nature and Design, Mode, Subjects, Efficacy and Necessity

Chapter 42 Baptism:its Nature and Design, Mode, Subjects, Efficacy and Necessity. The Nature and Design of Baptism.

1. State the facts with regard to the prevalence of washing untie water, as a symbol of spiritual purification, among the Jews and Gentile nations before the advent of Christ. No other religious symbol is so natural and obvious, and none has been so universally practiced. Its usage is distinctly traced among the disciples of Zoroaster, the Brahmen, the Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans, and especially the Jews. In the original tabernacle, the pattern of which God showed Moses on the mount, a large laver stood between the altar on which expiation was made for sin, and the Holy House. At which laver the priests continually washed ere they entered the presence of God. This symbolism penetrated all their religious services and language (Psalms 26:6;Hebrews 9:10), and at the time of Christ it was carried into all the details of secular life (Mark 7:3-4). The religious washing of the body with water lay, therefore, ready to the use of John the Baptist, and the disciples of our Lord.

2. Was John's baptism Christian baptism ? The "Council of Trent," (sees. 7, "De Baptismo," Song of Solomon 1:1-17) decided," If any one should say that the baptism of John had the same effect with the baptism of Christ; let him be anathema." For controversial reasons Protestants, especially those of the school of Zwingle and Calvin, took the opposite side, and decided that the two were identical (Calvins "Instit.," Bk. 4.,Ch.15., & 7–18, Turretin's " Instit.," 50. l9, Quae. 16).

We believe Calvin, etc., to have been wrong, for the following reason—

1st. John belonged to the Old and not to the New Testament economy. He came "in the spirit and power of Elias,"Luke 1:17, in the garb, with the manners, and teaching the doctrine of the ancient prophets (Matthew 11:13-14;Luke 1:17).

2nd. His was the "baptism of repentance," binding its subjects to repentance, but not to the faith and obedience of Christ.

3rd. The Jewish Church yet remained in its old form. The Christian Church, as such, did not exist. John preached that "the kingdom of heaven was at hand" but he did not by baptism gather and seal the subjects of that kingdom into a separate visible society. While he lived his personal disciples were never merged with those of Christ.

4th. It was not administered in the name of the Trinity.

5th. Those baptized by John were rebaptized by Paul (Acts 18:24-28; Acts 19:1-7).

3. Were the baptisms practiced by the disciples of Christ previous to his crucifixion identical with that practiced by the Apostles after his ascension?—See John 3:22; John 4:1-2.

Up to the time of his death Christ, like John, conformed to the usages and taught the doctrines of the Jewish dispensation. His crucifixion and resurrection mark the actual transition of the new out of the old dispensation. The nature of his kingdom and his own divinity, and hence the doctrine of the Trinity was not clearly discerned, and the Christian Church as a distinct communion was not yet organized. He preached like John, “Repent for the kingdom of heaven is at hand”Matthew 4:17, and he commissioned his disciples to say “the kingdom of God has come nigh unto you.”—Luke 10:9.

We, therefore, believe that this baptism practiced by his disciples before his crucifixion was, like that of John, simply a preparatory purifying rite binding to repentance.

4. Where is the record of the real institution of Christian baptism contained?

Matthew 28:19-20.—“Go ye therefore, and disciple (μαθητευσατε) all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.”

5. Prove that its observance is of perpetual obligation. This has been denied by Socinians on rationalistic grounds, and by Quakers (Barclay, “Apol. Prop.,” 12, comm. & 6), on the ground of a false spiritualism, and by some parties of AntiBaptists, who hold baptism to have been exclusively designed for the initiation of aliens to the church, and therefore not to be applied to those born within the church, in established Christian communities. That it was designed to be observed everywhere and always is plain—

1st. From the command given in the words of institution.

(1.) “All nations,” and (2) “alway, even unto the end of the world.”

2nd. The commands and practice of the apostles. Acts 2:38; Acts 10:47; Acts 16:33, etc.

3rd. The reason of and necessity for the ordinance which determined its existence at the first, remains and is universal.

4th. The uniform practice of the entire church in all its branches from the beginning.

6. How is baptism defined in our standards?

“Con. of Faith,” Chap. 28.; “Larger Catechism”, Q. 165; “Shorter Catechism,” Q. 94. The essential points of this definition are—

1st. It is a washing with water.

2nd. A washing in the name of the father, son, and Holy Ghost.

3rd. It is done with the design to “signify and seal our ingrafting into Christ, and partaking of the benefits of the covenant of grace, and our engagement to be the Lord’s.”

7. What is essential to the “ matter” of baptism? As to its “matter,” baptism is essentially a washing with water. No particular mode of washing is essential—

1st. Because no such mode is specified in the command.—See below, Questions 12—21.

2nd. Because no such mode of administration is essential to the proper symbolism of the ordinance.—See below, Question 11. On the other hand, water. is necessary—

1st. Because it is commanded.

2nd. Because it is essential to the symbolism of the rite. It is the natural symbol of moral purification, Ephesians 5:25-26; and it was established as such in the ritual of Moses.

8. What is necessary as to the form of words in which baptism is administered?

It is essential to the validity of the ordinance that it should be administered “in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” This is certain—

1st. Because it is included in the command.—Matthew 28:19.

2nd. From the significancy of the rite. Besides being a symbol of purification, it is essentially, as a rite of initiation into the Christian church, a covenanting ordinance whereby the recipient recognizes and pledges his allegiance to God in that character and in those relations in which he has revealed himself to us in the Scriptures. The formula of baptism, therefore, is a summary statement of the whole Scripture doctrine of the Triune Jehovah as he has chosen to reveal himself to us, and in all those relations which the several Persons of the Trinity graciously sustain in the scheme of redemption to the believer. Hence the baptism of all those sects which reject the scriptural doctrine of the Trinity is invalid. The frequent phrases, to be baptized in “the name of Jesus Christ”, or “ in the name of the Lord Jesus”, or “in the name of the Lord” (Acts 2:38; Acts 10:48; Acts 19:5), do not at all present the form of words which the apostles used in administering this sacrament, but are simply used to designate Christian baptism in distinction from that of John, or to indicate the uniform effect of that spiritual grace which is symbolized in baptism, viz., union with Christ.—Galatians 3:27.

9. What is the meaning of the formula “to baptize ”in the name (εις το ονομα) of any one? To be baptized “in the name of Paul” (εις το ονομα), 1 Corinthians 1:13, or “unto Moses,” (εις το Μωυσην), 1 Corinthians 10:2, is, on the part of the baptized, to be made the believing and obedient disciples of Paul and Moses, and the objects of their care, and the participants in whatever blessings they have to bestow. To be baptized in the name of the Trinity (Matthew 28:19), or “in the name of the Lord Jesus” (Acts 19:5), or “into Jesus Christ,” (Romans 6:3), is by baptism, or rather by the grace of which ritual baptism is the sign, to be united to Christ, or to the Trinity through Christ, as his disciples, believers in his doctrine, heirs of his promises, and participants in his spiritual life.

10. What is the design of baptism? Its design is–

1st. Primarily, to signify, seal, and convey to those to whom they belong the benefits of the covenant of grace. Thus—

(1.) It symbolizes “the washing of regeneration”“the renewing of the Holy Ghost,” which unites the believer to Christ, and so makes him a participant in Christ’s life and all other benefits.—1 Corinthians 12:13; Galatians 3:27; Titus 3:5.

(2.) Christ herein visibly seals his promises to those who receive it with faith, and invests them with the grace promised.

2nd. Its design was, secondarily, as springing from the former,

(1.) to be a visible sign of our covenant to be the Lord's, i. e., to accept his salvation, and to consecrate ourselves to his service.

(2.) And, hence, to be a badge of our public profession, our separation from the world, and our initiation into the visible church. As a badge it marks us as belonging to the Lord, and consequently (a) distinguishes us from the world, (b) symbolizes our union with our fellow–Christians.—1 Corinthians 12:13.

11. What is the emblematic import of baptism? In every sacrament there is a visible sign representing an invisible grace. The sign represents the grace in virtue of Christ's authoritatively appointing it thereto, but the selection by Christ of the particular sign is founded on its fitness as a natural emblem of the grace which he appoints it to represent. Thus in the Lord's supper the bread broken by the officiating minister, and the wine poured out, are natural emblems of the body of Christ broken, and his blood shed as a sacrifice for our sins. And in like manner in the sacrament of baptism the application of water to the person of the recipient is a natural emblem of the "washing of regeneration."—Titus 3:5. Hence we are said to be "born of water and of the Spirit,"John 3:5, i. e., regenerated by the Holy Spirit, of which new birth baptism with water is the emblem; and to be baptized "by one Spirit into one body,"i. e., the spiritual body of Christ; and to be "baptized into Christ," so as "to have put on Christ,"Galatians 3:27; and to be "baptized into his death," and to be "buried with him in baptism . . . so that we should walk with him in newness of life,"Romans 6:3-4, because the sacrament of baptism is the emblem of that spiritual regeneration which unites us both federally and spiritually to Christ, so that we have part with him both in his life and in his death, and as he died unto sin as a sacrifice, so we die unto sin in its ceasing to be the controlling principle of our natures; and as he rose again in the resumption of his natural life, we rise to the possession and exercise of a new spiritual life.

Baptist interpreters, on the other hand, 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. Dr. Carson says, p. 381, "The immersion of the whole body is essential to baptism, not because nothing but immersion can be an emblem of purification, but because immersion is the thing commanded, and because that, without immersion, there is no emblem of death, burial, and resurrection, which are in the emblem equally with purification." He founds his assumption that the outward sign in the sacrament of baptism was designed to be an emblem of the death, burial, and resurrection of the believer in union with Christ, upon Romans 6:3-4, and Colossians 2:12.

We object to this interpretation—

1st. In neither of these passages 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 sin, and live unto holiness, in which death and new life we are conformed unto the death and resurrection of Christ. We are said to be "baptized into Christ," which is the work of the Spirit not "into the name of Christ.," which is the

phrase always used when speaking of ritual baptism.—Matthew 28:19; Acts 2:38; Acts 19:5.

2nd. To be “baptized into his death” is a phrase perfectly analogous to baptism “into repentance,”Matthew 3:11 and “into remission of sins,”Mark 1:4, and “into one body,”1 Corinthians 12:13, i. e., in order that, or to the effect that, we participate in the benefits of his death.

3rd. 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.”

4th. Baptists agree with us that baptism with water is an emblem of spiritual purification, i. e., 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.—Dr. Carson, p. 143. But what is the distinction between regeneration and a death unto sin, and life unto holiness.

5th. 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.

6th. Our union with Christ through the Spirit, and the spiritual consequences thereof; are illustrated in Scripture by many various figures, e. g., the substitution of a heart of flesh for a heart of stone, Ezekiel 36:26; the building of a house, Ephesians 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, Ephesians 4:22-24; as a spiritual death, burial, and resurrection, and as a being planted in the likeness of his death, Romans 6:3-5; as the application of a cleansing element to the body, Ezekiel 36:25. Now baptism with water represents all these, because it is an emblem of spiritual regeneration, of which all of these are analogical illustrations. Hence we are said to be “baptized into one body,”1 Corinthians 12:13, and by baptism to “have put on Christ,”Galatians 3:27. 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.—See Dr. Armstrong’s “Doctrine of Baptisms” Part 2., Chap. 2. THE MODE OF BAPTISM.

12. What are the words which, in the original language of Scripture, are used to convey the command to baptize? The primary word (βαπτω) occurs four times in the new Testament (Luke 16:24; John 13:26; Revelation 19:13), but never in connection with the subject of Christian baptism. Its classical meaning was,

1st, to dip;

2nd, to dye;

3rd, to wash by dipping or pouring. The word (βαπτιζω) in form, though not in usage, the frequentative of (βαπτω), occurs seventy–six times in the New Testament, and is the word used by the Holy Ghost to convey the command to baptize. Its classical meaning was, (1) dip,

submerge, sink; (2) to wet thoroughly; (3) to pour upon, to drench; (4) to overwhelm. Besides these, we have the nouns of the same root and usage, (βαπτισμα) occurring twenty–two times, translated baptism, and (βαπτισμος) occurring four times, translated baptism, Hebrews 6:2, and washing, Mark 7:4; Mark 7:8;Hebrews 9:10. The only question with which we are concerned, however, is as to the scriptural usage of these words. It is an important and universally recognized principle, that the biblical and classical usage of the same word is often very different. This effect is to be traced to the influence of three general causes.—See “Baptism, its Modes and Subjects,” by Dr. Alex. Carson; “Meaning and Use of the Word Baptizein,” by Rev. Dr. Conant, and “Classic, Judaic, Johannic, and Christian Baptism,” by Rev. James W. Dale, D.D.

1st. The principal classics of the language were composed in the Attic dialect. But the general language used by the Greek–speaking world at the Christian era was the “common, or Hellenic dialect of the later Greek” resulting from the fusion of the different dialects previously existing.

2nd. The language of the writers of the New Testament was again greatly modified by the fact that their vernacular was a form of the Hebrew language (Syro–Chaldaic); that their constant use of the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew Scriptures had largely influenced their usage of the Greek language, especially in the department of religious thought and expression; and that, in the very act of composing the New Testament Scriptures, they were engaged in the statement of religious ideas, an in the inauguration of religious institutions which had their types and symbols in the ancient dispensation, as revealed in the sacred language of the Hebrew scriptures.

3rd. The New Testament writings are a revelation of new ideas and relations, and hence the words and phrases through which these new thoughts are conveyed must be greatly modified in respect to their former etymological sense and heathen usage, and “for the full depth and compass of meaning belonging to them in their new application we must look to the New Testament itself, comparing one passage with another, and viewing the language used in the light of the great things which it brings to our apprehension.” As examples of this contrast between the scriptural and classical usage of a word, observe, αγγελος, angel; πρεσβυτερος presbyter or elder; εκκλεσια, church; βασιλεια του θεου, or των ουρανων, kingdom of God, or of heaven; παλιγγενεσια, regeneration; χαρις, grace, etc., etc.—Fairbairn’s “Herm. Manual,” Part 1., section 2.

13. What is the position of the Baptist churches as to the meaning of the Scriptural word βαπτιζω and by what arguments do they seek to prove that immersion is the only valid mode of baptism?

“That it always signifies to dip, never expressing any thing but mode.”—“Carson on Baptism,” p. 55. He confesses:“I have ALL the lexicographers and commentators against me.” Baptists insist, therefore, upon always translating the words βαπτιζω and βαπτισμα by the words immerse and immersion.

They argue that immersion is the only valid mode of baptism—

1st. From the constant meaning of the word βαπτιζω.

2nd. From the symbolical import of the rite, as emblematic of burial and resurrection.

3rd. From the practice of the apostles.

4th. From history of the early church.

14. What is the position occupied upon this point by all other Christians?

1st. It is an established principle of scriptural usage that the names and attributes of the things signified by sacramental signs are attributed to the signs, and on the other hand that the name of the sign is used to designate the grace signified. Thus, Genesis 17:11; Genesis 17:13, the name of covenant is given to circumcision; Matthew 26:26-28, Christ called the bread his body, and the wine his blood; Titus 3:5, baptism is called the washing of regeneration. Thus also the words BAPTIZE and BAPTISM are often used to designate that work of the Holy Ghost in regeneration, which the sign, or water baptism, signifies.—Matthew 3:11;1 Corinthians 12:13;Galatians 3:27; Deuteronomy 30:6. It follows consequently that these words are often used in a spiritual sense.

2nd. These words when relating to ritual baptism, or the sign representing the thing signified, imply the application of water in the name of the Trinity, as an emblem of purification or spiritual regeneration, and never, in their scriptural usage, signify any thing whatever as to the mode in which the water is applied. The precise question in debate is to be stated thus. Baptists insist that Christ's command to baptize is a command to "immerse." All other Christians hold that it is a command to "wash with water," as a symbol of spiritual purification.

I have answered, under Question 11, above, the second Baptist argument, as stated under Question 13. Their first and third arguments, as there stated, I will proceed to answer now.

15. How may it be proved from their scriptural usage that the wardsβαπτιζω and ZG baptisma ZX do not signify immersion, but WASHING to effect PURIFICATION, without any reference to mode?

1st. The word occurs four times in the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, in three of which instances it refers to baptism with water. 2 Kings 5:14—The prophet told Naaman to "wash and be clean," and "he baptized himself in Jordan, and he was clean."Sir 34:25—"He that baptizeth himself after the touching of a dead body." This purification according to the law was accomplished by sprinkling the water of separation.—Numbers 19:9; Numbers 19:13; Numbers 19:20, "baptized herself in the camp at a fountain of water." Bathing was not performed among those nations by immersion; and the circumstances in which Judith was placed increase the improbability in her case. It was a purification, for she "baptized herself," and "so came in clean."

2nd. The question agitated between some of John's disciples and the Jews, John 3:22-30; John 4:1-3, concerning baptism, is called a question concerning purification, περι καθαρισμου.

3rd. Matthew 15:2; Mark 7:1-5; Luke 11:37-39. The word βαπτιζω is here used (1) for the customary washing of the hands before meals, which was designed to purify, and was habitually performed by pouring water upon them, 2 Kings 3:11; (2) it is interchanged with the word νιπτω, which always signifies a partial washing; (3) its effect is declared to be to purify, καθαρισιεν; (4) the baptized or washed hands are opposed to the unclean, κοιναις.

4th. Mark 7:4; Mark 7:8, "Baptism of pots and cups, brazen vessels, and of tables κλιναι, couches upon which Jews reclined at their meals, large enough to accommodate several persons at once. The object of these baptisms was purification, and the mode could not have been immersion in the case of the tables, couches, etc."

5th. Hebrews 9:10, Paul says the first tabernacle "stood only in meats, and drinks, and divers baptisms." In Hebrews 9:13, Hebrews 9:19, Hebrews 9:21, he specifies some of these "divers

baptisms" or washings, "For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh" and "Moses sprinkled both the book and all the people, and the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry."—Dr. Armstrong's "Doc. of Bapt.," Part 1.

16. What argument in favor of this view of the subject may be drawn from what is said of baptism with the Holy Ghost?

Matthew 3:11;Mark 1:8;Luke 3:16;John 1:26; John 1:33;Acts 1:5; Acts 11:16; 1 Corinthians 12:13.

If the word βαπτισω only means to immerse, it would be incapable of the figurative use to which, in these passages, it is actually subjected. But if, as we claim, it signifies to purify, to cleanse, then water baptism, as a washing, though never as an immersion, may fitly represent the cleansing work of the Holy Ghost. See next Question.

17. What argument may be drawn from the fact that the blessings symbolized by baptism are said to be applied by sprinkling and pouring? The gift of the Holy Ghost was the grace signified.—Acts 2:1-4; Acts 2:32-33; Acts 10:44-48; Acts 11:15-16. The fire which did not immerse them, but appeared as cloven tongues, and "sat upon each one of them," was the sign of that grace. Jesus was himself the baptizer, who now fulfilled the prediction of John the Baptist that he should baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire. This gift of the Holy Ghost is set forth in such terms as "came from heaven,""poured out,""shed forth,""fell on them."

These very blessings were predicted in the Old Testament by similar language.—Isaiah 44:3; Isaiah 52:15; Ezekiel 36:25-27;Joel 2:28-29. Hence we argue that if these spiritual blessings were predicted in the Old Testament by means of these figures of sprinkling; and pouring, and if in the New Testament they were symbolically set forth under the same form, they may, of course, be symbolized by the church now by the same emblematical actions.

18. What argument may be drawn from the mode of purification adopted under the Old Testament? The rites of purification prescribed by the Levitical law were in no case commanded to be performed by immersion in the case of persons. Washing and bathing is prescribed, but there is no indication given by the words used, or otherwise, that these were performed by immersion, which was not the usual mode of bathing practiced in those countries. The hands and feet of the priests, whenever they appeared to minister before the Lord, were washed, Exodus 30:18-21, and their personal ablutions were performed at the brazen laver, 2 Chronicles 4:6, from which the water poured forth through spouts or cocks.—1 Kings 7:27-39. On the other hand, purification was freely ordered to be effected by sprinkling of blood, ashes, or water.—Leviticus 8:30; Leviticus 14:7; Leviticus 14:51;Exodus 24:5-8;Numbers 8:6-7;Hebrews 9:12-22. Now, as Christian baptism is a purification, and as it was instituted among the Jews, familiar with the Jewish forms of purification, it follows that a knowledge of those forms must throw much light upon the essential nature and proper mode of the Christian rite.

19. How may it be shown from 1 Corinthians 10:1-2, and from 1 Peter 3:20-21, that to baptize does not mean to immerse?

1 Corinthians 10:1-2. The Israelites are said to have been "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."—Compare Exodus 14:19-31. The Israelites were baptized, yet went over dryshod.

The Egyptians were immersed, yet not baptized. Dr. Carson, p. 413, says, Moses “got a dry dip.”

1 Peter 3:20-21. Peter declares that baptism is the antitype of the salvation of the eight souls in the ark. Yet their salvation consisted in their not being immersed.

20. What argument as to the proper mode of baptism is to be drawn from the record of the baptisms performed by John?

1st. John’s baptism was not the Christian sacrament, but a rite of purification administered by a Jew upon Jews, under Jewish law. From this we infer (1) that it was not performed by immersion, since the Levitical purification of persons was not performed in that way; yet (2) that he needed for his purpose either a running stream as Jordan, or much water as at AEnon (or the springs), because under that law whatsoever an unclean person touched previous to his purification became unclean, Numbers 19:21-22, with the exception of a “fountain or pit in which is plenty of water,”Leviticus 11:36, which he could not find in the desert in which he preached. After the gospel dispensation was introduced we hear nothing of the apostles baptizing in rivers, or needing “much water” for that purpose.

2nd. In no single instance is it stated in the record that John baptized by immersion. All the language employed applies just as naturally as accurately to a baptism performed by effusion (the subject standing partly in the water, the baptizer pouring water upon the person with his hand). The phrases “baptized in Jordan,”“coming out of the water,” would have been as accurately applied in the one case as in the other. That John’s baptism was more probably performed by affusion appears

(1.) from the fact that it was a purification performed by a Jewish prophet upon Jews, and that Jewish washings were performed by effusion. The custom was general then, and has continued to this day.

(2.) This mode better accords with the vast multitudes baptized by one man.—Matthew 3:5-6;Mark 1:5; Luke 3:3-21.

(3.) The very earliest works of Christian art extant represent the baptism of Christ by John as having been performed by affusion.—Dr. Armstrong’s “Doctrine of Baptisms,” Part 2., Chap. 3.

21. What evidence is afforded by the instances of Christian baptism recorded in the New Testament?

1st. It has been abundantly shown above that the command to baptize is a command to purify by washing with water, and it hence follows that even if it could be shown that the apostles baptized by immersion, that fact would not prove that particular mode of washing to be essential to the validity of the ordinance, unless it can be proved also that, according to the analogies of gospel institutions, the mere mode of obeying a command is made as essential as the thing itself: But the reverse is notoriously the fact. The church was organized on certain general principles, and the public worship of the gospel ordained, but the details as to the manner of accomplishing those ends are not prescribed. Christ instituted the Lord’s supper at night, reclining on a couch, and with unleavened bread. Yet in none of these respects is the “mode,” essential.

2nd. But, in fact, there is not one instance in which the record makes it even probable that the apostles baptized by immersion, and in the great majority of instances it is rendered in the last degree improbable.

(1.) The baptism of the eunuch by Philip, Acts 8:26-39, is the only instance which even by appearance favors immersion. But observe (a) the language used by Luke, even as rendered in our version, applies just as naturally to baptism performed by effusion as by immersion. (b.) The Greek prepositions, ZG ei" ZX , here translated into, and ZG ek ZX , here translated out of, are in innumerable instances used to express motion, toward, unto and from.—Acts 26:14; Acts 27:34; Acts 27:40. They probably descended from the chariot to the brink of the water. Philip is also said to have “descended to,” and to have “ascended from the water,” but surely he was not also immersed. (c.) The very passage of Isaiah, which the eunuch was reading, Isaiah 52:15, declared that the Messiah, in whom he believed, should “sprinkle many nations.” (d.) Luke says the place was “a desert,” and no body of water sufficient for immersion can be discovered on that road.

(2.) Every other instance of Christian baptism recorded in the Scriptures bears evidence positively against immersion. (a.) The baptism of three thousand in Jerusalem on one occasion on the day of Pentecost.—Acts 2:38-41. (b.) The baptism of Paul.—Acts 9:17-18; Acts 22:12-16. Ananias said to him “standing up, be baptized,” ZG anasta" baptisai ZX , and, “standing up, he was baptized.” (c.) The baptism of Cornelius.—Acts 10:44-48. (a.) The baptism of the jailor, at Philippi.—Acts 16:2-34. In all these instances baptism was administered on the spot, wherever the convert received the gospel. Nothing is said of rivers, or much water, but vast multitudes at a time, and individuals and families were baptized in their houses, or in prisons, wherever they happened to be at the moment.

22. What has been in the past, and what is in the present, the usage of the churches as to the mode of baptism? In the early church the prevalent mode was to immerse the naked body. For several ages trine–immersion was practiced, or the dipping the head of the person standing in the water, three times. In cases of extreme danger of death, and when water was scarce, affusion or sprinkling was considered valid (Bingham’s “Christ. Antiquities,” Bk. 2., ch. 11.; Neander’s “Ch. Hist.,” Vol. 1., Torrey’s Trans., p. 310; Schaff’s “Ch. Hist.,” Vol. 2., & 92). The Greek Church has insisted on immersion. The Romish and Protestant churches admit either form. The modern customs favor sprinkling. The Baptists maintain that immersion is the only valid baptism. All other western churches deny this and maintain the equal validity of pouring and of sprinkling.—“Con. faith,” Ch. 28., & 3. No advocate of sprinkling can, in consistency with his own fundamental principles or with the historical usages of the Christian Church, outlaw immersion. The opposition of most churches to immersion arises from the narrow and arrogant claims of the Baptists, and from their false views with respect to the emblematic import of baptism, making it a “burying,” instead of a “washing”; against THIS we mean to protest.

616. SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

23. Who are the proper subjects of baptisms?

“Confession of Faith” Chap. 28., Section 4; “Larger Catechism,” Question 166; “ Shorter Catechism,” Question 95.

All those, and those only, who are members oft the visible church, are to be baptized. These are, 1st, they who make a credible profession of their faith in Christ;

2nd, the children of one or both believing parents.

24. What in the case of adults are the prequisites of baptism?

Credible profession of their faith in Jesus as their Saviour. This is evident—

1st. From the very nature of the ordinance as symbolizing spiritual gifts, and as sealing our covenant to be the Lord's.

2nd. From the uniform practice of the apostles and evangelists.—Acts 2:41; Acts 8:37. For a full answer to this question, see below Ch. 43., Ques. 25, for conditions of admission to Lord's table, which are identical with those requisite for baptism.

25. Upon what essential constitutional principle of human nature does this institution rest? and show how that principle is recognized in all God's providential and gracious dealing with the race. The grand peculiarity of humanity is that while each individual is a free responsible moral agent, yet we constitute a race, reproduced under the law of generation, and each newborn agent is educated and his character formed under social conditions. Hence everywhere the "free will of the parent becomes the destiny of the child." Hence results the representative character of progenitors, and the inherited character and destiny of all races, nations, and families. This principle runs through all God's dealing with the human race under the economy of redemption. The family and not the individual is the unit embraced in all covenants and dispensations. This may be traced in all God's dealings with Adam, Noah (Genesis 9:9), Abraham (Genesis 17:7, and Galatians 3:8), and the nation of Israel (Exodus 20:5;Deuteronomy 29:10-13). The same principle is continued in the Christian dispensation as asserted by Peter in the first sermon.—Acts 2:38-39.

26. What is the visible church, to which baptism is the initiating rite?

1st. The word church, εκκλησια is used in Scripture in the general sense of the company of God's people, called out from the world, and bound to him in covenant relations.

2nd. The true spiritual church, therefore, in distinction to the phenomenal church organized on earth, consists of the whole company of the elect, who are included in the eternal covenant of grace formed between the father and the second Adam.—Ephesians 5:27;Hebrews 12:23.

3rd. But the visible church universal consists of "all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children, and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation."—"Confession of Faith," chap. 25, section

2. This visible kingdom, Christ, as Mediator of the covenant of grace, has instituted, as an administrative provision, for the purpose of administering thereby the provisions of that covenant; and this kingdom, as an outward visible society of professors, he established by the covenant he made with Abraham.—Genesis 12:1-3; Genesis 17:1-14.

4th. Christ has administered this covenant in three successive modes or dispensations.

(1.) From Abraham to Moses, during which he attached to it the ratifying seal of circumcision.

(2.) From Moses to his advent (for the law which was temporarily added did not make the promise of none effect, but rather administered it in a special mode, Galatians 3:17), he added a new seal, the passover, emblematic of the atoning work of the promised seed, as set forth in the clearer revelation then vouchsafed.

(3.) From Christ to the end of the world, when the promise being unfolded in an incomparably fuller revelation, the original seals are superseded by baptism and the Lord's Supper. See below, Question 26.

5th. That the Abrahamic covenant was designed to embrace the visible church of Christ, and not his mere natural seed in their family or national capacity, is plain.

(1.) It pledged salvation by Christ on the condition of faith.—Compare Genesis 12:3, with Galatians 3:8; Galatians 3:16;Acts 3:25-26.

(2.) The sign and seal attached to it symbolized spiritual blessings, and sealed justification by faith.—Deuteronomy 10:15-16; Deuteronomy 30:6;Jeremiah 4:4;Romans 2:28-29; Romans 4:11.

(3.) This covenant was made with him as the representative of the visible church universal. (a.) It was made with him as the "father of many nations." Paul said it constituted him the "heir of the world,""the father of all them that believe,"Romans 4:11; Romans 4:13, and that all believers in Christ now, Jew or Gentile, are "Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise."—Galatians 3:29. (b.) It contained a provision for the introduction to its privileges, of those who were not born of the natural seed of Abraham.—Genesis 17:12. Multitudes of such proselytes had been thus introduced before the advent of Christ, and many such were present ill Jerusalem as members of the church under its old form on the day of Pentecost "out of every nation under heaven."—Acts 2:5-11.

6th. That the church thus embraced in this administrative covenant is not the body of the elect, as such, but the visible church of professors and their children, is evident, because,

(1.) the covenant contains the offer of the gospel, including the setting forth of Christ, and the offer of his salvation to all men (all the families of the earth) on the condition of faith. Galatians 3:8. But this belongs to the visible church, and must be administered by means of inspired oracles and a visible ministry.

(2.) As an indisputable fact, there was such a visible society under the old dispensation; and under the new dispensation all Christians, whatever theories they may entertain, attempt to realize the ideal of such a visible society, for Christian and ministerial communion.

(3.) Under both dispensations Christ has committed to his church, as to a visible kingdom, written records, sacramental ordinances, ecclesiastical institutions, and a teaching and ruling ministry. Although these are all designed to minister the provisions of the covenant of grace and to effect as their ultimate end the ingathering of the elect, it is evident that visible signs and seals, a written word and a visible ministry, can, as such, attach only to a visible church. Romans 9:4;Ephesians 4:11.

(4.) The same representation of the church is given in the New Testament, in the parable of the tares, etc.—Matthew 13:24-30; Matthew 13:47-50; Matthew 25:1-13. It was to consist of a mixed community of good and evil, true and merely professed believers, and the separation is not to be made until the “end of the world.”

7th. This visible church from the beginning has been transmitted and extended in a twofold manner.

(1.) Those who are born “strangers from the covenants of promise,” or “aliens from the commonwealth of Israel,”Ephesians 2:12, were introduced to that relation only by profession of faith and conformity of life. Under the old dispensation these are called proselytes. Acts 2:10;Numbers 15:15.

(2.) All born within the covenant had part in all of the benefits of a standing in the visible church by inheritance. The covenant was with Abraham and his “seed after him, in all their generations, as an everlasting covenant,” and consequently they received the sacrament which was the sign and seal of that covenant. Hence the duty of teaching and training was engrafted on the covenant, Genesis 18:18-19; and the church made a school, or training institution, Deuteronomy 6:6-9. In accordance with this, Christ commissioned his apostles to disciple all nations, baptizing and teaching them. Matthew 28:19-20. Thus the church is represented as a flock, including the lambs with the sheep, Is. 40:11, and as a vineyard in which the scion is trained, the barren tree cultivated, and, if incurable, cut down.—Isaiah 5:1-7; Luke 13:7-8.

27. How may it be shown that this visible church is identical under both dispensations, and what argument may be thence derived to prove that the infant children of believers should be baptized?

1st. The church, under both dispensations, has the same nature and design. The 01d Testament church, embraced in the Abrahamic covenant, rested on the gospel offer of salvation by faith.—Galatians 3:8;Hebrews 11:1-40 :Its design was to prepare a spiritual seed for the Lord. Hence—

(1.) Its foundation was the same—the sacrifice and mediation of Christ.

(2.) Conditions of membership were the same. (a.) Every true Israelite was a true believer.—Galatians 3:7. (b.) All Israelites were at least professors of the true religion.

(3.) Its sacraments symbolized and sealed the same grace as those of the New Testament church. Thus the passover, as the Lord’s Supper, represented the sacrifice of Christ.—1 Corinthians 5:7. Circumcision, as baptism, represented “the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh,” and baptism is called by Paul “the circumcision of Christ.”Colossians 2:11-12. Even the ritual of the Mosaic law was only a symbolical revelation of the gospel.

2nd. They bear precisely the same name. εκκλησια κυρια , the church of the Lord, is an exact rendering in Greek of the Hebrew ■■■■■ ■■■■■■ translated in our version the “congregation of the Lord,”—Compare Psalms 22:22, with Hebrews 2:12. Thus Stephen called the congregation of Israel before Sinai “the church. in the wilderness.”—Compare Acts 7:38, with Exodus 32:1-35 :Thus also Christ is the Greek form of the Hebrew Messiah, and the elders of the New Testament church are identical in function and name with those of the synagogue.

3rd. There is no evidence whatever furnished by the apostolical records that the ancient church was abolished and a new and a different one organized in its place. The apostles never say one word about any such new organization. The pre–existence of such a visible society is everywhere taken for granted as a fact. Their disciples were always added to the “church,” or “ congregation” previously existing.—Acts 2:47. The Mosaic ritual law, by means of which the Abrahamic character of the church had been administered for about fifteen hundred years, was indeed abolished. But Paul argues that the introduction of this law, four hundred and thirty years after, could not make the promise of none effect, Galatians 3:17, and consequently the disannulling of the law, could only give place to the more perfect execution of the covenant, and development of the church embraced within it.

4th. There is abundant positive evidence that the ancient church, resting upon its original charter, was not abolished by the new dispensation.

(1.) Many of the Old Testament prophecies plainly declare that the then existing visible church, instead of being abrogated by the advent of the Messiah, should thereby be gloriously–strengthened and enlarged, so as to embrace the Gentiles also.—Isaiah 49:13-23, and Isaiah 60:1-14. They declare also that the federal constitution, embracing the child with the parent, shall continue under the new dispensation of the church, after “the Redeemer has come to Zion.”—Isaiah 59:21-22. Peter, in Acts 3:22-23, expounds the prophecy of Moses, Deuteronomy 18:15-19, to the effect that every soul which will not hear that prophet (the Messiah) shall be cut off from among the people, i. e., from the church, which of course implies that the church from which they are cut off continues.

(2.) In precise accordance with these prophecies Paul declares that the Jewish church was not abolished, but that the unbelieving Jews were cut off from their own olive–tree, and the Gentile branches grafted in in their place; and he foretells the time when God will graft the Jews back again into their own stock and not into another. Romans 11:18-26. He says that the alien Gentiles are made fellow–citizens with believing Jews in the old household of the faith.—Ephesians 2:11-22.

(3.) The covenant which constituted the ancient church also constituted Abraham the father of many nation. The promise of the covenant was that God would “be a God unto him and to his seed after him.” This covenant, therefore, embraced the “many nations” with their father Abraham. Hence it never could have been fulfilled until the advent of the Messiah, and the abolishment of the restrictive law. Hence the Abrahamic covenant, instead of having been superseded by the gospel, only now begins to have its just accomplishment. Hence, on the day of Pentecost, Peter exhorts all to repent and be BAPTIZED, BECAUSE the Abrahamic covenant still held in force for all Jews and for their children, and for all those afar off, i. e., Gentiles, as many as God should call. Acts 2:38-39. Hence also Paul argued earnestly that since the Abrahamic covenant is still in force, therefore, from its very terms, the Gentiles who should believe in Christ had a right to a place in that ancient church, which was founded upon it, on equal terms with the Jews. “In thee shall all nations be blessed, so THEN,” says Paul, “they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham,” and all who believe in Christ, Jew or Gentile indiscriminately, “are,” to the full intent of the covenant, “Abraham’s seed” and heirs according to the promise, Galatians 3:6-29, which promise was, “I will be a God to thee, and TO THY SEED AFTER THEE.” The bearing of this

argument upon the question of infant baptism is direct and conclusive.

Ist. Baptism now occupies the same relation to the covenant and the church which circumcision did.

(1.) Both rites represent the same spiritual grace, namely, regeneration.—Deuteronomy 30:6;Colossians 2:11;Romans 6:3-4.

(2.) Baptism is now what circumcision was, the seal, or confirming sign, of the Abrahamic covenant. Peter says, “be baptized FOR the PROMISE is to you and to your children.”—Acts 2:38-39. Paul says explicitly that baptism is the sign of that covenant, “for as many as have been baptized into Christ are Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise,”Galatians 3:27; Galatians 3:29; and that baptism is the circumcision of Christ.—Colossians 2:10-11.

(3.) Both rites are the appointed forms, in successive eras, of initiation into the church, which we have proved to be the same church under both dispensations.

2nd. Since the church is the same, in the absence of all explicit command to the contrary, the members are the same. Children of believers were members then. They ought to be recognized as members now, and receive the initiatory rite. This the apostles took for granted as self–evident, and universally admitted; an explicit command to baptize would have implied doubt in the ancient church rights of infants.

3rd. Since the covenant, with its promise to be “a God to the believer and his seed,” is expressly declared to stand firm under the gospel, the believer’s seed have a right to the seal of that promise.—Dr. John M. Mason’s “Essays on the Church.”

28. Present the evidence that Christ recognized the church standing of children.

1st. Christ declares of little children (Matthew, παιδια , Luke βρεφη, infants) that “of such is the kingdom of heaven.”—Matthew 19:14;Luke 18:16. The phrase “kingdom of God and of heaven” signifies the visible church under the new dispensation.—Matthew 3:2; Matthew 13:47.

2nd. In his recommission of Peter, after his apostasy, our Lord commanded him, as under shepherd, to feed the lambs, as well as the sheep of the flock.—John 21:15-17.

3rd. In his general commission of the apostles, he commanded them to disciple nations (which are always constituted of families) by baptizing, and then teaching them.— Matthew 28:19-20.

29. Show that the apostles always acted on the principle that the child is a church member if the parent is. The apostles were not settled pastors in the midst of an established Christian community, but itinerant missionaries to an unbelieving world, sent not to baptize, but to preach the gospel.—1 Corinthians 1:7. Hence we have in the Acts and Epistles the record of only ten separate instances of baptism. In two of these, viz., of the eunuch and of Paul, Acts 8:38; Acts 9:18, there were no families to be baptized. In the case of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, the people of Samaria, and the disciples of John at Ephesus, crowds were baptized on the very spot on which they professed to believe. Of the remaining five instances, in the four cases in which the family is mentioned at all, it is expressly said they were baptized, viz., the households of Lydia of Thyatira, of the jailer of Philippi, of Stephanas, and of Crispus.—Acts 16:15; Acts

16:32-33; Acts 18:8;1 Corinthians 1:16. In the remaining instance of Cornelius, the record implies that the family was also baptized. Thus the apostles, in every case, without a single recorded exception, baptized believers on the spot, and whenever they had families, they also baptized their households, as such.

They also addressed children in their epistles as members of the church.—Compare Ephesians 1:1, and Colossians 1:1-2, with Ephesians 6:1-3, and Colossians 3:20. And declared that even the children of only one believing parent were to be regarded “holy,” or consecrated to the Lord, i. e., as church members.—1 Corinthians 7:12-14.

30. What argument may be inferred from the fact that the blessings symbolized in baptism are promised and granted to children?

Baptism represents regeneration in union with Christ. Infants are born children of wrath, even as others. They can not be saved, therefore, unless they are born again, and have part in the benefits of Christ’s death. They are evidently, from the nature of the case, in the same sense capable of being subjects of regeneration as adults are. “Of such is the kingdom of heaven.”—Matthew 21:15-16; Luke 1:41; Luke 1:44.

31. What argument may be drawn from the practice of the early church? The practice of infant baptism is an institution which exists as a fact, and prevails throughout the universal church, with the exception of the modern Baptists, whose origin can be definitely traced to the Anabaptists of Germany, about A. D. 1537. Such an institution must either have been handed down from the apostles, or have had a definite commencement as a novelty, which must have been signalized by opposition and controversy. As a fact, however, we find it noticed in the very earliest records as a universal custom, and an apostolical tradition. Justin Martyr, writing A. D. 138, says that “There were among Christians of his time, many persons of both sexes, some sixty and some seventy years old, who had been made disciples of Christ from their infancy.” Irenaeus, born about A. D. 97, says, “He came to save all by himself; all I say who by him are born again unto God, infants, and little children and youths.” It is acknowledged by Tertullian, born in Carthage, A. D. 160, or only sixty years after the death of the apostle John. Origen, born of Christian parents in Egypt, A. D. 185, declares that it was “the usage of the church to baptize infants,” and that “the church had received the tradition from the apostles.” Cyprian, bishop of Carthage from A. D. 248 to 258, together with an entire synod over which he presided, decided that baptism should be administered to infants before the eighth day. St. Augustine, born A. D. 358, declared that this “doctrines is held by the whole church, not instituted by councils, but always retained.” This Pelagius admitted, after having visited all parts of the church from Britain to Syria, although the fact was so repugnant to his system of doctrine.—See Wall’s “Hist. of Infant Baptism,” and gingham’s “Christ. Antiquities” Bk. 11., Ch. 4. Our argument is that infant baptism has prevailed (a) from the apostolic age, (b) in all sections of the ancient church, (c) uninterruptedly to the present time, (d) in every one of the great historical churches of the Reformation. While its impugners (a) date since the Reformation, (b) and are generally guilty of the gross schismatical sin of close communion.

32. How is the objection, that faith is a prerequisite to baptism, and that infants can not believe, to be answered? The Baptists argue—

1st. From the commission of the Lord, “Go preach—he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned,”Mark 16:16, that infants ought not to be baptized because they can not believe.

2nd. From the nature of baptism, as a sign of a spiritual grace and seal of a covenant, that infants ought not to be baptized, since they are incapable of understanding the sign, or of contracting the covenant.

We answer—

1st. The requisition of faith evidently applies only to the adult, because faith is made the essential prerequisite of salvation, and yet infants are saved, though they can not believe.

2nd. Circumcision was a sign of a spiritual grace; it required faith in the adult recipient, and it was the seal of a covenant; yet, by God’s appointment, infants were circumcised. The truth is that faith is required, but it is the faith of the parent acting for his child. The covenant of which baptism is the seal is contracted with the parent, in behalf of the child upon whom the seal is properly applied.

It is besides to be remembered that the infant is not a thing, but a person born with an unholy moral nature, and fully capable of present regeneration, and of receiving from the Holy Ghost the “habit” or state of soul of which faith is the expression. Hence Calvin says (“Instit.,” Bk. 4, Ch. 16., & 20), “The seed of both repentance and faith lies hid in them by the secret operation of the Spirit.”

33. How can we avoid the conclusion that infants should be admitted to the Lord’s Supper, if they are admitted to baptism? The same reason and the same precedents do not hold in relation to both sacraments.

1st. Baptism recognizes and seals church membership, while the Lord’s Supper is a commemorative act.

2nd. In the action of baptism the subject is passive, and in that of the Lord’s Supper active.

3rd. Infants were never admitted to the Passover until they were capable of comprehending the nature of the service.

4th. The apostles baptized. households, but never admitted households as such to the Supper.

34. Whose children ought to be baptized?

“Infants of such as are members of the visible church,”“Shorter Catechism” Q. 95; that is, theoretically, “infants of one or both believing parents,”“Con. of Faith,” Chap. 28., sec. 4; and practically, “of parents, one or both of them professing faith n Christ.”—“Larger Catechism,” Q. 166. Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, the Protestants of the continent, the Presbyterians of Scotland (and formerly of this country), act upon the principle that every baptized person, not excommunicated, being himself a member of the visible church, has a right to have his child regarded and treated as such also. Even when parents are unbelievers Catholics and Episcopalians will baptize their infants upon the faith of sponsors.

It is evident, however, that only the children of such parents, or actual guardians, as make a credible profession of personal faith ought to be baptized.

1st.. Because of the nature of the act. Faith is the condition of the covenant of which baptism is the seal. The Gen. Assembly of 1794 decided that our “Directory for Worship” demands that the parent enters before God and the Church into an express engagement, “that they pray with and for the child, that they set an example of piety and godliness before it” etc. And the Gen. Synod of 1735 asserts that if other than parents professing piety are encouraged to take these engagements “the seal would be set to a blank”

(“Moore’s Digest,” pp. 665 and 666). Hence it is evident that the conditions prerequisite for having one’s children baptized are precisely the same with those prerequisite for being baptized or admitted to the Lord’s Supper one’s self, i. e., credible profession of a true faith.

2nd. Sponsors who are neither parents nor actual and permanent guardians are evidently neither the providentially constituted representatives of the child, nor in a position to make good their engagements.

3rd. Those who having been baptized, do not by faith and obedience discharge their baptismal vows when they are of mature age, are ipso facto in a state of suspension from covenant privileges, and can not, therefore, plead them for their children.

4th. The apostles baptized the households only of those who professed faith in Christ. THE EFFICACY OF BAPTISM.

35. What is the Romish and Ritualistic doctrine as to the efficacy of baptism. The Romish doctrine, with which the “Tractarian” doctrine essentially agrees, is,

1st, that baptism confers the merits of Christ and the power of the Holy Ghost, and therefore (1) it cleanses from inherent corruption; (2) it secures the remission of the penalty of sin; (3) it secures the infusion of sanctifying grace; (4) it unites to Christ; (5) it impresses upon the soul an indelible character; (6) it opens the portals of heaven. Newman, “Lectures on Justification” p. 257; “Cat. Rom.,” Pt. 2., Chap. 2. Q. 32–44.

2nd. That the efficacy of the ordinance is inherent in itself in virtue of the divine institution. Its virtue does not depend either on the merit of the officiating minister, nor on that of the recipient, but in the sacramental action itself as an opus operatum(works performed). In the case of infants, the only condition of its efficiency is the right administration of the ordinance. In the case of adults its efficiency depends upon the additional condition that the recipient is not in mortal sin, and does not resist by an opposing will.—Dens “De Baptismo,” N. 29.

36. 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 further than the Reformed in maintaining the sacramental union between the sign and the grace signified. Luther, in his “Small Cat.,” Pt. 4., sec. 2, says baptism, “worketh forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and confers everlasting salvation on all who believe” and, in sec. 3, 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.” This efficacy depends upon true saving faith in the adult

subject:“Moreover, faith being absent, it remains only a naked and inoperative sign.”

Hence they hold—lst. Baptism is an efficient means of conferring the forgiveness of sins and the grace of Christ.

2nd. It contains the grace it confers.

3rd. Its efficacy resides not in the water but in the word and in the Holy Spirit in the word.

4th. Its efficacy, in the case of the adult, depends upon the faith of the subject. Krauth’s “Conservative Reformation”, pp. 545–584.

37. What was the Zwinglian doctrine on this subject ? That the outward rite is a mere sign, an objective representation by symbol of the truth, having no efficacy whatever beyond that due to the truth represented.

38. What is the doctrine of the Reformed churches, and of our own among the number, on this subject ?

They all agree, 1st, that the Zwinglian view is incomplete.

2nd. 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.

3rd. That this conveyance is effected, not by the bare operation of the sacramental action, but by the Holy Ghost, which accompanies his own ordinance.

4th. That in the adult the reception of the blessing depends upon faith.

5th. 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 afterwards. Our “ Confession of Faith,” Chap. 28., sections 5 and 6, affirms,

“1st. That 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.”

2nd. That baptism does not in all cases secure the blessings of the covenant.

3rd. That in the cases in which it does the gift is not connected necessarily in time with the administration of the ordinance.

4th. “That these blessings depend upon two things:(1) the right use of the ordinance; (2) the secret purpose of God.”–Dr. Hodge.

39. What in general is the doctrine known as Baptismal Regeneration ? On what ground does it rest ? and how can it be shown to be false ? The Protestant advocates of Baptismal Regeneration, without committing themselves to the Romish theory of an opus operatum, hold that baptism is God’s ordained instrument of communicating the benefits of redemption in the first instance. That whatever gracious experiences may be enjoyed by the unbaptized, are uncovenanted mercies.

That by baptism the guilt of original sin is removed, and the Holy Ghost is given, whose effects remain like a seed in the soul, to be actualized by the free–will of the subject, or neglected and hence rendered abortive. Every infant is regenerated when baptized. If he dies in infancy the seed is actualized in paradise. If he lives to adult age, its result depends upon his use of it (Blunt's "Dict. of Theology," Art. Baptism). See above, Ch. 29., Ques. 4.

They rest their doctrine on a large class of Scripture passages like the following, "Christ gave himself for the church that he might sanctify and cleanse it by the washing of water, by the word"Ephesians 5:26, "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins."—Acts 22:16. Also John 3:5;1 Peter 3:21;Galatians 3:27, etc. The Reformed explain these passages on the following principles.

1st. In every sacrament there are two things (a) an outward visible sign, and (b) an inward invisible grace thereby signified. There is between these a sacramental or symbolical relation that naturally gives rise to a usus loquendi(meaning of words by usage), whereby the properties and effects of the grace are attributed to the sign. Yet it never follows that the two are inseparable, any more than it proves the absurdity that the two are identical.

2nd. The sacraments are badges of religious faith, and necessarily involve the profession of that faith. In all ordinary language, therefore, that faith is presumed to be present, and to be genuine, in which case the grace signified by the sacrament is, of course, always not only offered but conveyed ("Shorter Catechism," Ques. 91 and. 92). That baptism can not be the only or even the ordinary means of conveying the grace of regeneration (i. e., for initiating the soul into a state of grace) is plain.—

1st. Faith and repentance are the fruits of regeneration. But faith and repentance are required as conditions prerequisite to baptism.— Acts 2:38; Acts 8:37; Acts 10:47; Acts 11:17.

2nd. This doctrine is identical with that of the Pharisees, which Christ and his apostles constantly rebuked.—Matthew 23:23-26. "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but faith that worketh by love—but a new creature."—Galatians 5:6; Galatians 6:15; Romans 2:25-29. Faith alone is said to save, the absence of faith alone to damn.—Acts 16:31, and Mark 16:16.

3rd. The entire spirit and method of the gospel is ethical not magical. The great instrument of the Holy Ghost is the TRUTH, and all that is ever said of the efficacy of the sacraments is said of the efficacy of the truth. They are means of grace therefore in common with the word and as they contain and seal it (1 Peter 1:23, and John 17:17; John 17:19). Our Saviour says "by their fruits ye shall know them."—(Matthew 7:20).

4th. This doctrine is disproved by experience. Vast multitudes of the baptized of all ages and nations bring forth none of the fruits of regeneration. Multitudes who were never baptized have produced these fruits. The ages and communities in which this doctrine has been most strictly held have been conspicuous for spiritual barrenness.

5th. The great evil of the system of which the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is a part, is that it tends to make religion a matter of external and magical forms, and hence to promote rationalistic skepticism among the intelligent, and superstition among the ignorant and morbid, and to

dissociate among all classes religion and morality. THE NECESSITY OF BAPTISM.

40. What is the Romish doctrine as to the necessity of baptism ? That it is by the appointment of God the one means, sine qua non, of justification (regeneration, etc.) both for infants and adults. In the case of adults they except only the case of those who have formed a sincere purpose of being baptized, which has been providentially hindered. In the case of infants there is no exception.

41. What is the Lutheran view ? Their standards state the necessity of the sacraments without apparent qualification (See “Aug. Confession” Art. 9, and “Apol. Aug. Confession,” p. 156, quoted under last chapter). But Dr. Krauth has shown from the writings of Luther and their standard theologians, that their actual view was that (1) baptism is not essential(as e. g., Christ’s atonement is), but that (2) it is necessary, as the ordained ordinary means of conferring grace, yet (3) not unconditionally, because the “necessity” is limited (a) by the possibility of having it, so that not the deprivation of baptism, but the contempt of it condemns a man, and (b) by the fact that all the blessings of baptism are conditioned on faith. (4) Baptism is not always followed by regeneration, and regeneration is not always preceded by baptism, and men may be saved though unbaptized. (5) That within the church all infants are saved although unbaptized. (6) As to infants of heathen, the point undecided, because unrevealed, but hopeful views entertained.—Krauth “Conserv. Reform.,” pp. 557–564.

42 What is the Reformed doctrine? That it is “necessary” because commanded, and universally obligatory, because it is a divinely ordained and most precious means of grace, which it would be impious knowingly and willingly to neglect. And because it is the appointed and commonly recognized badge whereby our allegiance to Christ is openly acknowledged. Under the circumstances, intelligent neglect of the sacraments looks very like treason. But baptism does not ordinarily confer grace in the first instance, but presupposes it, and the grace it symbolizes and seals is often realized both before and without their use.–“Confession of Faith,” Ch. 28., “Cal. Instit.,” Bk. 4., ch. 16., & 26. THE AUTHORITATIVE CREED STATEMENTS.

ROMISH DOCTRINE.

“Cat. Conc. Trident.” Pt. 2, Ch. 2, Ques. 5.—“It follows that baptism may be accurately and appositely defined to be the sacrament of regeneration by water in the word. For by nature we are born from Adam children of wrath, but by baptism we are regenerated in Christ children of mercy.”

Ib., Pt. 2, Ch. 2, Ques. 33.—“For as no other means of salvation remains for infant children except baptism, it is easy to comprehend the enormity of the guilt under which they lay themselves, who suffer them to be deprived of the grace of the sacrament longer than necessity requires.”

Bellarmin “Bapt.,” 1, 4.–“The church has always believed that infants perish if they depart this life without baptism. For although little children fail of baptism without any fault of their own, yet they do not perish without their own fault, since they have original sin.”

LUTHERAN DOCTRINE.—See quotations under last chapter.

Quenstedt,. 147.—“By baptism and in baptism the Holy Ghost excites in infants a true, saving, life–giving, and actual faith, whence also baptized infants truly believe.”

“Art. Smalcald,” pt. 3, art. 5, “De Baptismo.”—“Baptism is nothing else than the word of God with dipping in water, according to his institution and command. . . . The word is added to the element and it becomes a sacrament.”

“Cat. Minor,” 4., Ques. 3.—“Baptism effects remission of sins, liberates from death and the devil, and gives eternal blessedness to all and each who believe this which the word and divine promises hold forth.”

REFORMED DOCTRINE.

“Cat. Genev.,” p. 522.—“The signification of baptism has two parts, for therein is represented remission of sins. . . . . :Do you attribute nothing else to the water, than that it is only a figure of washing? I think it is such a figure, that at the same time a truth is joined with it. For God does not disappoint us in promising to us his gifts. Hence it is certain that pardon of sins and newness of life are offered and received by us in baptism.”

Calvin’s “Instit.”, B. 4., Ch. 16, & 26.—“I would not be understood as insinuating that baptism may be contemned with impunity. So far from excusing this contempt, I hold that it violates the covenant of the Lord. The passage (John 5:24) only serves to show that we must not deem baptism so necessary as to suppose that every one who has lost the opportunity of obtaining it has forthwith perished.”

“Thirty–nine Art. of Ch. of England,” Art. 27.—“Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that are 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 the 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.”

“Confession of Faith,” Ch. 28; “Larger Catechism”, Q. 165–167; “Shorter Catechism,” Q. 94. 95.

& 1.—“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, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life.”

& 5.—“Although it be a great sin to contemn of neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated.”

& 6.—“ The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered, yet, notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the council of God’s own will, in his appointed time.”

SOCINIAN DOCTRINE.—Socinus believed baptism to have been practiced by the apostles after the death of Christ, and to have been applicable only to converts from without the church. Socinians generally held baptism to be only a badge of public profession of adherence to Christ, and maintained that immersion is the only proper mode, and adults the only proper subjects.—“Racovian Cat.”, Section 5, Ch. 3.

02.43. The Lords Supper.

Chapter 43 The Lord's Supper.

1. In what passages of the New Testament is the institution of the Lord's Supper recorded ?

Matthew 26:26-28;Mark 14:22-24;Luke 22:17-20;1 Corinthians 10:16-17; 1 Corinthians 11:23-30.

2. Prove that its observance is a perpetual obligation.

1st. From the words of institution, "Do this in remembrance of me," and again "this do as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me."

2nd. Paul's word.—1 Corinthians 11:26. " For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show the Lord's death till he come."

3rd. The apostolic example (Acts 2:42; Acts 2:46; Acts 20:7, etc.).

4th. The frequent reference to it as of perpetual obligation in the apostolical writings (1 Corinthians 10:16-21, etc.).

5th. The practice of the entire Christian church in all its branches from the first.

3. What are the various phrases used in Scripture to designate the Lord's Supper, and their import ?

1st. "Lord's Supper."—1 Corinthians 11:20. The Greek word δειπνον, translated supper, designated the dinner, or principal meal of the Jews, taken towards or in the evening. Hence this sacrament received this name because it was instituted at that meal. It was called the "Lord's," because it was instituted by him, to commemorate his death, and signify and seal his grace.

2nd. "Cup of blessing."—1 Corinthians 10:16 The cup was blessed by Christ, and the blessing of God is now invoked upon it by the officiating minister.—Matthew 26:26-27.

3rd. "Lord's Table."—1 Corinthians 10:21. Table here stands by a usual figure for the provisions spread upon it. It is the table at which the Lord invites his guests, and at which he presides.

4th. "Communion."—1 Corinthians 10:16. In partaking of this sacrament, the fellowship of the believer with Christ is established and exercised in a mutual giving and receiving, and consequently also the fellowship of believers with one another, through Christ.

5th. "Breaking of bread."—Acts 2:42. Here the symbolical action of the officiating minister is put for the whole service.

4. By what other terms was it designated in the early church ?

1st. "Eucharist," from ευχαριστεω, to give thanks. See Matthew 26:27. This beautifully designates it as a thanksgiving service. It is both the cup of thanksgiving, whereby we celebrate the grace of

God and pledge our gratitude to him, and the cup of blessing, or the consecrated cup.

2nd. & Συναξις, a coming together, because the sacrament was administered in the public congregation.

3rd. Λειτουργια, a sacred ministration, applied to the sacrament by way of eminence. From this word is derived the English word liturgy.

4th. Θυσια, sacrifice offering. “This term was not applied to the sacrament in the proper sense of a propitiatory sacrifice. But (1) because it was accompanied with a collection and oblation of alms; (2) because it commemorated the true sacrifice of Christ on the cross; (3) because it was truly a eucharistical sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, Hebrews 13:15; (4) because, in the style of the ancients, every religious action, whereby we consecrate any thing to God for his glory and our salvation, is called a sacrifice.”

5th. Αγαπη The Agapae, or love feasts, were meals at which all the communicants assembled, and in connection with which they received the consecrated elements. Hence the name of the feast was given to the sacrament itself.

6th. μυστηριον, a mystery, or a symbolical revelation of truth, designed for the special benefit of initiated Christians. This was applied to both sacraments. In the Scriptures it is applied to all the doctrines of revelation.—Matthew 13:11;Colossians 1:26.

7th. Missa, mass. The principal designation used by the Latin church. The most probable derivation of this term is from the ancient formula of dismission. When the sacred rites were finished the deacons called out, “ Ite, missa est,”go, it is discharged. Turretin 50. 19, Q. 21.

5. How is this sacrament defined, and what are the essential points included in the definition ?

See “Larger Catechism,” Q. 168; “Shorter Catechism,” Q.96. The essential points of this definition are, 1st, the elements, bread and wine, given and received according to the appointment of Jesus Christ.

2nd. The design of the recipient of doing this in obedience to Christ’s appointment, in remembrance of him, to show forth his death till he come.

3rd. The promised presence of Christ in the sacrament by his Spirit, “ so that the worthy receivers are not after a corporeal and carnal manner, but by faith, made partakers of Christ’s body and blood, with all his benefits, to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace.”

6. What kind of bread is to be used in the sacrament, and what is the usage of the different churches on this point ?

Bread of some kind is essential, 1st, from the command of Christ;

2nd, from the significancy of the symbol; since bread, as the principal natural nourishment of our bodies, represents his flesh, which, as living bread, he gave for the life of the world.—John 6:51. But the kind of (read, whether leavened or unleavened, is not specified in the command, nor is it rendered essential by the nature of the service.

Christ used unleavened bread because it was present at the Passover. The early Christians celebrated the Communion at a common meal, with the bread of common life, which was leavened. The Romish Church has used unleavened bread ever since the eighth century, and commands the use of the same as the only proper kind, but does not make it essential ("Cat. Conc. Trident.," Pt. 2, ch. 4:, && 13 and 14). The Creek Church insists upon the use of leavened bread. The Lutherans Church uses unleavened bread. The Reformed Church, including the Church of England, regards the use of leavened bread, as the food of common life, to be most proper, since bread in the Supper is the symbol of spiritual nourishment. The use of sweet cake, practiced in some of our churches is provincial and arbitrary, and is without any support in Scripture, tradition, or good taste.

7. What is the meaning of the termοινος, wine, in the New Testament, and how does it appear that wine and no other liquid must be used in the Lord's Supper ?

It is evident from the usage of this word in the New Testament that it was designed by the sacred writers to designate the fermented juice of the grape.—Matthew 9:17;John 2:3-10;Romans 14:21;Ephesians 5:18;1 Timothy 3:8; 1 Timothy 5:23;Titus 2:3. This is established by the unanimous testimony of all competent scholars and missionary residents in the East.—See Dr. Lindsay W. Alexander's article in Kitto's "Cyclopaedia"; and Dr. Wm. L. Bevan's art. on "Wine" in "Smith's Bible Dict."; and Dr. Ph. Schaff in Lange's "Commentary on John,"ch. 2:1-11, note p. 111; and Rev. Dr. T. Laurie, missionary, in the "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1869; and Dr. Justin Perkins, "Residence of Eight Years in Persia," p. 236; and Dr. Eli Smith in the "Bib. Sacra," 1846, pp. 385, etc.; and Rev. J. H. Shedd (missionary), in "Interior," of July 20,1871. The Romish Church contends, on the authority of tradition, that water should be mingled with the wine ("Cat. Conc. Trident.", Pt. 2., Ch. 4., Ques. 16 and 17). But this has not been commanded, nor is it involved in any way in the symbolical significancy of the rite. That wine and no other liquid is to be used is clear from the record of the institution, Matthew 26:26-29, and from the usage of the apostles.

8. How does it appear that breaking the bread is an important part of the service ?

1st. The example of Christ in the act of institution, which is particularly noticed in each inspired record of the matter. Matthew 26:26; Mark 14:22; Luke 22:1-71; Co 11:24.

2nd. It is prominently set forth in the reference made by the apostles to the sacrament in the epistles.—1 Corinthians 10:16. The entire service is designated from this one action.

3rd. It pertains to the symbolical significancy of the sacrament.

(1.) It represents the breaking of Christ's body for us. 1 Corinthians 11:24.

(2.) It represents the communion of believers, being many in one body.—1 Corinthians 10:17. This is denied by the Lutheran Church, which holds that the "breaking" is only a preparation for distribution (see Krauth's "Conservative Reformation," pp. 719–722).

9. What is the proper interpretation of 1 Corinthians 10:16, and in what sense are the elements to be blessed or consecrated ? The phrase to bless is used in Scripture only in three senses, 1st. To bless God, i. e., to declare his praises, and to utter our gratitude to him.

2nd. To confer blessing actually, as God does upon his creatures.

3rd. To invoke the blessing of God upon any person or thing. The “cup of blessing which we bless” is the consecrated cup upon which the minister has invoked the divine blessing. As the blessing of God is invoked upon food, and it is thus consecrated unto the end of its natural use, 1 Timothy 4:5, so the elements are set apart as sacramental signs of an invisible spiritual grace, to the end of showing forth Christ death, and of ministering grace to the believing recipient. by the invocation by the minister of God’s blessing in the promised presence of Christ through his spirit. The Romish Church teaches that when the priest pronounces the words of consecration with the due intention, he really effects the transubstantiation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. The form to be used in the consecration of the bread is, “This is my body.” The form to be used in consecrating the wine is, “For this is the chalice of my blood, of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many for the remission of sins” (“Cat. Conc. Trident.,” Pt. 2., Ch. 4., Ques. 19–26).

10. Show that the distribution of the elements to the people and their reception by them is an essential part of this sacrament ?

Since the Romish Church has perfectly developed the doctrines of transubstantiation, and of the sacrifice of the mass, they have logically come to regard the essential design of the ordinance to be effected when the act of consecration has been performed, and hence the distribution of the elements to the people is considered non–essential. Hence they preserve the bread as the veritable body of the Lord shut up in the pyx, carry it about in processions and worship it. Hence they also maintain the right of the priest in the mass to communicate without the people, and to carry the wafer to the sick who are absent from the place of communion.—“ Conc. Trident.,” Sess. 13, Ch. 6, and cans. 4–7, and Sess. 22, Song of Solomon 8:1-14.

Protestants, on the contrary, hold that it is of the essence of this holy ordinance that it is an action, beginning and ending in the appointed use of the elements. “Take eat,” said Christ. “This do in remembrance of me.” It is a “breaking of bread,” an “eating and drinking” in remembrance of Christ, it is a “communion.” Protestants all hold, consequently, that the distribution and reception of the elements are essential parts of the service, and that when these are accomplished the sacrament ends. The Lutherans hold that the presence of the flesh and blood of Christ in the sacrament is confined to the time of the sacramental use of the elements, that is to the time of their distribution and reception, and that what remains afterwards is common bread and wine.—“Form. Concord.,” Pt. 2, Ch. 7, 82, and 108; “Confession of Faith,” Ch. 29, & 4. The Reformed Church holds that the elements should be put into the hands of the communicant, and not as Catholics, into his mouth. Christ said, “take eat,” and the act is symbolical of personal self–appropriation.

Since this sacrament is a “communion” (1 Corinthians 10:16-17) of the members with one another and with Christ together, the rite is abused when the elements are sent to persons absent from the company among whom it is celebrated, and all private communion of ministers or laymen is absurd. In case of need all Reformed Churches allow the pastor and elders to go. with as many Christian fiends as the case admits of; and hold a communion in the chamber of sick believers, who otherwise would be unable to attend (Gen. Assem. O. S., 1863, “Moore’s Digest.,” p. 668).

11. What should be the nature of the exercises during the distribution of the elements ?

“The Sacraments are seals of the Covenant of Grace” formed between Christ and his people, and in the Lord’s Supper “the worthy receivers really and truly receive and apply unto themselves Christ crucified,” each believer being made “a priest unto God” (1 Peter 2:5;Revelation 1:20), “having liberty to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus” (Hebrews 10:19). From all this it necessarily follows that in this sacrament the communicants are to act immediately in their covenanting with the Lord. The minister ought never, therefore, to throw the communicants into a passive attitude as the recipients of instructions or exhortations. All such didactic and hortatory exercises being assigned to the “preparatory” services, and to the sermon before communion, the minister should confine himself to leading the communicants in the act of communion in exercises of direct worship such as suitable prayers and hymns. And all the prayers and hymns associated with this holy ordinance should be specifically appropriate to it, and not merely of a general religious character. THE RELATION OF THE SIGN AND THE GRACE SIGNIFIED.

12. What is the Romish doctrine on this subject? And how is it expressed by the term Transubstantiation? The early fathers spoke of the presence of Christ in the Supper in indefinite language, and with a general tendency to exaggeration. Their metaphorical language tended to a confusion between the symbols of religious service and the spiritual ideas represented. As the ministry came to be regarded as a priesthood, and the only channels of grace to the people, the sacraments were more and more exalted into the necessary instruments through which they acted. With the conception of a real priesthood necessarily emerged the need of a real sacrifice; and for the reality of the sacrifice the real presence of a divine incarnate victim also was necessarily provided. The doctrine in its present form was first brought out explicitly by Paschasius Radbert, abbot of Corbet (A. D. 831). It was opposed by Ratramnus, but gradually gained ground. The term transubstantiatio, conversion of substance, was used to define it in the first instance by Hildebert of Tours (1134). It was first decreed as an article of faith, at the instance of Innocent III., by the fourth “Lateran Council,” A. D. 1215. Their doctrine is that when the words of consecration are pronounced by the priest—

1st. The whole substance of the bread is changed into the very body of Christ which was born of the Virgin, and is now seated at the right hand of the Father in heaven, and the whole substance of the wine is changed into the blood of Christ.

2nd. That as in his theantropic person the soul is inseparable from the body, and the divinity from the soul, so in the sacrament the soul and body of the Redeemer is present with his flesh and blood.

3rd. That only the species, or sensible qualities of the bread and wine remain, accidentia sine subjecto, and that the substance of the flesh and blood is present without their accidents.

4th. This conversion of substance is permanent, so that the flesh and blood remain permanently and are to be preserved and adored as such. They rest their doctrine on Scripture (Hic est corpus meum), tradition, and the authority of councils.

13. On what grounds does the Romish Church withhold the use of the cup from all except the officiating priest and what is their doctrine of ‘concomitance.’ (bread and wine ‘are one’ with the body and blood of Christ)? The Early Church for ages, and the Greek and all Protestant Churches to the present time, follow the example of Christ and his apostles in distributing among all

communicants both the bread and the wine “sub utraque forma .”(under both kinds) The Romish Church however, for fear that some portion of the Lord’s person might be unintentionally desecrated, has restricted the cup to the officiating minister alone. The only exception allowed is when the cardinals receive the cup from the pope officiating on Holy Thursday. The Hussite War had for its principal object the gaining for the people the privilege of communicating in both kinds. To defend their custom theologians advanced the doctrine that the whole Christ is present in each of the elements, to which Thomas Aquinas first gave the name concomitantia. The body includes the nerves, sinews, and all else that is necessary to a complete body; and as the blood is inseparable from the flesh, and the soul from the body, and the divinity from the soul, it follows that the entire person of the Redeemer is present in each particle of both elements, separation having been made. He, therefore, who receives any fraction of the bread receives blood as well as flesh, because he receives the whole Christ.

14. Present the arguments proving the Romish doctrine of the relation of the sign to the thing signifed to be unscriptural as well as irrational.

1st. The sole Scriptural argument of the Romanists is derived from the words of institution, “This is my body” (Matthew 26:26). Protestants answer. This phrase in this place must mean, “this bread represents, or symbolizes, my body.” This is evident—

(1.) Because such language in Scripture must often be so interpreted, e. g., Genesis 41:26-27—“The seven good kine are seven years:and the seven good ears are seven years.”Daniel 7:24—“And the ten horns are ten kings.”Exodus 12:11;Ezekiel 37:11 —“These bones are the whole house of Israel.”Matthew 13:19; Matthew 13:37; Revelation 1:20—“The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches, and the seven candlesticks are the seven churches.”

(2.) In this case any other interpretation is rendered impossible by the fact that Christ was sitting present in the body when he spoke the words, and that he also eat the bread.

(3.) Also by what Christ says of the cup. Matt., “This cup is my blood.” Luke, “This cup is the New Testament in my blood.” Paul (1 Corinthians 10:16) says the cup is the κοινωνια of the blood, and the bread is the κοινωνια of the body of Christ.

2nd. Paul calls one of the elements bread, as well after as before its consecration.—1 Corinthians 10:16; 1 Corinthians 11:26-28.

3rd. This doctrine is inconsistent with their own definition of a sacrament. They agree with Protestants and with the fathers in distinguishing, in every sacrament, two things, viz., the sign and the thing signified. See above, Chap. 41., Question 2. But the doctrine of transubstantiation confounds these together.

4th. The senses, when exercised in their proper sphere, are as much a revelation from God as any other. No miracle recorded in the Bible contradicted the senses, but, on the contrary, the reality of the miracle was established by the testimony of the senses. See the transubstantiation of water into wine.—John 2:1-10, and Luke 24:36-43. But this doctrine flatly contradicts our senses, since we see, smell, taste, and touch the bread and wine as well after their consecration as before.

5th. Reason also, in its proper sphere, is a divine revelation, and though it may be transcended, never can be contradicted by any other revelation, supernatural or otherwise. See above, Chap. 3., Question 14. But this doctrine contradicts the principles of reason

(1.) with respect to the nature of Christ's body, by supposing that, although it is material, it may be, without division, wholly present in heaven, and at many different places on earth at the same time.

(2.) In maintaining that the body and blood of Christ are present in the sacrament, yet without any of their sensible qualities, and that all the sensible qualities of the bread and wine are present, while the bodies to which they belong are absent. But qualities have no existence apart from the substances to which they belong.

6th. This doctrine is an inseparable part of a system of priestcraft entirely anti–Christian, including the worship of the host, the sacrifice of the mass, and hence the entire substitution of the priest and his work in the place of Christ and his work. It also blasphemously subjects the awful divinity of our Saviour to the control of his sinful creatures, who at their own will call him down from heaven, and withhold or communicate him to the people.

15. State the Lutheran view as to the nature of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. The Lutherans hold—

1st. The communicatio idiomatum, or that the personal union of the divine and human natures involve the sharing of the humanity at least with the omnipresence of the divinity. The entire person of the incarnate God, body, soul, and divinity are everywhere.

2nd. That the language of our Lord in the institution, "This (bread) is my body," is to be understood literally.

They, therefore, hold—

1st. That the entire person, body and blood of Christ are really and corporeally present in, with and under the sensible elements.

2nd. That they are received by the mouth.

3rd. That they are received by the unbeliever as well as by the believer. But the unbeliever receives them to his own condemnation. On the other hand they deny—

1st. Transubstantiation; holding that the bread and wine remain (as to their substance) what they appear.

2nd. That the presence of Christ in the sacrament is effected by the officiating minister.

3rd. That the presence of Christ in the elements is permanent; being sacramental, it ceases when the sacrament is over.

4th. That the bread and wine only represent Christ's body and blood.

5th. That the presence of the true body and blood is "spiritual," in the sense of being mediated either (a) through the Holy Ghost, or (b) through the faith of the recipient.

16. State the doctrine of the Reformed Church.

Luther's activity as a reformer extended from 1517 to 1546; Melanchthon's from 1521 to 1560;Zwingle's from his appearance at Zurich, 1518, to his death, 1531; Calvin's from 1536 to 1564. The Marburg Colloquy was held October, 1529; the Augsburg Confession published June, 1530; and the first edition of "Calvin's Institutes," was published at Basle, 1536, and the finished work was published by him in Geneva, 1559.

I. Zwingle held that the bread and wine are mere memorials of the body of Christ absent in heaven. His view at first prevailed among the Reformed churches, and was embodied in Zwingle's "Fidei Ratio," sent to the diet at Augsburg, 1530; the "Confessio Tetrapolitana," by Martin Bucer, 1530; the "First Basle, Confession," by Oswald Myconius, 1532; and the "First Helvetic Confession," by Bullinger, Myconius, etc., 1536.

II. Calvin occupied middle ground between the Zwinglians and Lutherans. He held—

(1.) In common with Zwingle and all the Reformed that the words "This is my body", means "this bread represents my body."

(2.) That God in this sacrament offers to all, and gives to all believing recipients, through the eating and drinking the bread and wine all the sacrificial benefits of Christ's redemption.

(3.) He also taught that besides this the very body and blood of Christ, though absent in heaven, communicate a life–giving influence to the believer in the act of receiving the elements. But that this influence though real and vital is (a) mystical not physical, (b) mediated through the Holy Ghost, (c) conditioned upon the act of faith by which the communicant receives them. This view is set forth chiefly in his "Institutes," Bk. 4, Ch.17 and in the "Gallic Confession," Art. 36, prepared by a Synod in Paris, 1559; in the "Scottish Confession," Art. 21, by John Knox, 1560; and the "Belgic Confession," Art. 35, by Von Bres, 1561.

III. Alter all hope of reconciling the Lutherans with the Reformed branches of the church on this subject was exhausted, Calvin drew up the Consensus Tigurinus in 1549 for the purpose of uniting the Zurich–Zwinglian with the Genevan–Calvanistic party in one doctrine of the Eucharist. It was accepted by both parties, and the doctrine it presents has ever since been received as the consensus of the Reformed churches. It prevails in the "Second Helvetic Confession," by Bullinger, 1564; the "Heidelberg Cathechism," by Ursinus, a student of Melanchton, 1562; the "Thirty–nine Articles of the Church of England," 1562; and the "Westminster Confession of Faith," 1648.

These all agree—

1st. As to the "presence," of the flesh and blood of Christ.

(1.) His human nature is in heaven only.

(2.) His Person as God–man is omnipresent everywhere and always, our communion is with his entire person rather that with his flesh and blood (see above, Ch.. 60., Ques. 13 and 16).

(3.) The presence of his flesh and blood in the sacrament is neither physical nor local; but only through the Holy Spirit, affecting the soul graciously.

2nd. As to that which the believer feeds upon, they agreed that it was not the “substance” but the virtue or efficacy of his body and blood, i. e., their sacrificial virtue, as broken and shed for sin.

3rd. As to the “feeding,” of believers upon this “body and blood,” they agreed—

(1.) It was not with the mouth in any manner.

(2.) It was by the soul alone.

(3.) It was by faith, the mouth or hand of the soul.

(4.) By or through the power of the Holy Ghost.

(5.) It is not confined to the Lord’s Supper. It takes place whenever faith in him is exercised.—“Bib. Ref:,” April, 1848. THE EFFICACY OF THIS SACRAMENT.

17. What is the Romish doctrine as to the efficacy of the Eucharist, and in what sense and on what ground do they hold that it is also a sacrifice ?

They distinguish between the eucharist as a sacrament, and as a sacrifice. As a sacrament its effect is that ex opere operato(through works) the receiver who does not present an obstacle, is nourished spiritually, sanctified and replenished with merit by the actual substance of the Redeemer eaten or drunk. On the other hand—“The sacrifice of the mass is an external oblation of the body and blood of Christ offered to God in recognition of his supreme Lordship, under the appearance of bread and wine visibly exhibited by a legitimate minister, with the addition of certain prayers and ceremonies prescribed by the church for the greater worship of God and edification of the people.”—Dens, Vol. 5., p. 358. With respect to its end it is to be distinguished into, 1st, Latreuticum, or an act of supreme worship offered to God.

2nd. Eucharisticum, thanksgiving.

3rd. Propitiatorium, atoning for sin, and propitiating God by the offering up of the body and blood of Christ again.

4th. Imperatorium, since through it we attain to many spiritual and temporal blessings.—Dens, Vol. 5., p. 368. The difference between the eucharist as a sacrament and a sacrifice is very great, and is twofold; as a sacrament it is perfected by consecration, as a sacrifice all its efficacy, consists in its oblation. As a sacrament it is to the worthy receiver a source of merit, as a sacrifice it is not only a source of merit, but also of satisfaction, expiating the sins of the living and the dead.—“Cat. Rom.,” Pt. 2., Chap. 4., Q. 55; “Council Trent,” Sess. 22.

They found this doctrine upon the authority of the church, and absurdly appeal to Malachi 1:11, as a prophecy of this perpetually recurrent sacrifice, and to the declaration, Hebrews 7:17, that Christ is “a priest forever, after the order of Melchizedec,” who, say they, discharged his priestly functions in offering bread and wine to Abraham.—Genesis 14:18.

18. How may this doctrine be refuted ?

1st. It has no foundation whatever in Scripture. Their appeal to the prophecy in Malachi, and to the typical relation of Melchizedec to Christ, is self–evidently absurd.

2nd. It rests wholly upon the fiction of transubstantiation, which was disproved above, Question 14.

3rd. The sacrifice of Christ on the cross was perfect, and from its essential nature excludes all others.—Hebrews 9:25-28; Hebrews 10:10-14; Hebrews 10:18; Hebrews 10:26-27.

4th. It is inconsistent with the words of institution pronounced by Christ.—Luke 22:19, and 1 Corinthians 11:24-26. The sacrament commemorates the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, and consequently can not be a new propitiatory sacrifice itself for the same reason the essence of a sacrament is different from that of a sacrifice. The two can not coexist in the same ordinance.

5th. It belonged to the very essence of all propitiatory sacrifices, as well to the typical sacrifices of the Old Testament, as to the all–perfect one of Christ, that life should be taken, that blood should be shed, since it consisted in vicariously suffering the penalty of the law.—Hebrews 9:22. But the Papists themselves call the mass a bloodless sacrifice, and it is wholly without pain or death.

6th. A sacrifice implies a priest to present it, but the Christian ministry is not a priesthood.—See above, Chap. 24, Question 21.

19. What is the Lutheran view as to the efficacy of the sacrament ? The Lutheran view on this point is that the efficacy of the sacrament resides not in the signs, but in the word of God connected with them, and that it is operative only when there is true faith in the receiver. This effect is identical with that of the word, and through faith includes the benefits of vital communion with Christ and all the fruits thereof. It, however, lays stress upon the virtue of the literal body and blood of Christ as present in, with, and under, the bread and wine. This body and blood, being physically received equally by the believer and unbeliever, but being of gracious avail only in the case of the believer.—Luther's "Small Cat.," Part V., Krauth's "Conserv. Reform.," pp. 825–829.

20. What is the so–called Zwinglian and Remonstrant and Socinians view as to the efficacy of the Eucharist?

Zwingle died prematurely. He undoubtedly took too low a view of the sacraments. If he had lived he would, doubtless, have accompanied his disciples in their union with Calvin in the adoption of the Consensus Tigurinus. The doctrine ever since known by his name, and really held by the Socinians and Remonstrants, differs from the Reformed—

1st. In making the elements mere signs; and in denying that Christ is in any special sense present in the eucharist.

2nd. In denying that they are means of grace, and holding that they are bare acts of commemoration and badges of profession.

21. What is the view of the Reformed churches upon this subject ?

They rejected the Romish view which regards the efficacy of the sacrament as inhering in it physically as its intrinsic property, as heat inheres in fire. They rejected also the Lutheran view as far as it attributes to the sacrament an inherent supernatural power due indeed not to the signs, but to the word of God which accompanies them, but which, nevertheless, is always operative, provided there be faith in the receiver. And, thirdly, they rejected the doctrine of the Socinians and

others, that the sacrament is a mere badge of profession, or an empty sign of Christ and his benefits. They declared it to be an efficacious means of grace; but its efficacy, as such, is referred neither to any virtue in it, nor in him that administers it, but solely to the attending operation of the Holy Ghost (virtue Spiritus Sancti extrinsecus accedens), precisely as in the case of the word. It has indeed the moral objective power of a significant emblem, and as a seal it really conveys to every believer the grace of which it is a sign, and it is set apart with especial solemnity as a meeting point between Christ and his people; but its power to convey grace depends entirely, as in the case of the word, on the cooperation of the Holy Ghost. Hence the power is in no way tied to the sacrament. It may be exerted without it. It does not always attend it, nor is it confined to the time, place, or service.—"Bib. Ref., April, 1848; see LORD'S Gal. Confession," Arts. 36 and 37; "Helv.," 2., 100. 21; "Scotch Conf:," Art. 21; 28th and 29th "Articles of Church of England"; also our own standards, "Confession of Faith," Chapter 29., section 7.

22. What do our standards teach as to the qualifications for admission to the Lord's Supper ?

1st. Only those who are truly regenerated by the Holy Ghost are qualified, and only those who profess faith in Christ and walk consistently are to be admitted.

2nd. Wicked and ignorant persons, and those who know themselves not to be regenerate, are not qualified, and ought not to be admitted by the church officers.—"Confession of Faith," Ch. 29. section 8; "Larger Catechism," Question 173.

3rd. But since many who doubt as to their being in Christ are nevertheless genuine Christians, so if one thus doubting unfeignedly desires to be found in Christ, and to depart from iniquity, he ought to labor to have his doubts resolved, and, so doing, to come to the Lord's Supper, that he may be further strengthened.—" L Cat.," Question 172.

4th. "Children born within the pale of the visible church, and dedicated to God in baptism, when they come to years of discretion, if they be free from scandal, appear sober and steady, and to have sufficient knowledge to discern the Lord's body, they ought to be informed it is their duty and their privilege to come to the Lord's Supper.""The years of discretion in young Christians can not be precisely fixed. This must be left to the prudence of the eldership."—"Direct. for Worship," Chap. 9.

23. What is the practice which prevails in the different churches on this subject, and on what principles does such practice rest?

1st. The Romanists make the condition of salvation to be union with and obedience to the church, and, consequently, admit all to the sacraments who express their desire to conform and obey. "No one," however, "conscious of mortal sin, and having an opportunity of recurring to a confessor, however contrite he may deem himself; is to approach the holy eucharist, until he is purified by sacramental confession."—"Coun. Trent," sess. 13, canon 11. The Lutherans agree with them in admitting all who conform to the external requirements of the church.

2nd. High Church prelatists, and others who regard the sacraments as in themselves effective means of grace, maintain that even those who, knowing themselves to be destitute of the fruits of the Spirit, nevertheless have speculative faith, in the gospel, and are free from scandal, and desire to come, should be admitted.

3rd. The faith and practice of all the evangelical churches is that the communion is designed only for believers, and therefore, that a credible profession of faith and obedience should be required of every applicant.

(1.) The Baptist churches, denying altogether the right of infant church membership, receive all applicants for the communion as from the world, and therefore demand positive evidences of the new birth of all.

(2.) All the Pedobaptist churches, maintaining that all children baptized in infancy are already members of the church, distinguish between the admission of the children of the church to the communion, and the admission de novo(altogether new) to the church of the unbaptized alien from the world. With regard to the former, the presumption is that they should come to the Lord's table when they arrive at "years of discretion, if they be free from scandal, appear to be sober and steady, and to have sufficient knowledge to discern the Lord's body." In the case of the unbaptized worldling, the presumption is that they are aliens until they bring a credible profession of a change.

24. How may it be proved that the Lord's Supper is not designed for the unrenewed ?

It can, of course, be designed only for those who are spiritually qualified to do in reality what every recipient of the sacrament does in form and professedly. But this ordinance is essentially–

1st. A profession of Christ.

2nd. A solemn covenant to accept Christ and his gospel, and to fulfil the conditions of discipleship.

3rd. An act of spiritual communion with Christ. The qualifications for acceptable communion, therefore, are such knowledge, and such a spiritual condition, as shall enable the recipient intelligently and honestly to discern in the emblems the Lord's body as sacrificed for sin, to contract with him the gospel covenant, and to hold fellowship with him through the Spirit.

25. What have the church and its officers a right to require of those whom they admit to the Lord's Supper ?

"The officers of the church are the judges of the qualifications of those to be admitted to sealing ordinances.""And those so admitted shall be examined as to their knowledge and piety."—"Direct for Worsh.," Chap. 9. As God has not endowed any of these officers with the power of reading the heart, it follows that the qualifications of which they are the judges are simply those of competent knowledge purity of life, and credible profession of faith. [By "credible," is meant not that which convinces, but that which can be believed to be genuine.] It is their duty to examine the applicant as to his knowledge, to watch and inquire concerning his walk and conversation, to set before him faithfully the inward spiritual qualifications requisite for acceptable communion, and to hear his profession of that spiritual faith and purpose. The responsibility of the act then rests upon the individual professor, and not upon the session, who are never to be understood as passing judgment upon, or as indorsing the validity of his evidences.

26. What is the difference between the Presbyterian and the Congregational churches upon this point?

There exists a difference between the traditionary views and practice of these two bodies of Christians with respect to the ability, the right, and the duty of church officers, of forming and affirming a positive official judgment upon the inward spiritual character of applicants for church privileges. The Congregationalists understand by “credible profession” the positive evidence of a religious experience which satisfies the official judges of the gracious state of the applicant. The Presbyterians understand by that phrase only an intelligent profession of true spiritual faith in Christ, which is not contradicted by the life.

Dr. Candlish, in the “Edinburgh Witness,” June 8th, 1848, says, “The principle (of communion), as it is notorious that the Presbyterian church has always held it, does not constitute the pastor, elders, or congregation, judges of the actual conversion of the applicant; but, on the contrary, lays much responsibility upon the applicant himself The minister and kirk session must be satisfied as to his competent knowledge, credible profession, and consistent walk They must determine negatively that there is no reason for pronouncing him not to be a Christian, but they do not undertake the responsibility of positively judging of his conversion. This is the Presbyterian rule of discipline, be it right or wrong, differing materially from that of the Congregationalists. In practice there is room for much dealing with the conscience under either rule, and persons destitute of knowledge and of a credible profession are excluded.”

AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS OF CHURCH DOCTRINE.

ROMISH DOCTRINE.—DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST BOTH AS A SACRAMENT AND AS A SACRIFICE.

“Conc. Trident.,” Sess. 13, Song of Solomon 1:1-17.—“If any one denieth, that in the sacrament of the most holy 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; but saith that he is only therein as in a sign, or in figure, or virtue; let him be anathema.”

Song of Solomon 2:1-17.—“If any one saith, that, in the sacred and holy sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains conjointly with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and denieth that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and the whole substance of the wine into the blood— the species (accidents) of the bread and wine remaining—which conversion indeed the Catholic Church most aptly calls Transubstantiation; let him be anathema.”

Song of Solomon 3:1-11.—“If any one denieth, that, in the venerable sacrament of the Eucharist, the whole Christ is contained under each species, and under every part of each species, when separation has been made; let him be anathema.”

Song of Solomon 4:1-16.—“If any one saith, that, after the consecration has been completed, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are not in the admirable sacrament of the Eucharist, but (are there) only during the use, whilst it is being taken, and not either before or after; and that in the host, or consecrated particles, which are received or remain after communion, the true body remaineth not; let him be anathema.”

Song of Solomon 6:1-13.—“If any one saith, that, in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is not to be adored with the worship, even external, of latria; and is,

consequently, neither to be venerated with special festive solemnity, nor to be solemnly borne about in processions, according to the laudable and universal rite and custom of holy church, or, is not to be exposed publicly to the people to be adored, and that the adorers thereof are idolaters; let him be anathema."

Song of Solomon 7:1-13.—"If any one shall say–that it is not lawful for the sacred Eucharist to be reserved in the sacrarium, but that immediately after consecration, it must necessarily be distributed amongst those present; or, that it is not lawful that it be carried with honor to the sick; let him be anathema."

Song of Solomon 8:1-14.—"If any one saith, that Christ, given in the Eucharist, is eaten spiritually only, and not also sacramentally and really; let him be anathema."

Can. 10.—"If any one saith, that it is not lawful for the celebrating priest to communicate by himself; let him be anathema."

Sess. 21, Song of Solomon 1:1-17.—"If any one saith, that, by the precept of God, or by necessity of salvation, all and each of the faithful of Christ ought to receive both species of the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, let him be anathema."

Song of Solomon 2:1-17.—"If any one saith, that the holy Catholic Church was not induced, by just causes and reasons, to communicate under the species of bread only, laymen and also clerics when not consecrating; let him be anathema."

Song of Solomon 3:1-11.—"If any one denieth that Christ whole and entire—the fountain and author of all graces—is received under the one species of bread; because that—as some falsely assert—he is not received according to the institution of Christ himself under both species, let him be anathema."

Sess. 22, Song of Solomon 1:1-17.—"If any one saith, that in the mass, a true and proper sacrifice is not made to God, or, that to be offered is nothing else but that Christ is given us to eat; let him be anathema."

Song of Solomon 2:1-17.—"If any one saith, that by those words, Do this for the commemoration of me(Luke 22:19), Christ did not institute the apostles priests, or did not ordain that they and other priests should offer his own body and blood, let him be anathema."

Song of Solomon 3:1-11.—"If any one saith, that the sacrifice of the mass is only a sacrifice of praise and of thanksgiving; or, that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice, or, that it profits him only that receives; and that it ought not to be offered for the living and for the dead, for sins, pains, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be anathema."

Song of Solomon 8:1-14.—"If any one saith, that masses, wherein the priest alone communicates sacramentally, are unlawful . . let him be anathema."

Chap. 2.—"Forasmuch as in this divine sacrifice which is celebrated in the mass, that same Christ is contained and immolated in an unbloody manner, who once offered himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross . . . therefor, not only for the sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other

necessities of the faithful who are living, but also for those who are departed in Christ, and who are not as yet fully purified, is it rightly offered agreeably to a tradition of the apostles."

Bellarmin, " Controv. de Euchar.," 5. 5.—"The sacrifice of the mass has not an efficacy ex opere operato after the manner of a sacrament. The sacrifice does not operate efficiently and immediately, nor is it properly the instrument of God for making just. It does not make just immediately as baptism and absolution do, but it impetrates the gift of penitence, through which a sinner is made willing to approach the sacrament and by this be justified. . . The sacrifice of the mass is the procurer not only of spiritual but also of temporal benefits, and therefore it can be offered for sins, for punishments, and for any other necessary uses."

LUTHERAN DOCTRINE.

"Augsburg Confession," Pars 1, Art. 10; "Apol. Augs. Confession," p. 157 (Hase), "Formula Concordioe," Pars 1, ch. 7, &, 1.—"We believe, teach, and profess that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present, and that together with the bread and wine they are truly distributed and received. & 2.—The words of Christ (this is my body) are to be understood only in their strictly literal sense; so that neither the bread signifies the absent body of Christ, nor the wine the absent blood of Christ, but so that on account of the sacramental union the bread and wine truly are the body and blood of Christ. & 3.—As to what pertains to the consecration we believe, etc., that no human act, nor any utterance of the minister of the church, is the cause of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper, but that this is to be attributed solely to the omnipotent power of our Lord Jesus Christ. & 5—The grounds, however, on which, in this matter, we contend against the Sacramentarians, are these. . . The first ground is an article of our Christian faith, namely, Jesus Christ is true, essential, natural, perfect God and man, in unity of person inseparable and undivided. The second is that the right hand of God is everywhere; but there Christ has, truly and in very deed, been placed, in respect to his humanity, and therefore being present he rules, and holds in his hands and under his feet all things which are in heaven and on earth. The third is that the word of God can not be false. The fourth is that God knows and has in his power various modes in which it is possible to be in a place (present), and he was not restricted to that single mode of presence which philosophers have been accustomed to call local or circumscribed . & 6.—We believe, etc., that the body and blood of Christ are received not only spiritually through faith, but also by the mouth, not after a capernaitish, but a supernatural and celestial manner, by virtue of a sacramental union. . . & 7.—We believe, etc., that not only those who believe in Christ, and worthily approach the Lord's Supper, but also the unworthy and unbelievers receive the true body and blood of Christ, so that, however, they shall not thence derive either consolation or life, but rather that this receiving shall fall out to judgment to them, unless they be converted and exercise repentance."

DOCTRINE OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES.

"Gallic Confession," Art. 36.—"Although Christ is now in heaven, there also to remain till he shall come to judge the world, yet we believe that he, by the hidden and incomprehensible power of his Spirit, nourishes and vivifies us with the substance of his body and blood, apprehended by faith.,"

"Scottish Confession"—"And although there is great distance of place between his now glorified body in heaven and us mortals now upon the earth, yet we nevertheless believe that the bread

which we break is the communion of his body, and the cup which we bless is the communion of his blood. . . So we confess that believers in the right use of the Lord's Supper do thus eat the body and drink the blood of Jesus Christ; and we surely believe that he remains in them and they in him, yea, so become flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones, that as the eternal divinity gives life and immortality to the flesh of Jesus Christ, so also, his flesh and blood, when eaten and drunk by us, confer on us the same privileges."

"Belgic Confession," Art. 35.

Calvin's "Institutes," Bk. 4., Ch. 17 & 10.—"The sum is, that the flesh and blood of Christ, feed our souls just as bread and wine maintain and support our corporeal life. . . But though it seems an incredible thing that the flesh and blood of Christ, while at such a distance from us in respect of place, should be food to us, let us remember how far the secret virtue of the Holy Spirit surpasses all our conceptions, and how foolish it is to measure its immensity by our feeble capacity. Therefore what our mind does not comprehend, let faith conceive; viz., that the Spirit truly unites things separated by space. That sacred communion of flesh and blood whereby Christ transfuses his life into us, just as if it penetrated our bones and marrow, he testifies and seals in his supper, and that not by presenting a vain or empty sign, but by there exerting an efficacy of the Spirit by which he fulfils what he promises. And truly the thing there signified he exhibits and offers to all who sit down at that spiritual feast, although it is beneficially received by believers only."

"Thirty–nine Articles" Art. 28.—"The Supper of the Lord is a sacrament of the 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 partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ, . . The body of Christ, is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean 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 worshipped."

"Heidelberg Cat." Ques. 76.—"What is it to eat the crucified body of Christ, and to drink his shed blood? It means, not only with thankful hearts to appropriate the passion of Christ, and thereby receive forgiveness of sins and eternal life, but also and therein, through the Holy Ghost who dwelleth in Christ and in us, to be more and more united to his blessed body so that, although he is in heaven, and we are upon earth, we nevertheless are flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones, and live forever one spirit with him."

"West. Confession of Faith," Ch.. 29, & 5.—"The outward elements in this sacrament, duly set apart to the uses ordained by Christ, have such a relation to him crucified, as that truly, yet sacramentally only they are sometimes called by the names of the things they represent, to wit, the body and blood of Christ, albeit in substance and nature they still remain truly and only bread and wine. & 7.—Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, but not carnally and corporeally, but spiritually receive and feed upon Christ crucified and all the benefits of his death:the body and blood of Christ being then not corporeally or carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet as really but spiritually present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to the outward senses."—

Chapter 84

03.0.1. POPULAR LECTURES ON THEOLOGICAL THEMES.

POPULAR LECTURES ON THEOLOGICAL THEMES. BY ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER HODGE, D.D..LL.D.

PHILADELPHIA : PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION

1887

03.0.2. Table of Contents

Table of Contents

PREFACE LECTURE I. God His Nature and Relations to the Universe LECTURE II. The Scripture Doctrine of Divine Providence LECTURE III. Miracles LECTURE IV. The Holy Scriptures.—The Canon and Inspiration LECTURE V. Prayer and the Prayer-Cure LECTURE VI. The Trinity of Persons in the Godhead LECTURE VII. Predestination LECTURE VIII. The Original State of Man LECTURE IX. God's Covenants with Man.—The Church LECTURE X. The Person of Christ LECTURE XI. The Offices of Christ LECTURE XII The Kingly Office of Christ LECTURE XIII. The Kingdom of Christ LECTURE XIV. The Law of the Kingdom LECTURE XV. Sanctification and Good Works—Higher Life LECTURE XVI. The Sacraments—Baptism LECTURE XVII. The Lord's Supper LECTURE XVIII. The State of Man after Death, and the Resurrection LECTURE XIX. Final Rewards and Punishments

03.0.3. Preface

PREFACE. The Lectures which compose this volume originated in the request of a number of ladies in Princeton to be formed into a class for instruction in theological subjects. This class was continued for two winters, the method adopted being entirely oral. In the fall of 1885 a few ladies in Philadelphia proposed that the Lectures should be repeated to a similar class in that city. Large audiences of both men and women were attracted to hear them, and the reports published in the Presbyterian and the Presbyterian Journal awakened a desire for their repetition elsewhere. The reports published in The Presbyterian were for the most part from manuscript furnished by the author, which in some instances was prepared after the delivery of the Lectures; and the courtesy of The Presbyterian in permitting the author to use these, with revision and amendments, is gratefully acknowledged. In 1886 it was proposed that a shorter course be prepared to complete the presentation of subjects, and that the whole should be issued in a volume. Seven additional Lectures were prepared for this purpose, and, with the exception of the close of Lecture XVII., were fully written during the summer, but were never passed in review by the writer. In this way it appears that Lectures I., II., III., IV., V., VI., X., XV., XVIII, XIX. were revised or rewritten after delivery; Lectures VIII., IX. are printed from the newspaper reports, which were not so revised; while Lectures VII., XL, XII., XIII, XIV., XVI., XVII. are printed from the author's MSS. without revision. If all had passed under his eye while going through the press, he would doubtless have carefully corrected them, and balanced the treatment so as to secure uniformity in the relation of parts. No changes have been attempted which were not obviously necessary.

Many thanks are due to the author's friend, the Rev. S. T. Lowrie, D. D., for much labor kindly bestowed in preparing the copy for the press, as well as in the preparation of the Index. In the hope that their posthumous publication may serve to promote the truth to which the author's life was devoted, and so further the end of their original delivery, the Lectures are offered to the public.

Princeton, March, 1887.

Chapter 87

03.01. LECTURE 01 - GOD-HIS NATURE AND RELATION TO THE UNIVERSE

LECTURE I GOD—HIS NATURE AND RELATION TO THE UNIVERSE

Ladies and Gentlemen: We have met together this afternoon to engage in the first of a proposed series of discussions of the chief questions in theology. It is not my purpose to attempt to present you with new truth, or even with unaccustomed views of truth long known, but simply to set before you in logical perspective the whole assemblage of the things that from the beginning have been most surely believed among us, so that their symmetrical proportions and harmonious relations may be more clearly discerned and appreciated. In this view of the matter the most important question is that of order. The perspective of every landscape differs endlessly with the various points of view from which we look upon it. As you sweep rapidly on a railroad among the Alps, the vast mountain-peaks apparently revolve through involved curves and group themselves in innumerable combinations as in a dance, the law of which we are unable to unravel. But when we once .gain the central summit in which the whole geological system culminates, we look down upon all the members of the landscape, each in its appropriate place and relations, and the picture is complete. As long as men were confined in their imaginations as well as in their bodies to this small and ceaselessly revolving sphere the movements of our fellow-planets, moving with us, were absolutely incomprehensible. But the instant Copernicus taught us to occupy in idea the solar-centric point of view all was seen to be the simplest and most orderly movement possible.

All theology must therefore be theo-centric, must have God for its beginning and end. There is a great deal of confusion of thought arising from substituting words for thoughts in the pious claim in vogue now-a-days that all theology must be grouped Christo-centrically. There is an immense sense in which every loyal Christian will recognize this as true. In the first place, the revelation of God in Christ is so infinitely more clear and full than in all the universe besides that we may well say not only that Christ is God, but also that there is no God other than the One whose consummate self-revelation is in Christ. In the second place, Christ is undoubtedly the Author and Finisher of our faith and the beginning and ending of human salvation. The entire scheme of salvation begins and ends in his person and work. And, in the third place, all power in all worlds is put in Christ’s hands, so that all events are controlled by his will, all history revolves around his person and all science finds its key in his doctrine. Notwithstanding all this, however, Christ is central because Christ is God. The unincarnate God and his natural relations to the universe must be logically prior to and more fundamental than the incarnate God and his gracious relations to his creatures. The apostle Paul has a deep meaning when he says (1 Corinthians 11:3): "The head of every man is Christ, . . . and the head of Christ is God f which is equivalent to saying, " The centre of every man is Christ, and the centre of Christ is God."

Three questions therefore obviously lie at the foundation not only of all man’s religious knowledge, but equally at the foundation of every possible form of knowledge:

(1)Is there a God?

(2)What is God?

(3)What is God’s relation to the universe? And if he does sustain a relation to the universe which is in any degree intelligible to us, a fourth question emerges:

(4)What is the sphere, nature and extent of his providential action upon or in reference to his creatures ? The answer to the first question, as to the fact of God’s existence, we propose in these lectures to assume as granted. The most certain of all truths is the existence of God.

I. The second question, therefore, presents itself: What do we know as to the essential nature op God?

God reveals himself to us through the simultaneously concurrent action of two sources of knowledge, neither of which could give us the information separately. We are, each one, immediately conscious that we are intelligent, moral, voluntary agents and true causes. This, and all that this involves, comes to us by consciousness It is the most immediate and certain of all knowledge, and that upon which all other knowledge rests; and we give definite expression to this self-knowledge when we call ourselves spirits and persons. It is precisely this, and nothing else, that we mean by the words "spirit" and " person." When we come to look upon the course of external nature, to reflect upon our own origin and history internal and external, and upon the history of the human race and the life of the general community of which we form a part, we immediately and indubi- · tably discern everywhere the presence and control of a Being like ourselves in kind. In that intelligible order which pervades the infinite multiplicity and heterogeneity of events, and, which makes science possible, we see and certainly know the presence of intelligence, of personal will, of moral character—i. e. of all that is connoted by our common term " personal spirit." God is seen to be of common generic character with ourselves. The great difference we see is that while we are essentially limited in respect to time or space or knowledge or power, God, the personal agent we see at work in nature and history, is essentially unlimited in all these respects. The only reason that so many students of natural science have found themselves unable to see God in nature is that their absorption in nature has made them lose sight of their own essential personality. Hence they have attempted to interpret the phenomena of self-consciousness in the terms of mechanical nature, instead of interpreting nature under the light of self-conscious spirit. But the scientist, after all, comes before his science, the reader before the book he deciphers. And the intelligibility of nature proves its intelligent source, and the essential likeness of the Author of nature, who reveals himself in his work, and of the interpreter of nature, who retraces his processes and appreciates alike the intellectual and the artistic character of his design.

Since God is infinite, of course a definition of him is impossible. Obviously, no bounds can be drawn around the boundless. God can be known only so far forth as he has chosen to reveal himself. And being essentially infinite, every side and element of his nature is infinite, and every glimpse we have of his being involves the outlying immensity or the transcendent perfection which cannot be known. But since we have been created in his likeness, and since we discern him in all his works as, like ourselves, an intelligent and moral personal spirit, we can define our idea of him by stating (1) the genus or kind to which he is known to belong, and (2) the differentia, or

differences, which distinguish him from all other beings of that kind. The best definition of the idea of God ever given is constructed on this principle. First, as to his kind: God is a personal Spirit; second, as to his difference from all other spirits: God is infinite, eternal, unchangeable, and in all his moral attributes absolutely perfect, and he is infinite, eternal and unchangeable alike in his being, in his wisdom, in his power, etc. etc

First, as to his kind. God is a personal Spirit. We mean by this precisely what we mean when we affirm that we ourselves are personal spirits. This conception comes wholly from consciousness, and it is absolutely certain. We see and know God, as manifested in his activities alike in the whole world within us and around us as far as the remotest star, to be another of the same kind with ourselves. We know ourselves to be intelligent causes. We see him likewise to be an intelligent Cause, and the original, the absolute, and the perfect One. In applying this law in constructing our idea of God we proceed according to three principles of judgment:

(1)That of causality. We judge the nature of every cause from what we see of its effects; we judge the character of every author from what we read of his works. So the manifold works of God, past and present, physical and spiritual, reveal his nature as First Cause.

(2)That of negation. We deny of him all those attributes and conditions the possession of which involves imperfection—e. g. materiality, bodily parts or passions, the limitations of time or space.

(3) That of eminence. We attribute to him all that is found to be excellent in ourselves, in absolute perfection and in unlimited degree.

Second. This leads, necessarily, to the discrimination, in the second place, of those properties which distinguish God from all other personal spirits.

1. We know ourselves as causes; we can really originate new things. But we are dependent and limited causes. We did not originate, and we cannot sustain, ourselves. We can put forth our causal energy only under certain conditions, and we can bring to pass only a very limited class of effects. But God as a cause is absolutely independent and unlimited. He is the uncaused First Cause of all things. He is an eternal and necessary Being who has his own cause in himself. He is not only the first link in the chain of causation, but he is the everywhere present sustaining and actuating basis of all dependent existence and the originating con-cause in all causation, because we and all other dependent causes act only as we live and move and have all our being in him.

2. We know ourselves always and necessarily as existing, thinking and acting under the limitations of time and space; we can think or act only under these limitations. But God necessarily transcends all these limitations, and condescends to them only on occasion, at his own pleasure, in the way of self-limitation.

We began to be at a definite period in the past. We continue to exist and to think and to act through a ceaseless succession of moments, the present moment ever emerging out of the past and immerging into the future. But God is without beginning or succession or end. All duration, past, present and future, is always equally comprehended in his infinite consciousness as the eternal Now.

We are in space definitely, and are surrounded by it, and pass from one position to another through all the intermediate portions of space in succession. But God fills all space: not by

extension, like the water of the sea or as the atmosphere; not by multiplication, nor by rapid movement, like an ubiquitous general along the line of his army; not as represented by his agents, as the head of an army or state may be said to be and to act wherever his agents carry out his orders; not by his knowledge or his power merely, as when an astronomer may be said to be in thought wherever his telescope points, or a great sovereign to reign wherever his laws are obeyed. But by reason of his own infinite perfection, Father, Son and Holy Ghost are in their whole undivided being present at every point of space at every moment of time. The whole God is always everywhere within all things, acting from within outward from the centre of every atom, and from the innermost springs of the life and thought and feeling and will of every spirit; without all things, embracing them as an infinite abyss, and acting upon them in a thousand ways from without.

3. We know ourselves as possessing the spoiled and defaced lineaments of a moral character, the main elements of which are truth, purity, justice, benevolence. We know that God, who has revealed his character in the external physical world, in human history and in the person of his Son Jesus Christ, is the absolutely perfect norm of our moral idea. Our morality is reflected, his is original and radiant. Ours is defective, his is absolute. It has become the weak and conceited mode of those who pose as the advanced thinkers of this luxurious age, to emphasize the benevolence of God at the expense of his immaculate holiness and jus-tide. They teach us that the cultured mind finds the old doctrines of blood-expiation and of eternal perdition utterly inconsistent with its better idea of God. They think the great God " altogether such an one as themselves." The ground of this widely-advertised opinion is purely subjective—the Christian consciousness of the cultured elite in contradistinction to the historic Christian consciousness of the ages. The facts are all on the other side. The terrible record of him in history, blazed all along its line with the fires of judgment kindled by a sin-hating God, the death-throes of individuals and of nations, the answering cry of the human conscience uttered in the ceaseless rites of blood on altars and penitential stools, the entire voice of revelation, from the cherubim with the fiery sword driving out the homeless, helpless first pair from Eden, the frowning thunders and blasting lightnings of Sinai, the history of Canaan exterminated and of Israel chastised, the awful horrors of Gethsemane and Calvary, the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion and bondage of the Jews, to the final issue of the lake of fire set as the background of the picture of the Paradise regained, the eternal wailing and the smoke of torment ascending for ever and ever,—all these facts stand as the unquestionable evidence of the existence of other perfections in God besides benevolence.

II. The third question remains: What relation does God sustain to the universe he has called into being?

It is very evident that since we are able to comprehend neither God’s essential being, nor his mode of existence superior to the limits of either time or space, nor the nature of his agency in creating, upholding in being or in governing his creatures, we cannot by any central principle or a-qmori mode of reasoning think out a perfect theory of his relation to the universe. We can only-state severally the separate facts as we know them, leaving their complete elucidation and reconciliation to the future. And we are both assisted and confirmed in our efforts to present all the facts comprehended, by the circumstance that different heretical schools of thought emphasize one or another of these facts, while they deny or suppress the rest. Here we have a new and striking illustration of the universal principle that all heretical dogmas are partial truths—true in

what they assert, false in what they deny or ignore. Orthodoxy is always catholic truth, embracing and integrating all the possibly separate and apparently incongruous parts and aspects of the truth. Thus in the present instance we have the Agnostics, who maintain that the Infinite is the Unknowable; the Deists, who set God apart from the world, separate upon his throne in heaven; and those who maintain exclusively the fact that God is immanent, or uniformly and universally present in all things, while they deny or ignore his equal transcendence above and over all things. True Christian Theism maintains all these partial truths as equally parts of the one truth. God is at once the unfathomable Abyss, the transcendent Father, King and Judge, the immanent and vital Spirit.

First. God is unknowable, the infinite Abyss of darkness in which the universe floats as an atom. Herbert Spencer's philosophy emphasizes the truth that the more science advances, the more must the questions as to origin, first cause, ultimate force and end, be pushed back into darkness. If you light a spark in a starless night, it will fill a small sphere of illuminated space extending equidistant in all directions. If the spark becomes a candle, if the candle becomes a flame of gas, if the gas-flame becomes an electric arc, if the electric arc becomes a sun,—in every case the sphere of light will grow as the cube of its radius; and as the sphere of light becomes larger and larger, in exact proportion will it be enfolded within an ever-growing sphere of darkness. In this sense the more we meditate upon him, God is ever beyond. In this sense, while the sphere of human knowledge is ever increasing, and will through eternity never cease to increase, God is always unknowable. And the sphere of a creature's knowledge, be it that of an infant or of a man or of a philosopher or of a prophet or of saint or archangel in heaven, will float as a point of light athwart the bosom of that God who is the infinite Abyss for ever. This tremendous fact conditions all human knowledge in every stage of it. We can know anything only imperfectly, whether in science or in theology, because we know things only in parts, and can never comprehend the absolute whole. The botanist cannot comprehend a single flower except as he takes in the whole plant, nor the whole plant except as he takes in the whole species, nor the whole species except as he takes in the whole genus, nor the whole genus except as he takes in the whole system of organized life, the entire fauna and flora and all their history on the earth. The teacher may easily explain the laws and movements of the solar system to his class, but he knows them himself very partially, since he knows so little of the realities or of the history of the stellar universe of which the solar system is so small a dependency. All things go out into mystery. All our knowledge is conditioned upon the essential unknowable-ness of God. In all our knowing and in all our worship, the infinite God is always beyond. This side of the truth is taught as clearly in the oldest word of revelation as it is in the latest word of science. " Canst thou by searching find out God ? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do ? deeper than hell; what canst thou know? The measure thereof is larger than the earth, and broader than the sea" (Job 11:7-9).

Second. God is transcendent; that is, he is a distinct Person, separate from the world and from all other persons—who speaks to us face to face, who commands our wills and regulates our lives from on high; who upon occasion, when he wills, acts upon the universe or any part of it from without. He is objective to each one of us, as a distinct Person, alike when he speaks to as and when we speak to him. He created all things out of nothing. The universe is not a modification of his essence nor is it confused with his substance; he is essentially something other than any one

of his creatures, the extramundane God. The relation he sustains to the universe, therefore, is analogous to that of a maker to his work, of a preserver and governor of a mechanism, of a father to his children, of a moral ruler to his intelligent and responsible subjects. This view of the nature of God and of his relation to the world, and especially his relation to created spirits, is common to Deists and Christian Theists. It is denied utterly by Pantheists, and it is ignored in whole or in part by the modern special advocates of the immanence of God as containing all the essential truth related to our interests in the matter. Yet this view just presented of God's separate personality and agency and objectivity to man and transcendence above the world is true and infinitely important, although we concede that it is not the whole truth known to us on the subject. The view of God as extramundane is essentially the moral view of his relation to the world; that which recognizes his immanence is pre-eminently the religious view. If he be not extramundane, if he be not a separate transcendent person revealing himself objectively, commanding from above and working upon his creatures from without, it follows that he cannot sustain either social or governmental relations to us. He cannot be truly our Father, or our Lawgiver, or our moral Governor, or our Judge distributing rewards and punishments; he cannot come down at his will from without and work miracles of grace or power as signs and seals to his intelligent creatures. This is the prominent view embraced by the mass of the worshipers in all theistic religions, Jews, Christians and Mohammedans alike, among all historic bodies of Christians, Greeks, Romanists and all classes of Protestants. It is realized in the consciousness of every repentant sinner and of every believing Christian. It is implied in all faith and obedience, in all prayer and praise, and hence in all the psalms, hymns and prayers of the Church. It is taught equally in all Scriptures, the New Testament as well as the Old, which show forth Jehovah as sitting upon his throne in heaven, and as sending his messengers and as transmitting his energies and his judgments from heaven to earth, and as marshalling the hosts of heaven and the nations of the earth from afar. Above all, is this truth made patent as the sky, a matter of daily personal experience, in the personal incarnation of God in Christ. Christ is God. Christ is the same to-day and for ever as he was when he lived on earth. God is therefore a Person who is outside of and distinct from the world and all other persons ; who speaks to us and we speak to him; who hears us and we hear him; who commands, leads and guides us from without as another; and in whose personal society and under whose blessed reign we shall be transcendently happy for ever.

Third. God is immanent. He is everywhere present in every point of space and within the inmost constitution of all created things at the same time. God's activity springs up from the central seat of energy in all second causes, and acts from within through them as well as from without upon them. He reveals himself in us and to us through our own subjectivity, as well as objectively through the things presented to our senses. He is the universal present and active basis of all being and action, the First Cause ever living and acting in all second causes. This is evident, 1st, from the essential nature of God as omnipresent and as First Cause, the foundation of all dependent existence and the ultimate source of all energy. 2d. This is evident from what we see very plainly in the entire sphere and history of the physical universe. The impression made by the most transient observation is abundantly confirmed by science, that the continuity of physical causation through all worlds, through every sphere of mechanical, chemical and vital action, and through all the succeeding ages, is absolutely unbroken. There are no broken links, no sudden emergencies of disconnected events, but a continuous sequence of cause and effect everywhere. The deistical conception of God's relation to the universe is analogous to that of a human mechanist to the

machinery he has made and operates. He sits outside his engine, feeds its forces, adjusts its parts, controls its action, and thus directs its energies upon the accomplishment of its appointed ends. The conception of God and of his action as immanent in the universe, acting from within through the spontaneities of the things he has made, rather than upon them from without, is analogous rather to the action of the vital principle of a plant, which as a plastic architectonic energy is ever present within the germ from its first formation, and continues to control all the natural physical forces engaged in the upbuilding of the organism through all its organs during its entire life. The works of man are built up by the adding of part to part by external forces. The works of God grow continuously through the evolution of germs from within, by internal forces. Thus, in spite of the infinite number and diversity of the forces interacting in all the physical universe, and of all the wills interacting in human society, the history alike of the physical universe and of human society presents the absolutely continuous unfolding of a single plan. The same great truth is illustrated in our religious experience. A divine power not ourselves, working for righteousness, enters us on the side of our own subjectivity, and is confluent always with our most spontaneous and least deliberative exercises. Thus, regeneration is an effect of God's immediate working within the soul below, our consciousness, giving a new character to all our conscious states and acts. God works within us constantly to will, and by willing to do, of his good pleasure. And thus also, while each book of Holy Scripture was written by a human author in the language and style peculiar to his age, his nation and his personal character, and in the perfectly free exercise of all his faculties, yet all the books are the word op God. His suggestive, elevative and directive influence has so worked in them from within, mingling freely with their own spontaneities, that the writing is at once both God's and theirs, both supernatural and natural, because they, being men, wrote as they were moved by the immanent Spirit of God. Angels and men influence one another from without by objective presentations; God influences all from within by subjective impulses. Hence we realize the complementary truth that we live and move in him and have all our being in him. In some distant sense, as the birds draw their life and have their being in the air, God is the one essential, fundamental environment and life-condition of all creatures. The consequences of this great fact of the divine immanence are:

(1.) The whole universe exists in God. As the stars in the ether, as the clouds in the air, the whole universe floats on the pulsing bosom of God.

(2.) All the intelligence manifested in the physical universe, all that larger and timeless intelligence which embraces and directs the limited and transient intelligence of the human actors in the drama of history, is of God. In the physical world we see an infinitude of blind, unconscious forces, apparently independent in their nature and source, working together harmoniously to build upon a continuous and universal plan the most intricate and harmonious results, as the great cathedral dedicated to St. Peter in Rome rose out of the marble quarries of Italy through the agency of multitudes of thoughtless men and beasts of labor working without concert for many years, yet conspiring to balance harmoniously in the air a miracle of mechanical construction and of artistic beauty. It was because all the agents in that work, of all kinds and during the entire period of its development, were subject to the suggestive, elevative and directive inspiration of the great Michael Angelo.

(3.) Hence, also, in the third place, it follows that all the effect-producing energy seen in the physical universe is ultimately the efficiency of God. The First Cause must be the efficient cause of

all second causes and the source of all the dependent energy they ever exercise. As the sun's rays, shining on the tropic seas, raise by evaporation the vast oceans of aerial vapors which, condensed by our northern cold, precipitate in rain and generate the immense forces of our rivers and waterfalls ; as ultimately all the energies of nature distributed from our central suns hold the worlds together in the form of gravity, and are differentiated into the thousand forms of vegetable and animal life, and into the mechanical movement of the currents of winds and tides and of electric currents and of radiant light,—so all these issue ceaselessly from their ultimate seat in God. What the sun is to the solar system, what the furnace is to the steamship, what the great centre of nerve-force is to our bodies, that God is to his universe, and infinitely more.

(4.) Hence, lastly, it follows that everywhere the universe reveals God. The power of the indwelling spirit to express its changing modes through the changes of the body is a great mystery, and nevertheless is one of the most obvious and constant of all facts. Pallid fear, raging passion, calm contemplation, assured confidence, radiant joy, determined purpose, have each their universally recognized signs of expression current among all nations of men and animal tribes. So the constructive dream of the architect, the ideal of the sculptor and painter, the high theme of the musician, are all expressed in the several forms of their respective arts. The great artists are immortal, since they ever live, speaking and singing in their works. As our souls animate and manifest their presence and their changing modes in ever}' part of our bodies, and as God is immanent and active in all his works, so all nature and the course of universal history reflect his thoughts. All men always recognize events of extraordinary character as expressions of the will of God. Whatever is recognized by us as providential expresses to us the divine thought. Even Shakespeare says that Providence "shapes our ends, rough-hew them as we may." The Christian recognizes every event as providential. Every hair of our head is numbered, and not one sparrow falls to the ground except as our Father wills it. He works in us all to will and to do his good pleasure in all things. Hence every flower is a thought of God. The firmament reflects his immensity, and the order of the stars his limitless intelligence, and the myriad-fold beauty of the world unveils the secret chambers of his imagery. The tempest is the letting loose of his strength, and the thunder utters his voice. To the Christian the universe is not merely a temple in which God is worshiped, but it is also the ever-venerated countenance on which the affections of our Lord toward his children are visibly expressed. Everywhere we see God, and everywhere his ever-active and fecund benevolence toward us is articulated in smile and word and deed. This view of God, which we signalize by the word " immanence' is not a new one, nor is it confined to philosophers or to theologians. The plainest and most practical Christians of all churches live in the exercise of this faith every day. To the babes in Christ every event is providential and marks the constant thought and care of God. Especially have evangelical Christians of the school of Augustine and Calvin always recognized the constant dependence of the creature and the constant inworking of the divine energy as the controlling source of all our spontaneous affections and actions. It is a first principle in their theology that the creature can act only as it is first acted upon by the First Cause. The doctrine of prevenient grace, which is the grand evangelical distinction, implies this. God must first move the sinner to good before the sinner can begin to co-operate with that grace which ever continues to prompt and assist him. Thus they argue for a previous, simultaneous and determining concursus — i. e. continuous co-working—of the ceaseless activities of God with the activities of his creatures. They hold that even the sinful actions of men originate in God as to their matter, while as to their form or moral quality they

originate in the creature alone; as when a great artist handles an instrument put of tune the sound that issues is due to the artist, but the discord which deforms it issues only from the unbalanced organism of the instrument, the unstrung cords or the unadjusted pipes. The claim made by the advocates of the " New Departure " in theology, that this view of God as immanent and constantly active in all his works is new in the thoughts of Christians, is absolutely without shadow of evidence. It has never been denied or seriously ignored, nor is it in the least inconsistent with the complementary view of his personal transcendence and objective presentation and working from without. The Church has always held both sides together of this double truth, as both equally essential and precious.

Neither is this view of the divine immanence to be confounded with Pantheism. They both alike emphasize the common truth that God is within us; that he is to be sought in the sphere of the subjective as well as of the objective; that he is the immediate basis of all created existence and the ultimate source of all the intelligence and energy manifested in the external world. But Pantheism holds that the whole universe of extension and thought is one substance, and that substance God —that God exists only in the successive forms or events which constitute the universe. These forms are various, but God is one. They are successive, but God endures the same. He is not a person, but all persons are transient forms of his being. He has no existence other than that of the sum of all finite existence, and no consciousness nor intelligence other than the aggregate of the consciousness and intelligence of the transient creatures.

Hence Pantheism denies the freedom of man and the personality of God. It makes all events proceed by a law of absolute necessity. All evil, precisely as all good, comes immediately from God, and evil men are related to him precisely as are saints and angels. It confounds the doctrine of immanence with ontological identity, and it turns it into a heresy by denying the complementary truth of the divine transcendence. It allows no place for a heavenly Father beholding us complacently and providing for us benevolently. It makes no place for a moral Governor and Judge ruling over us, distributing rewards and punishments, teaching, disciplining and acting upon us from without. It makes no place for a supernatural world, for revelations or supernatural truths, for miracles or supernatural works, for a " kingdom of God," a supernatural state, or for a future or supernatural life. Therefore Pantheism in its very essence renders all morality and religion alike impossible. The Christian doctrine of the divine immanence, on the contrary, is the very essence of all religion. It admits and adjusts itself to the complementary doctrine of the divine transcendence. We begin, as we have shown above, with the conception of God as a distinct Person of absolute intellectual and moral perfection, self-conscious, self-determinate, absolutely free and sovereign, righteous and loving. This is our heavenly Father, the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. He created us in his likeness, rules us as our righteous moral Governor and Judge, and executes through all the universe and through all ages his all-perfect and immutable plan conceived in the infinitely wise and righteous counsel of his sovereign will. This Being, moreover, transcends all the limitations of space and time. He is everywhere present in his eternal essence. The whole essence, with all its inherent properties, is present at every moment of time to every point of space. As First Cause he is the constant, abiding, supporting and actuating basis of every second cause. All creatures exist, and act only as they exist, in him. At the same time, he acts through every atom from within and upon every atom from without. " In him all things live and move and have their being He turneth the hearts of men even as rivers of water are turned; He

worketh in us to will and to do of his own good pleasure. This is a function of the divine personality. The fact that the whole indivisible God is eternally in each point of space transcends our understanding, but it does not rationally necessitate the belief in many gods nor in a divided God; nor does it in any way invalidate the proof we have establishing his personality. The Scriptures clearly treat both truths together. The practical faith and experience of all Christians embrace both of these truths together in the same acts of trust and love. Both truths are together implied in all religious experience, recognizing God as our Father, speaking to him and listening to his voice, obeying his word, trusting to his love, and at the same time recognizing him as present everywhere and in all things and events, recognizing his hand in every object and occurrence, trusting him in everything because all nature executes his will, and hence reveals his presence and expresses his thought. The extension of our knowledge of the physical universe effected by modern science, rendering visible to us the absolute unity of the cosmos, the uninterrupted continuity of the chain of cause and effect, as well as of design, through all space and time, has not altered, but it has greatly emphasized, this religious conception of "the divine immanence." An eminent Christian scientist said to me recently, " God is either in all or in none." It is not possible to believe, when looking upon the course of natural creation and providence, that God comes down upon them at disconnected intervals from without. In the miracle he does that very thing, for "a miracle" is a sign the essence of which is its articulate significance to the answering intelligence of man. But in the natural course of providence the immanent God works continuously, without interval, from within through the spontaneities of the things themselves in which he dwells. He is not in one object or event any more than in all others. The whole course of the universe is divine in every part, except so far as sin has marred it, and all the normal activities of men and angels are religious— i. e. have their source and their end in God. This view, therefore, evidently differs from Pantheism in that

(1) it asserts the distinct personality of God as the Head of a moral government administered over free and responsible agents by a system of ideas and motives.

(2) It asserts the distinct personality and moral freedom and responsibility of men.

(3) It maintains the distinction of the human and the divine agency, although making the former depend upon the latter.

(4) It embraces and adjusts itself to the complementary doctrine of the divine transcendence, which Pantheism renders impossible.

(5) While Pantheism makes freedom, morality and religion impossible, this view of the divine immanence in all things is the necessary basis of the highest freedom and of the most exalted morality and of the most vivid religion conceivable.

(6) This view, as held by Christians, not only admits, but affords the most rational basis attainable for the supernatural; that is, for the activity in the sphere of nature of that God who in himself infinitely transcends all nature.

III. In this catholic Christian doctrine of the relation of God to the universe we comprehend all the half-truths or heresies which have divided the schools. We recognize all the facts, and we reconcile the practical faith of Christians with the highest science, and we provide a rational basis alike for the natural and the supernatural for the reign of law and for special miracle, for science

and for practical religion.

Here we stand under the blended light of nature and of grace, of science and of revelation. God the infinite, and therefore the timeless and spaceless, the absolutely unknowable, remains ever the unfathomable Abyss. In all our knowing God is always beyond us, hid in the light which is impenetrable. At the same time, he is always above us, enthroned in heaven, commanding, revealing, ruling, showering myriad blessings from above. At the same time, the same infinite God is before us, looking upon us and speaking with us face to face. He is our heavenly Father. He has formed us in his own image. Our highest life and blessedness are found in his personal communion; that is, personal interchange of ideas and of affections, for our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ. At the same time, God is ever within us, the ultimate ground of our being and the unfailing source of our life, the wellspring of eternal life, the inspiration of all spiritual knowledge and beatitudes, springing up within us to the ages of the ages.

All these glimpses of this immeasurable mystery, of God's nature and of his relation to the universe, afforded by the light of nature, are reinforced and gloriously supplemented and illumined by the revealed truths of the Trinity of persons and of the incarnation of the eternal Word.

Chapter 88

03.02. LECTURE 02 - THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE.

LECTURE II THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF DIVINE PROVIDENCE.

We are this afternoon to consider the general doctrine taught in the inspired Scriptures of the providence which God exercises over the world and its inhabitants. It is evident that this doctrine presupposes, and can be understood only in the light of what was ascertained in the previous lecture to be the facts of the case as to God's nature and his relation to the universe.

We then saw that there have prevailed among philosophers three partial views as to God's relation to the world, each presenting one side of the truth, but each radically erroneous, in so far as it was partial and denied the complementary truths presented by the others:

(1) The agnostic, maintaining that God is unknowable;

(2) the pantheistic or naturalistic, maintaining that God is. ever present and active in every element of every created existence, whether spiritual or material; and

(3) the deistical, which maintains the separate, extramundane existence of God and his action at will upon all his creatures from without. The element of truth in all of these alike is embraced and assimilated with the rest in Christian Theism. God is essentially unknowable. We can know only those parts of his nature, of his relations or of his ways which he has chosen to reveal to us. And at the best the creature can know even that which he is permitted to know only in part. At the same time, God is essentially omnipresent and active at the same time and in unbroken continuity in all his creatures. Our dependent being exists in him, and our dependent energies are ceaselessly re-created from the inexhaustible fountain of his life. All nature and all human history evolve in unbroken continuity through his guiding, co-operating will present in and working through the created dependent things themselves. None the less is God separate from the world, existing alike extensively and intensively infinitely above and beyond it.

All these views are essentially involved in all our practical, every-day religious experience. We all submit our intellects absolutely to Him, as we reverently bow before the inscrutable mystery of His being who, although his essence is light, in his relations to us has " made darkness his secret place, and his pavilion round about him the dark waters and the thick clouds of the skies " (Psalms 18:11). We all instinctively recognize his presence and activity in all his creatures, and in all their changes, and in the innermost and most spontaneous exercises of our own souls. We all look up to him as our Father, speak to him and hear him speak to us in his word and providence. He deals with us as a person exterior to ourselves. He presides over the physical universe and over communities of men as a person exterior and superior to all. He controls all events by his interior confluent energies according to a plan, one and universal, formed before the beginning of the world. He has formed a great moral government over his intelligent creatures as men and angels, and governs them by commands and motives objectively presented, and by his providences and

by his word. He at times, and for purposes evidently subsidiary to his general plan and to his ordinary methods, acts upon the system of second causes from without, working miracles, or signals to his intelligent children, thus arousing their attention, instructing their faith and determining their action. He has revealed the great end of his whole system of works, to which all things, in all eras and in all spheres, work together, to be the giving of objective expression to the perfections of his own nature, or, as we usually phrase it, the manifestation of his own glory. In all our religious experience, when we work and when we study and when we pray, God is always at once beyond us and above us and before us and within us—at once the source of all life and movement, the authority binding all consciences, and the sublime object of all personal love and worship.

I. The word providence means, first, to see beforehand, and then to exercise all that care and control which God's infinite prevision of his own ends and his knowledge of his appointed instrumentalities may suggest. The order of thought in theology is marked by the following commonplaces: Deus existens, God existing; his being, attributes and threefold personality; Deus volens, God willing or forming his eternal plan; Deus agens, God in the successions of time executing the plan he had formed in eternity. Our terra " providence," then, includes generally the entire sum of all God's activities exterior to himself and subsequent to creation through all time. " God executes his decrees" or plan " in his works of creation and providence." Here "providence" evidently includes the entire sum of God's activities of all kinds with reference to his creatures previously brought into existence. It is the general term which includes all varieties or special kinds of the same. It includes the exercise in every mode of his potestas ordinata, or energy exercised along the lines of pre-established and uniform law, and his potestas libera, or energy put forth independently of all established sequences upon special occasion and as determined by his personal will. This includes his general or natural providence, embracing the universe as one system and operating through the uniformities of natural law, and his special or supernatural providence, acting upon and modifying the action of second causes from without in the form of miracle and of grace.

We should clearly apprehend and firmly hold the obvious truth that what we distinguish as the natural and the supernatural providence of God—e. g. his ordinary providence, his gracious operations and his miraculous interventions—are nevertheless inseparable parts of one harmonious system in execution of one plan and the various manifestations of the energy of one God. They run on together at the same time as the work of one agent and the execution of one plan. Ordinary providence is the constant fact which is never intermitted. Grace always presupposes the ordinary providence, which it simply supplements and perfects; and the miracle always presupposes grace, which it subserves and confirms. In the case of an apostolical miracle, as in that of the man lame from his mother's womb healed at the gate of the temple called " Beautiful" by Peter and John, all three of these diverse modes of the divine activity were in operation at the same time and as necessary parts of one interdependent system :

(1) There was the ordinary providence of God sustaining and directing the normal action of the bodies and souls of all the parties engaged and of their physical and moral environment.

(2) There was at the same time the gracious operation of the divine Spirit upon the souls of the apostle and of the subject of the miraculous cure, producing their appropriate effects in their

sanctified affections.

(3) There was at the same time, and in perfect harmony with these, the miraculous power of God exercised at the word of the apostles in the person of the man born lame. As to the ultimate method of God's action upon or in concurrence with natural causes, either in the forms of ordinary providence, of grace or of miracle, we absolutely know nothing. But it is important to observe that we do know very certainly

(1) just as little of the one as of the other. The fact that we cannot understand the modus operandi of God in his works of grace or of miracle can be no objection to the admission of their reality to the man who believes in the reality of God's ordinary providence without being able to explain its method.

(2) We know that God's methods of operation, whether natural or supernatural, whether in the forms of ordinary providence, of grace or of miracle, are all carried on simultaneously, are all mutually harmonious, are all the activities of one and the same infinite Agent and in the execution of one all-comprehensive plan.

II. Whatever, however, may be the, to us, utterly unknown ultimate method of the divine operation, either in and through natural causes from within or upon them from without, it is intuitively certain, a priori, that they must in every case be consistent with what God has otherwise revealed to us of his own essential nature. It is simply impossible that God can deny himself or ever in any form act in a manner incongruous with his own perfections.

Hence it follows—1st. That the providence of God in all its modes, whether natural or supernatural, whether ordinary, gracious or miraculous, must be, all and several, the execution of one single indivisible plan. There can be no real incongruities or antagonisms between the natural and the supernatural or between ordinary providence and grace. God, being eternal and infinite in knowledge and wisdom, sees the end from the beginning. There can be with him no surprise nor repentance nor change of plan nor divided counsel. All that he purposes must be one purpose; all that he does, of every various mode of activity, must be the execution of the one purpose, and must therefore constitute one harmonious system.

2d. Hence it follows with equal certainty that the providence of God must be universal. It must comprehend in its grasp equally every agent and every event without the least discontinuity or exception. One event is never in any degree more providential than any other event. There prevails a very unintelligent and really irreligious habit among many true Christians of passing unnoticed the evidence of God's presence in the ordinary course of nature, and of recognizing it on the occasion of some event specially involving their supposed interests, as if it were special and unusual. They will say of some sudden, scarcely-hoped-for deliverance from danger, " Why, I think I may venture to say it was really providential." But would it have been any the less providential if they had been destroyed and not delivered ? Would it have been any the less providential if they had not been in jeopardy at all and had needed no deliverance? The great Dr. Witherspoon lived at a country-seat called Tusculum, on Rocky Hill, two miles north of Princeton. One day a man rushed into his presence crying, " Dr. Witherspoon, help me to thank God for his wonderful providence. My horse ran away, my buggy was dashed to pieces on the rocks, and behold! I am unharmed." The good doctor laughed benevolently at the inconsistent, halfway

character of the man’s religion. "Why," he answered, "I know a providence a thousand times better than that of yours. I have driven down that rocky road to Princeton hundreds of times and my horse never ran away and my buggy was never dashed to pieces." Undoubtedly, the deliverance was providential, but just as much so also were the uneventful rides of the college president. God is in the atom just as really and effectually as in the planet. He is in the unobserved sighing of the wind in the wilderness as in the earthquake which overthrows a city full of living men, and his infinite wisdom and power are as much concerned in the one event as in the other.

There is a distinction to be observed between God’s natural providence, which is universal and ordinary, and his supernatural providence, which is occasional and special. His natural providence is equally in every thing and event, but his grace and his supernatural intervention are in one event and not in another, at one time and not at another. It is proper, therefore, to distinguish his natural providence as general, and his grace or his supernatural providence as special. But it is essential to understand that in the ordinary sense of providence relating to the course of events in our natural lives the common distinction between general and special providence is unintelligent and irreligious. All God’s providence is at the same time both general and special, and general because it is special, and special because it is general. It is general because it reaches by continuous action equally every element of the world and every event. It is special for the same reason, because, reaching equally to every particular, it reaches universally to all particulars and to their entire sum. That which controls every link controls the whole chain. That which controls the movement of every atom controls the whole world. That which controls the thought and volition of every man controls the entire course of human history. God does not come down from above upon the course of our lives in spots. His whole infinite being dwells everlastingly in each atom and each spirit. He is universally in all things, because he is ever equally in each thing. In every grain of sand, in every drop of water, in every pulse of air, in every flower that blows, in every infant soul, in every human thought and will and act, in the equable flow of natural law, in the great catastrophe of exploding worlds or of nations brought to judgment, in the fall of Adam, in the giving of the law on Sinai, in the redemption of man on Calvary, in the mission of the Holy Ghost, in the resurrection of the dead and in the eternal judgment,—however heterogeneous these agents and events in themselves, however incommensurate their significance to us, and however various is the method of the divine operation in them severally, yet in them all the one Jehovah is equally present with his absolute perfections and in his supreme potency. Events may be infinitely different in their significance as well as in their importance to us, yet the truly religious mind finds equally in all things, even the least significant and the least important, the presence and supreme control and the benevolent administration of our heavenly Father.

3d. It is equally self-evident and certain that the whole of God’s providence in every part of it must be an expression of his essential perfections, of infinite wisdom and power and of absolute righteousness and benevolence. Nothing can be a surprise to his intelligence, or too complicated for his wisdom, or too difficult for his power, or inconsistent with his perfect righteousness or love.

These essential attributes of the great Euler are abundantly manifested in all his works. The whole universe, and the entire course of its history as far as known to us, exhibit unquestioned evidence of limitless intelligence and power and of unmistakable righteousness and benevolence. This is witnessed to by the entire volume of human literature, that of philosophers, scientists and poets, as well as that of the special devotee of religion.

Nevertheless, the course of providence from the point of view of man unilluminated by a supernatural revelation is full of anomalies to him utterly insoluble. The question is not whether the face of nature and the course of providence give evidence of the intelligence, power, righteousness and goodness of God—this is admitted by all sober men—but the true question is, as put by John Stuart Mill in his posthumously published Essay on Theism, Are the facts of nature and the history of events, as we know them, possibly reconcilable with the belief that the Creator and Controller of the world is at the same time infinite in his wisdom and in his power and in his righteousness and in his goodness? Mr. Mill is assured that this reconciliation is impossible in view of the awful prevalence of moral and physical evil. He is sure that God must be limited either in his wisdom or his power or his benevolence, and is inclined to think that he is limited in all, and upon the whole, with an imperfect standard and a limited ability, strives to do as well as he can. The apparent incongruousness of the facts, and hence the difficulty of the problem, we admit. But we have seen God because we have seen Christ, and we have learned to read all the course of providence in the light of the Cross. Since the baptism of Pentecost we have been convicted of sin and of a guilt we are utterly unable to gainsay or remove. We have been convinced that the finite can never measure the Infinite, and that self-convicted sinners can never judge the integrity of the All-holy. In the light of Calvary we have an impregnable assurance that the Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ is unlimited in wisdom and in power, and that he can do no wrong. Bowing our heads in unquestioning submission to his sovereign rights and with confidence in his absolute perfection, we exclaim in the face of all apparent anomalies, " Oh the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God ! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord, and who hath been his counselor? Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen " (Romans 11:33-36).

III. It is no less certain that, whatever be the ultimate method of God’s exercise of his energy in providence, it must necessarily be in a manner perfectly congruous to the nature of his creatures upon which and through which he works, and with the laws of their action. It is impossible to believe that the all-perfect Creator of all things will in his subsequent control of their action violate the properties with which he has endowed them or the laws he has imposed upon them. The Scriptures everywhere and constantly take for granted the principles of " natural realism " which correspond to the instinctive judgments and the spoken and written languages of all men. Material and spiritual beings are real entities. They have real, substantial, objective existence. Although they are ever dependent upon their First Cause, they are nevertheless real active agents and causes. God has endowed them each and severally, according to their respective kinds, with their essential properties and powers of action, which, as far as Ave know, never change or fail. We trace an absolutely unbroken continuity in the action of these second causes through the entire history of the world and of mankind. These elements, thus originally endowed with unchangeable properties, act and react with invariable uniformity under the same conditions; and as the conditions change they act differently, but always in a way uniformly related to the conditions under which they act.

As, therefore, the general adjustments or groupings of second causes under which they act are for the most part uniform from age to age, and change only locally and slowly, the uniformity of action which results gives origin to what are called " laws of nature," which continue absolutely uniform as

long as the adjustments or groupings of these causes remain unchanged. It is obvious that we apply this only to the world of matter and to certain spheres of the natural actions of spirits. The spirit of men in certain spheres of action is confessedly endowed with the divine power of originating and directing its own action independently of its external environment. But in the sphere of purely natural causes men never seek to attain their ends by violating the " laws of nature." On the contrary, they seek by science to attain a definite knowledge of those laws under all varieties of condition, and then they so apply this knowledge, by varying the conditions under which the natural causes act, that the very laws of nature themselves, thus directed, work out their purposes for them. Thus steam and electricity in the hands of men obey the " laws of nature " as implicitly as they do when nature is left to itself, only the same causes naturally produce different effects under changed conditions.

Now, men of pure science, habitually confining their attention to the uniformities of nature's action under the uniform conditions existing, regard the habit of religious men in ascribing results to the action of a personal agent having personal aims in view, and special reference to human characters and necessities, as irrational and superstitious. And hence, on the other hand, many unintelligent religious men regard the point of view of men of science as essentially irreligious. But it is obvious that these contrasted views of the course of events in the natural world are not mutually contradictory, but supplementary. They are the two equally true and real sides of the one system of objects. If even men comparatively ignorant and impotent can so wonderfully make the powers and laws of nature subservient to their own purposes without violating them, why cannot God at least do the same ? Nay, why, since God's knowledge and power are alike absolutely limitless, should not the whole of nature be as plastic to his will as the air in the organs of a great musician who articulates it into a fit expression of every thought and passion of his soaring soul. The reason that this analogy is not immediately conclusive to every mind is, that when man arranges the conditions so as to render the action of nature subservient to his purpose you can always trace his trail, see the visible marks of his interfering agency, while the course of nature flows on with mathematical precision of physical action, without the least trace of a providential interference ah extra. But it is forgotten that while man is always locally outside his work, and acts upon all elements from without, and in succession, a part at a time, God is simultaneously present and active within every ultimate element. His impulse is therefore through, not outside of, their own spontaneities. His control is neither partial nor successive, but simultaneously in the entire universe, thus co-ordinating all adjustments and all reactions in the execution of one plan and in the current of one issue.

There are two extreme tendencies to which different persons are inclined when regarding the course of events in the world, each of which is evidently false when exclusively indulged, but both of which together, when combined, lead to the true attitude which every Christian should cultivate: the view of the mere naturalist, in which the supernatural is altogether merged in the natural, and, conversely, the view of the pantheist, in which the natural is altogether merged in the supernatural. And these apparently opposite extremes virtually come to the same thing, because they both equally exclude a personal God and human freedom, and maintain a naturalistic fatalism. But both present a side of the one truth. The natural is the fixed and regulated method which the personal heavenly Father has laid down for his own guidance ; the supernatural does neither exclude nor supersede the natural, but it is the self-revelation of the heavenly Father, who works through

natural law, as the personal Agent who, having ordained law, uses it to accomplish his spiritual purposes. The universe has a personal basis. The laws of nature are the methods self-ordained of a personal Agent. The true scientists are the sons of God, who were not created for the laws of nature, but the laws of nature for them.

After the Charleston earthquake the Christian preachers endeavored to enforce upon their hearers the scriptural lessons of the event viewed as a divine dispensation. The visiting scientists are represented as having scoffed contemptuously, maintaining that the preachers should have confined themselves to an exposition of the laws of nature and drawn comfort from the proven exceptional character of such experiences. These men of mere science may have been able and useful in their narrow speoialty, but they were certainly very absurd philosophers. They were perfectly right in confining their own investigations to the scientific aspects of the phenomena, and the preachers had an equal authority in calling the attention of the Christian people to the aspect which the light of the inspired Scriptures, when thrown upon the providential facts, presented. We say, advisedly, that the preachers' authority in the premises is limited to the application of the light of the inspired Scriptures to the current facts. They have no right to assume the role of prophets, as too many are at times inclined to do; and no man not the subject of plenary inspiration should dare to explain the ultimate divine purpose in any particular event or its relation to human guilt. The Master himself said, "Suppose ye that those eighteen upon whom the tower in Siloam fell were sinners above all men that dwell in Jerusalem ? I tell you, Nay; but except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke 13:4-5).

IV. Providence, as made known to us in Scripture, history and our religious experience, includes two distinct exercises of the divine energy:

(1st) preservation, and (2d) government. let. Preservation is the continuous exercise of the divine omnipotence through successive duration upholding all creatures in being and in power. This does not in the least confound the Creator and Preserver with his works, nor does it invalidate the separate objective existence and the real efficiency of these created elements as second causes. But it simply affirms that they are essentially and continuously dependent existences and causes. All atoms of matter and all created spirits live and move and have all their being and the unfailing spring of all their energies in him only. If he should withdraw his supporting power, the whole dependent universe would lapse into non-being immediately.

2d. Government includes God's control of all the activities of all his creatures of every kind, and his direction of them toward the fulfilling of his one eternal plan.

[1.] That God has one universal plan which he executes with undeviating purpose in all his works of creation and of providence is made very certain, first, from the fact that he is an infinite Intelligence acting from eternity before all worlds, and absolutely unconditioned by any facts or powers external to himself. Secondly, from all that the Scriptures teach us as to his sovereignty, eternal foreknowledge, and as to making his own glory the single end of all things. And thirdly, the same fact is obviously exhibited in the unexceptional experience of all generations of men, and the revelations of modern science, exhibiting the absolutely unbroken continuity of thought and purpose and of divine superintendence and control in the whole universe, in all its parts and during all its successive ages. Of course this general plan, although one and indivisible, has many subordinate systems successive and contemporaneous, and many varieties of method. To us, of

course, these appear very various, and sometimes we make the mistake of regarding them as mutually inconsistent. But while various they are only to be understood when conceived as the many articulated members of one consummate system, reaching through all space and all time and all spheres.

Here we see that whatever is really true and significant in the famous but recent scientific doctrine of evolution had for many ages been anticipated by the Augustinian theology. Whatever may eventually turn out to be the facts with regard to genetic evolutions through successive natural births, all must unite in recognizing the fact that the universe in all its spheres and through all its history is the continuous logical evolution of one purpose, to one end, through the energies of one infallible and inexhaustible Will.

[2.] God effectually governs all his creatures and all their actions by a method to us inscrutable, but certainly consistent with his own perfections and with their properties and laws. This government is revealed in the Scriptures and in our experience to be universal, certainly efficient, holy, benevolent and wise. a. In matter God governs all things, apparently by the distribution and adjustment of material particles under the great categories of time, place, quantity and quality. This procedure leaves the properties and laws of matter entirely unmodified, and it makes the omnipresent, omniscient and omnipotent God Lord of all. b. The providence of God over his rational creatures involves three elements: First, his working in the entire sphere of their environment, presenting external motives and influences, moulding character and stimulating to action. Secondly, his working in their bodies and souls through the natural laws of their organizations, through the entire process of their growth. And thirdly, his immanent working within their will, whereby his directive energy becomes confluent with their own spontaneity, and " he turns the hearts of men as the rivers of water are turned," and " works in us to will, and be willing to do, of his own good pleasure." The redeemed Christian is a child already at home in his Father's house. All these beauties and all this abundant wealth belong to our Father, and are set apart for our use. All things whatsoever that come to pass, however dark and enigmatical, are expressions of our * Father's will, and are wisely designed to promote our welfare in the present and to secure it with infallible certainty in the great Hereafter. The word " chance " expresses simply a relation. An event happens by " chance " when the causes which produce it are so complex or so unusual as to be incapable of rational expectation by us. Hence, as far as God is concerned, there is absolutely no such thing as chance. As far as we are concerned, all events which lie beyond the reach of scientific prediction fall into the category of chance. But by faith we embrace the infinitely wise will of God and accept all events as the excellent will of our heavenly Father. Creation and providence are seen to be the preparatory work which culminates in redemption. We read all the means in the light of the glorious end. God is in every experience, making " 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 fullness of times he might gather together all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him. In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will: that we who first trusted in Christ should be to the praise of his glory."

" Oh the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things; to whom be glory for ever. Amen."

03.03. LECTURE 03 - MIRACLES.

LECTURE III

MIRACLES.

These are supernatural events implying a special and exceptional mode of God’s providential action.

I. The first thing we have to do in discussing the nature and attributes of a particular class of phenomena is to settle between ourselves very distinctly a common understanding as to what particular class of phenomena we are talking about. The word " miracle" has been so vaguely and promiscuously used that, unless we come to an understanding as to the kind of events to which we agree to restrict its application in this discussion, we should only talk at cross-purposes.

It should be remembered that there are two kinds of definitions:

(1) nominal or verbal, and

(2) real. The former defines the thing by the etymology or the general usage of its name. The latter defines it by its own nature or relations. In the present case it is essential to recognize the fact that a verbal definition of miracles, or a definition formed upon a study of the etymology or usage of the word " miracle," would be of not the least value. The word itself simply means a wonder; that is, it defines the events called " miracles " not by any essential characteristic of the events themselves, but simply by the effect they happen to produce upon the minds of some classes of beholders. That this is absurd is easily shown by an illustration. A missionary in the use of a chemical apparatus turned water into solid ice in the presence of the king of Siam. To the missionary it was a common effect of a combination of natural causes; to the king of Siam and his courtiers it was an unparalleled wonder. The like had never been a matter of previous experience in all the land or in all its history. Yet it was not a miracle to them. If they had regarded it as one, they would have been miserably deceived, and would soon have been brought to discredit all that had been associated with it in its assumed character.

These events are designated in Scripture by various descriptive titles which severally connote their various aspects and relations. Their true nature is represented adequately by no one of these names separately, but all collectively should be understood as describing rather than as defining the class. These names are in Hebrew , signum, portentum; , something separated, singular ; , power, some extraordinary manifestation of divine power. Also, the Greek τ■ρατα, wonders; δυν■μας, powerful works, manifesting divine power; σημι■α, signs. All these words signify real properties or qualities of the "miracle," and especially the last. The "miracle" was distinctively God’s "sign" to man.

Having thus dismissed, as profitless, the attempt to form a verbal definition of the " miracle," how shall we proceed to designate sharply the class of events to which, by common consent, the name should be restricted ?

We take the first step, then, when we point out the fact that the terms " miracle " and " the supernatural" are not coextensive. Every miracle is supernatural, but every supernatural event is by no means a miracle. " The supernatural" is the genus, while "the miracle " is a subordinate species of that genus. The first thing, therefore, is to attempt to reach a clear, distinct conception of " the supernatural." Supernatural events are of infinitely various kinds, yet they all have a common quality which renders them supernatural, and which distinguishes them from all kinds of events simply natural. What, then, is the common quality of all supernatural events?

" Nature " is from nascor, to be brought to the birth, to be produced, to become. The external world is the common type of pure nature. It is always becoming. Its process is genesis. In unbroken continuity the events of this moment proceed from the events of the last moment, and give birth to the events of the next moment. Viewed as a fecund cause, the whole external universe is the natura naturans—nature bringing forth ; and viewed as a manifold effect, the same universe is every moment the natura naturata—nature just brought forth. The supernatural is, therefore, that which is above nature, which springs from, and therefore manifests, a higher cause. But scholars, philosophers and theologians greatly differ as to where they draw the line between the natural and the supernatural.

1. Many draw it between matter and spirit, and hence just1 between the body and the soul of man. The body and the whole material world obey the law of necessity, while the soul moves spontaneously and is self-determined in the light of reason and conscience. Hence Coleridge, Bushnell and other high authorities class the body and material world as natural, and the soul of man and the entire world of spirits as supernatural. Whatever reason there may be for this distinction, it is evident that it will not help us in this discussion. Men—their souls as well as their bodies—have their genesis, inherit natures, and their action and entire history are determined by their nature. Hence by general consent all that is human is natural.

2. Others draw the line between the natural and the supernatural just above men and between man and the angelic world. The supernatural is thus equivalent to the superhuman. This is a very common conception, and determines much of our current language. All that belongs to ghosts or disembodied spirits of dead men, and all that belongs to angels or devils, are called " supernatural." This is a legitimate use of the word. But it is not accurate or stable enough to suit our purpose. Evidently, no action of angels or devils could be classed as supernatural in the same sense that a miracle, in the Bible sense of that word, is. All created spirits, as well as all created worlds, have their genesis, all have their God-given natures, all are under law. Therefore every adequate sense of the word " nature" must take in the universe as a whole. It is one system, and cannot be divided into two separate parts, the one called " nature," and the other set apart as independent and styled "the supernatural." We consequently draw the line between the natural and the supernatural in this discussion, between God and the universe, between the Creator and the creature, between the absolute and the relative and contingent. The " supernatural," therefore, is a peculiar kind or mode of God’s action on and through his creatures. As far as we know, this supernatural action of God in nature is exercised in the modes of (1) special intervention in behalf of persons in the interest of a moral system;

(2) gracious operation in the souls of Christ’s people;

(3) revelation of new truth, and inspiration controlling the communication of truth in the case of prophets, etc;

(4) " miracles’ in the special and technical sense of that word.

It is common to regard creation as the type of the supernatural and of the miracle. But the distinction is obvious and important. Creation, or the bringing of the thing into existence, must differ from every mode of divine action on it or through it after it is existent.

Creation is God’s bringing his creatures into existence.

Ordinary providence is God’s sustaining and governing all his creatures and all their actions after they are created. This ordinary providence always works through natural causes and according to the uniformities of natural law. The supernatural working of God embraces all of his various modes of acting upon or through his creatures, which produce effects beyond their natural powers to produce, and different from the uniform method of natural law. This includes special interventions, gracious operations, revelations, and, specifically, miracles.

" Miracle," as a technical word connoting a special matter in controversy, therefore refers only to a class of supernatural events alleged to have occurred in connection with the origin of the Jewish and of the Christian religions, which are recorded in the Old and New Testament Scriptures as a mode of divine attestation to the divine origin of these religions.

We exclude, therefore, from this discussion—

1.All spiritualistic phenomena—ghost-flitting, spirit-rapping, demoniac possession or other manifestation of merely superhuman power.

2.Extraordinary providences, as the draught of fishes and the flight of quails mentioned in Scripture.

3.All possible special intervention and modification of the ordinary course of providence in the spiritual education of souls.

4.All the gracious acts of God in the spiritual sphere regenerating and sanctifying the souls of his people.

5.His supernatural operations in the minds of his prophets, revealing truth, disclosing future events and inspiring them as public teachers. The " miracle," therefore, in the sense in which we now discuss it, should be defined thus:

(1) An event (2) occurring in the material world, (3) obvious to the senses, (4) of such a nature that it can be rationally referred only to the immediate act of God as its direct cause, (5) accompanying a teacher of religion sent from God, (6) and designed to authenticate his divine commission. When it is here said that a miracle is an event of such a nature that it can be rationally referred only to an immediate act of God as its direct cause, it is not meant that God is the only cause which operates in producing it. What is meant is that the direct intentional agency of God is always discerned to be one of its active causes, and that one which gives it its differentiating characteristics as a miracle. It is well known that the physical cause of any event in the physical world is never single; it is always dual, if not manifold. All the necessary conditions upon which the event depends are its

con-causes. The effect consists of these same conditions modified. If we kindle a fire, the con-causes are the fuel, the atmosphere, the flue, the match and the agency of the person combining all these conditions. The effect is the change brought about in the person, the match, the flue, the air and the fuel. In every miracle all surrounding and implicated natural bodies remain and act throughout the miracle in a manner perfectly true to nature under the peculiar conditions in which they are placed. But God, acting invisibly and from within, interpolates a new force, his own direct energy, into the plexus of con-causes naturally in operation, and the result is the miracle. It is God acting from without and down upon and in nature. When the iron was made to float in the water (2 Kings 6:5), earth, air, water and iron all remained acting according to the law of their nature under the circumstances. But God did invisibly and from within what human agency in this case might have accomplished visibly and from without; i. e. he simply interpolated a force acting in a direction contrary to gravity, and equal in intensity to the difference of the weight of the iron and of the weight of an equal bulk of water which it displaced.

It is obvious that upon the assumptions of the deist, the pantheist or the atheist or materialist, a miracle would be absolutely impossible. In this discussion, therefore, we necessarily assume as granted (1) that there is a God;

(2) that he has access to the physical world, and can act upon it at will;

(3) that he is a moral Governor;

(4) that men are the subjects of his moral government, and also that they are lost sinners in need of a redemption;

(5) that he has discovered a purpose of intervening redemptively in man's behalf.

II. It is objected by skeptics that a miracle in the sense just defined is an impossible event.

1. The first ground upon which this impossibility is argued is that such an event would involve a violation of natural law. But the only three natural laws that science has established as absolutely invariable are—

(1) All substance possesses power: every substance is an active cause, and acts as such invariably in the same way under the same conditions;

(2) all causes act uniformly under uniform conditions, and their actions always change as their conditions change;

(3) there is throughout all nature and during all known time an absolutely unbroken continuity of causation: there is and can be no broken link.

Either in the material or spiritual world, or in both together, the causes of every event are to be found, and all the con-causes immediately co-operate in producing each event. If by law of nature be meant the ordinary sequence of natural events occurring under ordinary conditions, then it is admitted that a miracle does necessarily violate such a law; but it is denied that natural law in this sense is necessarily uniform and immutable. The successions of day and night and of the seasons have changed, and will always continue to change, as the inclination of the earth's axis to the ecliptic and other elements of the problem vary. But in every other sense of the phrase " law of

nature " it is denied that the miracle violates it. It does not change the properties or powers of any natural substance. It does not annihilate or otherwise change any natural force. An act of God modifying the action of natural causes no more interrupts the law of physical continuity than an act of man doing the same thing. He only changes the conditions under which the entire plexus of natural con-causes acts. In all man's action in this world he uses his intelligence to bring the forces of nature into artificial combinations, and the result always is at the same time

(a) natural, (b) yet a modified nature, and (c) an unquestionable evidence of man's direct agency. The electric current carrying messages through the ocean cable is as much an exhibition of natural law as an original stroke of forked lightning from the sky. But, in addition to this, it is moreover an immediate and intentional revelation of man. The same is true of the behavior of all the natural forces implicated in a miracle, while at the same time the resultant action is an immediate and intentional revelation of God. This is fully admitted by John Stuart Mill, the clearest-minded of the agnostic thinkers of this century, in the fourth part of his Essay on Theism, published since his death by his step-daughter, Helen Taylor: " The interference of the human will with the course of nature is only not an exception to law when we include among laws the relation of motive to volition: by the same rule interference by the divine will would not be an exception either, since we cannot but suppose Deity, in every one of its acts, to be determined by motives." . . . "It is true that human volition exercises power over objects in general indirectly through the direct power it possesses over human muscles. God, however, has direct power, not merely over one thing, but overall the objects he has made." . . · "Divine interference with nature could be proved if we had the same sort of evidence for it that we have for human interferences."

2. Skeptics declare miracles to be impossible because God is immutable, eternally perfect in wisdom and power, and therefore, it is argued, he can have no cause to change his plan or to modify his work. The machine invented and executed by man proves its excellence just in proportion as it is able to run on in its appointed way by itself, without any need of repair or correction at the hands of the maker. A machine that needs the direct intervention of its maker discovers thereby some defect either in his calculations or in his skill in execution. An absolutely wise and omnipotent God should have made a world which would have needed no intervention for ever. Theodore Parker said: "There is no whim in God, and therefore no miracle in nature." This objection is absurdly irrelevant. The miracle involves no change in God's plan. Each miracle was foreseen and predetermined as an integral part of his eternal, all-comprehensive plan from the beginning. Neither does it imply any defect in his work. No miracle was ever designed to correct or regulate the action of the physical world (the machine). The physical world is controlled by forces and their interactions. The moral world is governed by ideas, reasons, motives, addressed to the will, and by discipline-forming character. A moral system involves free agency, and this independently of all theory as to its nature. The fact of personal self-determination cannot be doubted. Free agency involves liability to sin. Sin as an actual fact involves, necessitates, divine intervention either to punish or to redeem. Redemption involves the stupendous miracles of the incarnation and of the resurrection, susceptible, both of them, of demonstrative proof, and all other miracles are accompaniments of these. The physical world (the machine) is not an end in itself. It is the pedestal upon which God has erected his moral government, wherein he deals with a society of personal spirits. The physical world is the house in which the heavenly Father educates his children. He therefore uses the physical system as an instrument through which he makes "

signs " to his children. The conditions of this " sign "-making is (1) the invariability of natural law;

(2) the infrequent and temporary interruption revealing his presence and purpose.

We admit that if there be no moral system of which the physical system of the world is only the foundation, there can be no miracle. But if there be a moral system, in which the moral and spiritual education of his children is the chief concern of our heavenly Father, miracles are not incredible, because not improbable.

III. It is asserted by skeptics that miracles are so violently improbable that even if they occurred, that occurrence could not be proved to non-witnesses by any amount of human testimony. This is one fallacy underlying the famous argument of David Hume against the credibility of miracles. We all would willingly agree to this principle if the physical universe be separated from that moral system in which God is educating free personal spirits. In the physical system invariable law everywhere prevails. Uniformity of sequence is the rule in the experience of all men of all ages. From their very nature miracles must be to the last degree exceptional. If they were frequent or if they could be accounted for by natural causes or analogies, they would cease to be miracles. Their frequent or sporadic occurrence would reduce the phenomenal world to chaos, would confuse the reason and paralyze the activity of man, and obscure the providence of God. But if the fact of a moral government is admitted, the facts of man's moral and spiritual condition and of his relation to God being what they are shown to be by natural religion, then a direct intervention of our heavenly Father in behalf of his bewildered and helpless children is in the highest degree probable. If God directly intervenes to instruct and educate his children, revelations and miracles must co-operate in that work. Each prophet sent to speak for God must be authenticated. Men sent bearing supernatural messages will reasonably be expected to possess supernatural characteristics and to be accompanied with supernatural phenomena. A detached, objectless miracle would indeed be unprovable. But a system of miracles mutually supporting one another, like those recorded in the Christian Scriptures, evidently bearing a divine redemptive character, and all constituting parts of one redemptive scheme, all issuing from one source and bearing upon one end, and associated with persons bearing the aspect of celestial messengers, teaching a spiritual doctrine self-evidencing itself as the word of God,—such a system of miracles so supported becomes in the highest degree probable, and hence is to be received as true when supported by competent historical evidence.

IV. It is objected by skeptics that miracles, as above defined, even if they actually occurred, could not be certainly discriminated and recognized by us to be truly what they appear to be.

1. This is argued from the acknowledged fact that our knowledge of the powers and laws of nature are very limited, and therefore we are never competent, in view of any wonderful phenomenon transcending all past recorded experience, to say peremptorily that it transcends nature and must have been caused by the direct action of God. This is true in part, but irrelevant. The question does not relate to the possible achievements of science in the future, but to what was done through the agency of religious teachers in an obscure province of the Roman empire two thousand years ago. Besides, science secures its wonderful results by means of apparatus, by means of elaborately adjusted conditions, and never in any other way. But the miracle was always the response to a simple command in the name of God or of Christ. Besides all this, science has effectually shut some doors while it has opened many others. It is now scientifically certain that a

man four days dead in a hot climate cannot be brought back to life by natural forces alone. If the events in question actually occurred, then it is scientifically certain that they reveal the "finger of God."

2. Skeptics argue that miracles, even if they occurred, could not be certainly recognized as such, because the phenomenon, although obviously transcending natural physical law, may, for aught we can tell, be produced by some unknown superhuman agency; as, for instance, by the devil or by his angels. This might be true so far as the isolated fact as a physical event goes, although we have no evidence that finite spirits of any kind have power of life or death over men. But the objection is wholly irrelevant. The miracles were professed "signs" of divine revelation and commission. Good spirits would not conspire to counterfeit God and deceive men ; evil spirits could not, and would not be allowed to do so if they could. The prophet, his character, the doctrine and the miracle make one congruous whole, which in all its parts equally bears the unmistakable and uncounter-feitable sign-manual of God. Evil spirits could not conspire to build up the kingdom of God (Matthew 12:25).

3. It is again argued against the credibility of miracles, that of the alleged phenomena we have only popular reports, and no evidence of their having been submitted to any adequate scientific test. We acknowledge that the mass of people were then, as they are now, credulous and inaccurate observers. But in the case of the most important miracles recorded the tests to which the phenomena were subjected were all-sufficient. The whole problem as to the resurrection either of Lazarus or of Christ or of the son of the widow of Nain is embraced in two definite and easily-ascertained facts. They were really dead, and subsequently they were really alive again in the same bodies. That Christ was really dead on Friday the entire educated world, skeptical and believing, agree to be an ascertained historical fact. The fact that he was really alive again on Sunday and afterward was tested in the strictest sense scientifically, and especially by the apostle Thomas. The disciples used one sense to criticise and confirm the report of another. They saw, heard and handled him, and thrust their " hands into the print of the spear." Many different persons saw, heard and handled him in many different lights and in various situations through a space of six weeks. These persons were not deceived. They were intelligent and sober-minded men, as evidenced by all they did and wrote. They could not have conspired to deceive us. They consecrated their lives thenceforth "to preach Jesus and the resurrection." As conscious witnesses they were true, for they sealed their testimony as martyrs. As unconscious witnesses they could not deceive, for their unique experience transformed their characters and lives from being Galilean fishermen to being world-compelling apostles.

V. It is objected that the proof of which moral and spiritual truths are susceptible is their own inherent self-evidencing light that they are only worthily recognized when they are seen and felt to be truth in their own light; that miracles, consequently, even if real, are useless as evidences of divine revelation, since moral and spiritual truth cannot be established by any correlation with physical phenomena; that the truth of a truth can never be established by the effects of even an infinite physical force. But the gospel is not a disclosure of abstract moral or spiritual truths, but rather of a series of objective facts constituting the stupendous history of redemption. It is the history of God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh to condemn sin in the flesh, and afterward sending his Holy Spirit to apply and complete the work. No possible quickening of our intuitive consciousness would disclose these matters of historical fact. No self-evidence

establishes them as historical realities except the evidence which history renders. And among the most convincing elements of this history is the witness it bears to the events we call " miracles." The incarnation, the crucifixion, the resurrection, are the very substance of Christianity and its saving power; the first and third of these are the central suns of the constellations of miracles recorded in the Bible. It is conceded that sporadic, inconsequent miracles could prove nothing, and would themselves be difficult to prove. But given a supernatural crisis, a supernatural teacher and a supernatural doctrine, miracles are found to be in place like jewels on the state robes of a king. All the great miracles recorded in Scripture gather around two great foci in the history of redemption: the giving of the law through Moses and the life and death of the incarnate God. Miracles in such connections are inevitable, and in the highest sense congruous. Their absence would have been unaccountable.

Besides this, the miracle, when found in this its normal relation to the character of the genuine prophet and to the nature of the genuine revelation, adds its own specific and indispensable quota of evidence. The miracle (the "sign ") is the seal of God. A seal detached or attached accidentally to a rag or fraudulently to a fiction has no legal value. Even a true document in many cases has only an incomplete value in the absence of the seal. But when the true seal is attached to the true document, the evidence is impregnable. The prophet, the message and the miracle mutually authenticate one another. Separate, neither could be believed with confidence ; together, neither can be doubted. Faith is the highest reason, and therefore the most obligatory duty, while unbelief is alike irrational and sinful.

Chapter 90

03.04. LECTURE 04 - THE HOLY SCRIPTURES-THE CANON AND INSPIRATION.

LECTURE IV THE HOLY SCRIPTURES—THE CANON AND INSPIRATION.

I.I am to speak this afternoon of the Bible, its genesis and its inspiration. The word " Bible " means book, the word " Scripture " means writing, and it is by the common consent of men that these words are applied to this one subject, because it is a Book of books, and because, beyond all comparison, it is the Writing of writings. It is the most important of all books, because, as a matter of historical fact, this book, more than any other force, has moulded the character of the great nations of the world and given birth to what we call the modern or Western civilization; because all historic churches, with one accord, declare it to be the foundation of their creeds—declare that this book is the Word of God; because, in spite of all our divisions, the whole Church really accepts this book as the only infallible and divinely authoritative rule of our faith and practice; and because it is, between all Christians, the standard of appeal on all subjects of debate, the only common ground upon which we stand, the only court of last resort.

II.On what presuppositions does our doctrine rest ? In every problem there are two elements—the a priori element of principle and the a posteriori element of fact. To this there is no exception in any of the problems of philosophy or of science or of theology. The a priori question of principle must be taken first, and will condition the whole argument. We must, before we take up the subject of the Bible, first take up the questions, Is there a God? Does he exist? What relation does he sustain to the universe ? Can he reveal himself to man ? Has he made a revelation of himself to man ? Are men capable of receiving a divine revelation through the means of a book ?

Now, it is held, on the basis of all the presuppositions of Atheism, of Materialism, of Agnosticism, and even of the old Deism, that it is absolutely absurd to talk of any supernatural revelation of God, or of any Bible as either containing or being the Word of God. I want however, to assure the laymen who have not investigated these questions that nine-tenths of all the objections which men are making now to the Scriptures, in which they claim that the progress of knowledge, the progress of civilization, the progress of science, the progress of critical investigation, the vast aggregate of historical knowledge, all are sweeping away the foundations of our ancient faith in the Bible,—I wish to assure them that these objections are not only untrue, but absurd. Those that are made are not founded upon facts, but are founded upon a priori philosophical principles. Neither science nor history nor criticism bears any testimony against the divine origin of the Bible. I appeal with confidence to the a priori principles of a contrary philosophy. We must meet them on their own ground, and appeal from the postulates of a false philosophy to the postulates of a true. We have as much right to believe our philosophy as they have to believe theirs. Renan, for instance, begins his discussion upon the Epistles with this assumption : "The supernatural is impossible;" therefore the supernatural is unhistorical, and therefore any piece of literature that claims to convey to us supernatural information must so far forth be incorrect and be the subject of correction by critical hands.

You see that this is a mere assumption, and the whole principle on which it rests is that which underlies the philosophy, atheistic, materialistic, agnostic or deistic, of these errorists; and if this be swept away not only all the foundations for such a claim, but all color of presumption on which it rests, is swept away at once. Doubtless there are very many men of great ability who are perfectly honest who hold to this belief. They are thoroughly convinced of the principles of their a priori philosophy, and these principles are evidently inconsistent with the truths of Christianity. But if we discard the unproved assumptions, we invalidate their conclusions. There are others who ought to be treated kindly: they are thoroughly convinced, but they are half-educated, timid souls who are confused in this babel of tongues, and who do not know the deceitfulness of materialistic belief—who are inclined to believe in the ancient faith, but are also under pressure from the arrogant claims of philosophy. For such have great consideration, and instead of repelling them by words draw them to you by the Spirit of Christ, and by showing that you not only believe intellectually, but that you have a ground of assurance in your inward experience, in the testimony of the Holy Ghost, which must excite respect and confidence in them.

Now, in beginning this argument I wish to claim, first, the truth of all that I have said in the three preceding lectures. You see, therefore, the logical reason for the order I adopted. I claim, as preliminary to the discussion of the doctrine of holy Scripture, the truths of the principles already established: to wit, there is a God; this God possesses the attributes of omnipresence, omnipotence, infinitude, etc.; he is everywhere present; immanent in all things at all times; working continuously and universally through all things from within. He is also transcendent and extra-mundane, acting upon the world from without on such points and at such times as he wills. The whole order of providence and of moral government, whether natural, supernatural or gracious, is presupposed in this argument.

If a man does not believe in God as omnipresent and as active in all his creatures, if he does not believe that man is a free moral agent under the moral government of God, who is a holy, just and benevolent Ruler, then this lecture is not intended for him. But if a man does so believe we challenge him to present objections to the catholic doctrine of the Word of God which will be at the same time rational and consistent with Christian Theism.

III. How do we Ascertain the Constituent Parts of Scripture?—i. e. how do we (1) ascertain the several books which make up the canon? and (2) how do we ascertain the words which make up the correct text of those books ?

I can of course attempt only a very bare sketch of what should be the full and critically-learned answer to these questions. You all fully understand that they fall outside of the particular department of study to which my life has been devoted. The amount of the highest talent and learning consecrated within the Christian Church to the defence and elucidation of the sacred Scriptures would infinitely surprise the cheap and shallow critics who are vociferously claiming that its pretensions have been disproved. They should remember that a few frogs in a swamp make incomparably more noise than all the herds of cattle browsing upon a hundred hills. Yet none are deceived, except the frogs themselves. In Princeton Theological Seminary the study of the subjects embraced within this single lecture consume the larger part of three years of study and the entire attention of four learned and able professors.

(A.) 1. How do we Ascertain what Books Constitute the Canon of the Old Testament f The New Testament came into existence in an age in which a contemporaneous literature existed thoroughly illuminated by the light of history. But the Old Testament contains the very oldest extant literature of the world. It inaugurates human history, and therefore cannot, in its earliest contents, be verified by contemporaneous testimonies. It is only in its later periods that it receives confirmation unquestionable from the monuments of Egypt and the cylinders of Assyria.

Nevertheless, we are certain that we have the very same canon which Christ recognized when he said to his disciples, and through them to us, " Search the Scriptures ; . . . . they are they which testify of me." The very books which we have now are the very books to which Christ appealed. He cited them (1) by their classes, as "the Law," "the Law and the Prophets;" and

(2) he quoted the writings severally, and attributed them to their respective authors—as to Moses, to David and to Esaias. The same was done by the inspired writers of the New Testament. That the canon endorsed by Christ is the very canon we now possess we know to our absolute certainty; by the Septuagint translation made nearly three hundred years before Christ, by the Hebrew Bible jealously guarded by the Jews from the earliest ages to the present time, from the testimony of Philo and of Josephus, the great Jewish writers of the first Christian century, and from the earliest Latin and Syriac translations. As to this point, indeed, there is no controversy. The simple question remains, which to real Christians is no question, whether the testimony of Christ our Lord is sufficient to establish the fact.

2. How do we Ascertain the True Text of the Several Books which Constitute this Canon f Our reliance here also is upon the guarantee of Christ. We are sure that we possess the Masoretic text which was collected and recorded by the Masorets from the fifth century onward. These were great Jewish scholars, who searched all manuscripts open to them, not to form a new text, but to ascertain the true text in the material that had descended to them. The Targums and the Talmud also make it certain that the text we now have is essentially the identical text which Christ had, and which he virtually guarantees to us. The same fact is proved to us by the Septuagint Greek version before referred to, and by the Peshito, the old Syriac version made at the end of the second century. The Septuagint, the Hebrew Bible, the Syriac Version, the Vulgate, the Masoretic notes must embody the text as it existed in the time of Christ. The agreement of all the various sources of information is so close that the greatest differences they suggest would not change a single doctrine nor cast doubt upon a single historic fact of any importance. I am justified, therefore, in affirming that we stand possessed to-day of the very same Old-Testament Scriptures to which Christ appealed and to which his authority binds our obedience and our faith. In these days you hear much of the ravages which a learned criticism has made in the integrity of our traditional Scriptures, and thus in the historical foundations of our faith. Ordinary historical criticism is a perfectly legitimate and necessary process by which all the light, external and internal, afforded by history, literature and the intrinsic characteristics of the books or texts in question is collected, and we judge by means of all the best evidence we have what conclusions we are to draw in reference to their genuineness and their integrity, or the reverse. But there is an arrogant phase of the " Higher Criticism " that is far more ambitious, and attempts to correct, or even to reconstruct, the existing text by wide inductions from the history of the times, from the other writings and from the known or supposed character, knowledge, style, situation or subject of the writer. The whole historical situation is vividly conceived by the Critic of this school, and he proceeds to infer there

from what the writer must have said or could not have said. It is admitted that in some cases and within narrow limits such a process may be legitimate. When there is conflict or indefiniteness in the evidence afforded by direct explicit historical data of manuscript or version, it may be well to go farther afield for collateral or for inferential evidence. But it is very plain that this process of " Higher Criticism " is liable to be colored, and even wholly controlled, by the subjective conditions of the critic—by his sympathies, by his historical and philosophical and religious theories, and by his a priori judgments as to what the sacred writer ought to say. It is also very plain that the conclusions of this Criticism are of no value whatever when opposed to clearly-ascertained historical facts or documentary evidence. In the case of Criticism applied to the Old or New Testament Scriptures in a spirit hostile to the long-received faith of the Christian Church, it is notorious that it is the outgrowth of a false philosophy, of naturalistic views of God's relation to the world, and of a priori theories of evolution applied to history. Throughout, its representatives are alien from evangelical sympathy and effort. When we remember, therefore, what can be clearly proved by historic fact and document, that Christ endorsed as the Word of God the very Old Testament Scripture, book and text, which we now possess, when we remember that all the evidence attainable from Egyptian monuments and Assyrian cylinders corroborates the claims of this Hebrew Bible in all its parts, it is very evident that the conceited claims of this Criticism are as profane as they are groundless and absurd. Let each man choose for himself this day between Jesus Christ and the " critics."

(B.) 1. How do we Ascertain what Books of Right belong to the New Testament Canon t Here the case is different. Christ did not present us the collected books of the New Testament and guarantee their integrity. On the other hand, these books were written in the full light of an historically illuminated age, and come to us supported by a contemporaneous literature and followed by a copious consequent literature of their own creating. The rule by which the canonicity of any New Testament book is determined is: any book written by an apostle or received generally as canonical by the Church during the age in which it was presided over and instructed by the apostles is to be regarded as canonical. Take, for instance, the Epistle to the Hebrews. If written by Paul, then it would have a right to a place in the canon for that reason. But if not written by Paul, if it was received generally as canonical by the Church during the lives of Paul and John, then its right must be admitted on that ground. Of course, the facts in question must be determined by an examination of two classes of evidence:

(1) the internal character of the writing;

(2) the external historical evidence of its genuineness and of its recognition as canonical by the Church of the first century. Of course, no external evidence can prove a book to have come from God if its contents are morally bad or intellectually contemptible. Nevertheless, no matter what the contents of a book may be, we cannot admit that it belongs to the New Testament canon except on the ground of explicit and sufficient historical proof. The kind of evidence by which we establish the canonicity of each of the books of the New Testament is precisely the same as that by which we prove the authenticity and genuineness of any ancient classic. The only difference is that in behalf of the books of the New Testament the evidence is incomparably more abundant. This evidence may be distributed under the following heads, each head representing copious literatures critically sifted and logically arranged:

(1) quotations and references to these books found in the writings of early Christians;

(2) early catalogues of the sacred books;

(3) early translations;

(4) general verdict of the Church;

(5) internal characteristics.

You hear a great deal to-day about the " Christian consciousness." The new critics, having destroyed the ancient historical foundations of our Scriptures and of our faith, wish now to build them up again upon a basis of Christian consciousness. Every book and every specific reading is to be received which is approved by the subjective tests, literary, scientific, aesthetic, religious and fantastic, of these self-appointed Scripture-tasters of the nineteenth century. We also believe in a Christian consciousness—that is, in a human consciousness modified by religious experience and the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. But the mouth-piece of that consciousness is no self-appointed, self-conscious group of cultured moderns. It is voiced only by the consensus of all Christians of all nations, all ecclesiastical folds and ages. These very critics deny the growth of the whole Church since St. Augustine because its uniform testimonies rebuke them. We, on the contrary, appeal from the self-elected representatives of "Christian consciousness" to the thing itself—to the consensus of the whole Church, ancient, mediaeval and modern, Greek, Roman, Lutheran and Reformed. We appeal to the historic and abiding creeds, confessions, hymns and liturgies of all Christians. We appeal to the testimony of the Holy Ghost, to the witness of all saints and martyrs, to all reformations, revivals and missions since Pentecost. The progress of this controversy has been one unbroken march of triumph for the integrity of our traditional canon. The first destructive "critics" denied the authenticity and historic validity of the fourth Gospel and the originality and accuracy of the synoptic Gospels, and they admitted the genuineness of only four books—Romans, First and Second Corinthians and Galatians. These are admitted to have been the genuine writings of the apostle Paul by the general consent of the most destructive critics and of all branches and ages of the Christian Church. This admission alone defeats the enemy and establishes upon this rock of unquestionable historic fact the whole gospel system. The entire body of Christian doctrine can be shown to be taught in these four admitted original Christian documents, the entire person, office and work of Christ; the entire salvation, temporal and eternal, of his believing followers. Since that time the originality and validity of the synoptical Gospels have been victoriously vindicated. The genuineness of the fourth Gospel has been established beyond question, as is nobly admitted and maintained by the late Dr. Ezra Abbot, one of the most learned Unitarians America has ever produced.

2. How do we Ascertain the True Text of the Several Books of the New Testament f You can easily understand that through the process of multiplying manuscripts by hand, which is laborious and involves an infinitude of independent details, an untold number of variations would creep into the text. The textus receptus was formed in the age of the Reformation by a hasty and uncritical gathering and comparison of the manuscripts which were found lying ready to hand, without respect to their various age or authority. Cardinal Ximenes, in Complutum, Spain, printed the first edition, a. d. 1514, which, however, was not published till 1520 or 1521. The next edition was issued by Erasmus from Bale, 1516, with succeeding editions of 1519, 1522, 1527, 1535; then that

of Stephanus, from Paris, 1546; then that of Beza, from Geneva, 1565. Finally, the second Elzevir edition of 1633, Leyden, which claimed to give the textus receptus, was generally so received, and gave currency to that title. The text thus formed was the basis of the English version of King James and of all the New Testaments of all languages in modern times. But during the present century the text of the New Testament has been carefully studied, a far wider collection of manuscripts has been gathered, the more ancient and valuable manuscripts have been made the basis of a corrected text, and a text nearly approximating to the original autographs of the sacred writers has been arrived at by a process of critical comparison and judgment of the immense material collected. This is gathered—

(1) From ancient manuscripts: e.g. the Codex Alexandrinus in the British Museum, dating from the beginning of the fifth century, from 400 to 450 after the birth of Christ; the Codex Vaticanus, dating from some time in the fourth century; the Codex Sinaiticus, believed by Tischendorf to be one of the fifty copies prepared by the order of Constantine by Eusebius, a. d. 331.

(2) From the numerous quotations from the New Testament writings found in the works of the early Fathers.

(3) From the early translations, such as the Peshito, or early Syriac, latter part of the second century ; the Latin Vulgate of Jerome, a. d. 385; the Coptic, from the third century. From all these sources the new critical editions of the New Testament Greek text have been derived. The best of these in their order have been those of Griesbach, who died 1812; Lachmann, who died 1851; Teschendorf, who died 1874; and of Westcott and Hort, which was made the basis of the New Revision in 1880. This much has been settled upon definite and sufficient historical evidence critically sifted. The testimony establishes the fact that these New Testament books constitute the second division of God’s Word, and that the text in our possession is incomparably more accurate and more certain than that which is possessed of any other ancient book in the world. God has taken such care of his own Word that the differences which you may observe between the Revised Version and the Old Version of the Scriptures are such as do not involve the stability of a single important historic fact or of a single article of faith. We are brought by this process not only to the substance, but to the form and shading, of the truth as it came from the original organs of revelation. We can almost recognize the tone and inflection of the voice of Christ himself.

IV. Our fourth question is, How was the Bible, this Book of books?, produced What was the true genesis of these Scriptures? Written evidently by men, how did they become the Word of God?

There are three distinct ways in which we can conceive that God might produce a book to be read by man :

(1.) He could have produced it by his own immediate energy, acting directly and alone, as he did when he wrote the Ten Commandments with his own finger on tables of stone.

(2.) He might have used men as his amanuenses, not as conscious and free penmen, but mechanically as his instruments of writing in simple obedience to his verbal dictation.

(3.) The third way is the infinitely better one which God has chosen. It is the God-like way, which is in analogy with all his methods.

He first created man and endowed him constitutionally with all his rational, emotional, aesthetic, moral and volitional powers. He then brought certain individual men into existence with the specific qualifications necessary for writing certain parts of Scripture, and placed them under their specific historical conditions and in their specific positions in the succession of sacred writers, and gave them the precise degree and quality of religious experience, of natural providential guidance, of supernatural revelation and inspiration necessary to stimulate their free activity and to determine the result as he would have it.

1. In the first place, the Bible is as intensely and thoroughly a human book as ever existed. As Christ was a true man, tempted in all points as we are, yet without sin, because also divine, so the Bible is thoroughly human, yet without error, because also divine. God is infinite, yet his word, the Bible, is finite—i. e. God's thought is expressed under all the limits of human thought and language, so that man may receive and profit by it. God is omniscient, but his word, the Bible, is not omniscient. It is narrowly limited in its range as a human book, produced by the instrumentality of human minds and addressed to human minds of all classes; but within that range it is infallible, without any error. It has its limitations, as every human work has. It is based on human intuitions; it proceeds through the lines of human logic; it implies human feelings, tastes, experiences. Every separate book is a spontaneous work of human genius, and bears the marks of all the personal idiosyncrasies and of the historic situation of its author. The individuality of Peter, Paul, John, David, Isaiah and Moses is as fully expressed in their writings as that of Shakespeare or Milton in theirs. Each biblical writer wrought as freely and as spontaneously as any other. Each of these books was also a book of its time, bore the marks of its age, and was specifically adapted to accomplish its immediate end among its contemporaries. The provincialisms of thought and idiom proper to the situation of their writers are found in these books. They make no claim to eminent purity of language or to high literary merit either in substance or form. Yet all these writings, severally and collectively, are books of all times, adapted perfectly to the edification and instruction of the Church of every age—of Moses, of David, of the prophets, of the time of Christ, of the ancient, mediaeval, Reformation and modern Church. Of all books, it is the most comprehensively human. Of all God's works, it is the most characteristically divine. It is in one view an entire national literature ; in another view it is two distinct volumes; in another view it is one single work, with one Author, subject, method and end.

2. In the second place, the Bible is a divine book, bearing the attributes of its Author, God. All along the line of human authorship through which this wonderful book grew to be, during at least sixteen hundred years, God provided each specifically endowed and conditioned prophet for his appointed place in the succession, a place prepared for him by all who had preceded, and on this foundation already provided he proceeds to build up in organic continuity and in symmetrical proportion the system already inaugurated. To each prophet God has communicated his specific item of revelation and his specific impulse and direction through inspiration.

3. The result is that the whole is an organism, a whole consisting of many parts exquisitely correlated and vitally independent In this respect you may compare the Koran of Mohammed with the Christian Bible. In the great debate between the missionary Henry Martyn and the Persian moulvies the latter showed a great superiority of logical and rhetorical power. They proved that the Koran was written by a great genius, that it was an epoch-making book, giving law to a language pre-eminent for elegance, inexhaustible fullness and precision, revolutionizing kingdoms, forming

empires and moulding civilization. Nevertheless, it was a single work, within the grasp of one great man. But Henry Martyn proved that the Bible is one single book, one single, intricate, organic whole, produced by more than forty different writers of every variety of culture and condition through sixteen centuries of time; that is, through about fifty successive generations of mankind. As a great cathedral, erected by many hands through many years, is born of one conceiving mind and has had but one author, so only God can be the one Author of the whole Bible, for only he has been contemporaneous with all stages of its genesis; he only has been able to control and co-ordinate all the agents concerned in its production so as to conceive and realize the incomparable result

4. This book, whatever we may think of the propriety of it, unquestionably claims to be the Word of God. At the opening of the book it demands the implicit credence and obedience of every reader. Its instant order to every reader is, " Believe on peril of your soul's life!" It does not point to evidence nor plead before the bar of human reason. But it utters the voice of God and speaks by authority. What other book does this ? And this claim has been abundantly vindicated through the ages in the opinion of the wisest and best of mankind—

(1) by its demonstrations of supernatural knowledge, (2) of supernatural works, (3) of supernatural power over the hearts and consciences of men;

(4) by the accompanying witness of the Holy Ghost;

(5) by its omnipresent beneficent influence through all Christian lands and ages.

What would you think if to-day at high noon the existence and the light and heat and life-giving radiance of the sun were brought into question? How would you answer the skeptical denial of that self-evident fact by a blind man ? To all the living the sun is its own witness. So all who question the divinity of the Bible only condemn themselves. What a sorry appearance the grotesque herd make even now!

V. What is God's part in bringing this Book of books into existence? This falls under several heads, namely, providence; the gracious work of his Spirit on the heart; revelation; inspiration.

1. Providence. In a previous lecture I showed that God is to be conceived of as an infinite Spirit, presiding over all creatures and acting upon them from without at his will, but also as omnipresent, at every moment immanent in every ultimate element of every creature, and acting in and through all things from within. Thus God's activities are everywhere confluent with our own spontaneities. All creatures live and move and have their being in him. He works in us to will as well as to do; that is, as free agents, though willing to do according to his good pleasure. A great musician elicits his most perfect music out of instruments and under conditions made for him beforehand by other men. How much more completely would the artist be the sole creator of his work if he could at will first create his material with the very qualities he needs, then build and attune his instruments for his own purposes, and then bring out from them, thus prepared and adjusted, the very music in its fullness which his soul has designed from the first. So God from the first designed and adapted every human writer employed in the genesis of Scripture. Paul, John, Peter, David, Isaiah, have been made precisely what they were, and placed and conditioned precisely as they were, and then moved to write and directed in writing precisely what they wrote. The revelation was in a large measure through an historical series of events, led along by a providential guidance largely

natural, but surcharged, as a cloud with electricity, with supernatural elements all along its line. Thus under God's providence the Scriptures grew to be, all the conspiring forces which contributed to their formation acting under the providential control of the ever present, ever-acting, immanent God.

2. Spiritual Illumination. This includes the whole sum of God's gracious dealing with the soul of his prophet, qualifying him to be the fit organ for the communication of religious truth. In order to exhibit truth in its comprehensive logical relations God employed the logical and scholastically trained mind of Paul. In all his writing this natural and acquired faculty of Paul acted under God's guidance as spontaneously and naturally as the same faculty ever wrought in the case of any other writer. But in relation to spiritual truth the natural mind of man is blind and without feeling. Spiritual illumination by the Holy Ghost, a personal religious experience, was as necessary in the case of such writers as David, John and Paul as aesthetic taste and genius are in the case of a poet or artist. The spiritual intuition of John, the spiritualized understanding of Paul, the personal religious experience of David, have by the superadded gift of inspiration been rendered permanently typical and normal to the Church in all ages.

3. Revelation. Spiritual illumination opens the organ of spiritual vision and clarifies it Revelation, on the other hand, gives the additional light which nature does not supply. In every instance where supernatural knowledge of God, his attributes, his purposes, of the secrets of his grace or of the future of the Church in this world, of the life of body or of soul after death, came to be needed by a sacred writer, God immediately gave it to him by revelation. This was done in various ways, as by visions, dreams, direct mental suggestion, verbal dictation and the like; but whatever the method of communication it was perfectly adequate to the occasion and congruous to the nature of the person to whom it was made. This, of course, was never furnished except on the occasions when it was needed: it appears more frequently in some portions of Scripture than in others, but however frequent it was an occasional and not a constant element of the Bible.

4. Inspiration. This was the absolutely constant attribute of every portion and of every element of the Scriptures, and that attribute which renders them infallible in every utterance, and which thus constitutes their grand distinguishing trait, separating them by the whole heavens from all other books. Revelation supernaturally communicated to the sacred writer the truth which he needed, and which he did not possess and could not attain by any natural means. Inspiration, on the other hand, is that influence of the immanent Holy Ghost which accompanied every thought and feeling and impulse and action of the sacred writer involved in the function of writing the word, and which guided him in the selection and utterance of truth—i. e. in its conception and in its verbal expression—so that the very mind of God in the premises was expressed with infallible accuracy. This influence was exerted from within the writer, not upon him from without. It in no degree constrains or forces; it directs through the writer's own spontaneity. It modifies action only so far as action would be otherwise divergent from the purpose of God or inadequate.

It is like the directive agency of the plastic soul of the tree, which so directs the physical forces engaged in its erection that they spontaneously combine to form its intricate and voluminous organism. Or it is like the touch of the charioteer upon the reins which guide the courses of the racing steeds. Or it is like the touch of the hand of the steerer upon the rudder of the boat carried gently down the meandering stream by the currents of the air and water. These currents symbolize

the natural powers and knowledge of the sacred writer, reinforced by revelation and by grace. The hand on the rudder symbolizes inspiration. It secures the fact that all things go right according to the will of the steersman. But it interferes only by gentle and alternate pressure, and thus only when otherwise the currents if left to themselves would not fulfill his will.

VI. What is the doctrine of the Christian Church as to the extent to which the Scriptures are inspired t The two opinions which individual Christian men have severally maintained on this subject are represented respectively by the two alternative phrases, " The Scriptures contain the Word of God," " The Scriptures are the Word of God." The first is the loose formula of those who hold a low doctrine of inspiration. A river in India, " rolling down its golden sands," may be truly said to contain gold. But in that case we are left in doubt as to the relative proportion between the sand and the gold, and to our own resources to discriminate and separate the two. If the Bible only "contains the Word of God," it evidently can be no infallible rule of faith and practice, because we are confessedly left to the two very human and fallible instruments (1) of " Higher Criticism," and (2) of the " Christian consciousness," to determine what elements of the Scriptures are the very "Word of God" and what elements are only the word of man. A law can have no infallibility beyond that of the court which interprets it. So in this view of the case the Bible has no infallibility beyond that of the criticism and consciousness of our self-appointed, self-complacent guides. But the Church has always held that " the Scriptures are the "Word of God." This means that, however these books may have been produced through human agency, God has (1) so controlled the process of their genesis, and

(2) he so absolutely endorses the result, that the Bible in every book and every word, both in matter and in form, is the very Word of God uttered to us.

Hence it is in every part and in every word (of the original autographs) absolutely inerrant and of absolute divine authority. The phrase " verbal inspiration " applied to the Scriptures does not mean that the sacred writers were inspired or directed in their work by words dictated or suggested. But it means that the divine influence which we call inspiration, and which accompanied them throughout their entire work, extended to the verbal expression of every thought as well as to the thoughts themselves. This inspiration has extended equally to every part of Scripture, matter and form, thought and words, and renders the whole and every part inerrant.

Calvin, in the sixth, seventh and eighth chapters of his Institutes, continually uses the phrases " Scripture," " the Scriptures," " the sacred volume," and " the "Word of God " as synonymous. The first Reformed Confession of national authority, the First Helvetic, says, art. i., "Canonical Scripture is the Word of God" The Second Helvetic Confession was the most widely recognized of all the Reformed Confessions in Switzerland, France, Hungary, Poland, Scotland, and highly honored in England and Holland. It says, " We believe and confess that the canonical Scriptures of the holy prophets and apostles of both Testaments are the Word of God, and have plenary authority of themselves and not from men." Every Presbyterian minister and elder in England, Scotland, Ireland, Canada and the United States, North and South, believes this or he has forsworn himself. Each one has at his ordination solemnly declared, before God and man, that he believes these Scriptures "to be the Word of God" (Confession of Faith, Presbyterian Board of Publication, pp. 429, 434, 441). Thomas Cartwright, the father of English Presbyterianism, in his Treatise of the Christian Religion; or, The Whole Body and Substance of Divinity (London, a. d. 1616), has written

his twelfth chapter " On the Word of God." This he identifies with the collection of canonical books, and accounts for their authority by saying, "for God is the Author of them:9 This is the doctrine of the whole historical Church of God. The Roman Catholic Church declares it dc fide to believe that God is the Author of every part of both Testaments (Can. Council of Trent, sec. 4; Dog. Decrees of Vatican Council, 1870, sec. 3, chap. 2). Also every branch of the Reformed Church—e. g. Belgic Confession, Art 3; Second Helvetic Confession, chap. 1; Westminster Confession, chap. 1. In this respect the late Professor Henry B. Smith, the noble representative of the theology of the New School branch of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, precisely agrees with the late Professor Charles Hodge, who equally represented the theology of the Old School branch. In his sermon on The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, delivered before the Synod of New York and New Jersey, October 17, 1855, Dr. Smith said: "All the divine revelations which are here recorded are also inspired, but all that is the subject of inspiration need not be conceived of as distinctly revealed. Inspiration designates that divine influence under which prophets or apostles spake or wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Christ is the great Revealer, the Holy Spirit inspires.

" Its function is to convey unto the world, through divinely-commissioned prophets and apostles, either orally or by writing, under the specific influence of the Holy Spirit, whatever has been thus revealed. Its object is the communication of truth in an infallible manner, so that when rightfully interpreted no error is conveyed.

" It comprises both the matter and the form of the Bible—the matter in the form in which it is conveyed and set forth. It extends even to the language—not in the mechanical sense that each word is dictated by the Holy Spirit, but in the sense that under divine guidance each writer spake in his own language according to the measure of his knowledge, acquired by personal experience, the testimony of others or by immediate divine revelation.

" So wonderfully do the divine and human elements commingle in the Scriptures, as do the first and second causes also in the realm of providence, that it is vain to limit inspiration to doctrine and truth, excluding history from its sphere. The attempt is as unphilosophical as it is unscriptural. No analysis can detect such a line of separation. It is both invisible and not to be spiritually discerned.

"The theory of plenary inspiration, as we have already given it, comprises whatever is true in all these views, subordinate to the prime position that the Bible not only contains, but is, the Word of God."

Dr. H. B. Smith's Introduction to Christian Theology: "Inspiration gives us a book, properly called the Word of God, inspired in all its parts. The inspiration is plenary in the sense of extending to all the parts and of extending also to the words"

VII. What is to be said as to alleged discrepancies ■ The above statement unquestionably truly represents the ancient and catholic faith of the historic Church of Christ The hostile critics and theorists object that the Scriptures are full of inaccuracies and discrepancies of statement—

(1) as between the statements of Scripture and modern science or undoubted history;

(2) as between one statement or quotation of Scripture and another. In answer to this we have time to say only— 1st. We freely admit that many errors have crept into the sacred text as it exists at present, although none of these errors, nor all of them together, obscure one Christian doctrine

or important fact In order to make good the objection of the critics it is necessary that they show that the discrepancy exists when the clearly ascertained original text of Scripture is in question.

2d. The Scriptures were not written from the scientific point of view nor intended to anticipate science. A distinction should be clearly drawn and strongly held between the speculations of science and its ascertained facts. The speculations of science are like the changing currents of the sea, while the Scriptures have breasted them like the rocks for two thousand years. The Scriptures speak of nature as it presents itself phenomenally. When this is remembered, the Bible contradicts no fact of science. On the contrary, the entire view of the genesis and order of the physical world presented by the Bible, in contrast with all the other ancient books whatsoever, is in correspondence with that presented by modera science to a degree perfectly miraculous. The men who press this objection are ignorant either of science or of the Bible, or, more probably, of both.

3d. As to the alleged discrepancies with history, it must be remembered (a) that the most modern discoveries (from Egypt and Assyria) most wonderfully confirm the historical accuracy of Scripture; (6) that when only a part of an ancient situation is historically illuminated, different accounts may appear inconsistent which are really complementary to each other and mutually supporting.

4th. As to the discrepancies alleged to exist in certain passages between the Scriptures themselves, it is evident that the question is one of fact, which can be settled only by a thorough, learned, intelligent and impartial investigation. Very few men are qualified to give an opinion. There is no possibility of commencing even an investigation in a popular lecture. It is sufficient for me that men like my learned colleagues in Princeton Seminary, who spend their lives in the special study of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, assure me that one single instance of such discrepancy has never been proved. Friends, let the frogs croak; in the mean time let us possess our souls in peace, waiting until the first case of discrepancy, is proved.

Chapter 91

03.05. LECTURE 05 - PRAYER AND THE PRAYER-CURE.

LECTURE V PRAYER AND THE PRAYER-CURE. A complete treatise on the subject of prayer would necessarily include three special subdivisions:

(1) Prayer considered as a fact and an efficient agency in relation to God, to his eternal plans and to the laws of the universe;

(2) prayer considered as a Christian grace;

(3) the manner in which prayer is to be practiced and expressed, both as a private and as a public exercise. In this lecture we are, of course, confined by the limited time and by the nature of the occasion to the first subdivision; that is, to the consideration of prayer and its answer as a fact, and as an efficient agency in relation to God and to his eternal plans and to the laws and natural forces of the universe.

All religion presupposes the personality of God, and springs from the personal relations subsisting between man and God. God can and does act upon men from within and below consciousness, turning the hearts of men even as rivers of water are turned. But he also acts upon us through our conscious acts of perception and feeling, called into exercise by his external intercourse with us as a Person speaking to persons. He is always face to face with us, our constant companion and guide and friend. From our creation he is constantly standing to us in the relation of our Father and of our moral Governor. And in these relations we have been sustaining intercourse with him ceaselessly all our lives. Sin consists in man’s want of sympathy with God, his moral character, purposes and mode of action in these relations. When we are born again by the Holy Ghost we are brought into sympathy with him in all these respects, and thus intercourse with him becomes consciously active on our part, more and more intimate and tender, and a source of joy to us continually. To this conscious intercourse we assign the name " prayer" in the wide sense of that word, whether it is breathed in disconnected ejaculations or said or sung in connected sequences of thought or emotion. Prayer in this wider sense includes all the exercises proper to the relation our souls, as sinful yet redeemed and reconciled, sustain to God— e. g. adoration, confession, thanksgiving and supplication for ourselves and others. The great design of God in this relation is to effect our education and government as rational and spiritual beings. He accomplishes these ends by revealing to us his perfections, by training our intellects to follow the great lines of thought developed in his plans and revealed in his works, and by training us to action in the exercise of all our faculties as co-workers with each other and with him in the execution of his plans. In order to accomplish both these ends at once, the education of our thought and the training of our faculty by active exercise, God has established a comprehensive and unchangeable system of laws, of second causes working uniformly, of fixed sequences and established methods, by which he works and by which he can train us to understand his working and to work with him This careful adherence to the use of means, to the slow and circuitous operation of second causes and established laws, is surely not for God’s sake. It cannot be necessary to him. It is ordained and rigidly adhered to only for our sake. And for us it is absolutely necessary. If means were not

necessary to the attainment of ends ; if God did not carefully confine his powers to the lines of established and known laws; if we lived in a world in which miracle, instead of being the infinite exception, was the rule, and God was constantly breaking forth with the exercise of supernatural power in unexpected places, and like the wild lightning eluding the most rapid thought as it dashes zigzag across the sky,—we should find all thought and intelligent action impossible. We could not understand God, because we could not trace the relation of means to ends in his action. If we could not understand him, we could not appreciate his wisdom, his righteousness or his benevolence.

We could not work with him, for we could not depend upon the operation of any means, we could not hope to effect any results. The universe would be a chaos and the community of men a bedlam. In order to accomplish the necessary understanding between God and man, and in order to afford a secure basis for the exercise of human faculties in the education of man and the moulding of human character, the established fixed relations between cause and effect, uniform sequences of natural law, must be universal, continuous, perpetual and absolutely uninterrupted, without any exception except for good and well-understood reasons. If there be miracles at all, they must explain themselves as divine signs by their connection with a new direct message from the heavenly Father to his children on the earth. In that case, and in that case only, the miracle brings God nearer to his children and makes his way more plain to them. In every other case a miracle is only a bewilderment and an offence, which darkens the face of God and effaces the evidence of his being and the traces of his wisdom and love.

Observe how patiently through the ages of ages God confines himself to the slow processes of natural law, and never impatiently cuts across the heavens to accomplish suddenly by miracle the results for which he works. Follow the long, long cycle of the geologic ages in which God, by slow natural processes, by the law of means adapted to ends, is preparing the world to be the fit habitation of man and the adjusted theatre of human history. Trace with your eyes the long, long cycle of human history preceding the advent of our Redeemer, while God is patiently governing his rebellious subjects, and by natural causes and historical methods evolving the plan of salvation and preparing the world for Christ, who never came until all things were ready and the fullness of the time was come. Look along the tedious course of the history of the Christian Church since the advent of Christ, and learn the lesson of God’s methods by his use of second causes, by his slow following of the lines of natural law in the development of his kingdom, and his preparation for the second coming of our Lord. Each and all of these results God could have accomplished by miracle. But in that case his wisdom would have remained hidden in his own being, and his people would have failed utterly of education—neither knowing God or his way, nor trained to exercise all their faculties of head and heart and will as workers together with him.

There are two extreme and equally false views as to this framework of second causes and natural law in its relation to the action of God and to our intercourse with him through faith and prayer. The one view, that of deists and rationalists and agnostics, makes this framework of second causes and natural law, which men call Nature, an iron, impenetrable barrier, which utterly separates God and man, which makes prayer an empty form and divine help and sympathy a delusion. The opposite view, just as false and pernicious, regards this framework of second causes and natural law as simply a stage, with natural scenery as a background, on which to exhibit startling and bewildering miracles, without system or meaning or evidential value. The true view of this

framework of second causes and natural law is that (1) it reveals God and his perfections to man in a form he can understand and appreciate;

(2) it affords a practicable basis on which human faculties can be educated and men trained as intelligent co-workers with God;

(3) it presents an invariable course of action that we must follow; nevertheless it is infinitely flexible, so that men everywhere are able, by the rational use of means, to accomplish their purposes. Thus, men following and using natural law plant and sow and raise crops, navigate the air with balloons and the sea with ships, tunnel mountains, erect buildings, and girdle the earth with the electric currents of thought and purpose.

(4) This great permanent framework of second causes and natural laws is, of course, incomparably more flexible in the hands of God than it can be in the hands of man.

"We know these laws partially and imperfectly: God knows them perfectly. We act upon these second causes externally: God acts upon them internally. We act upon them only at a few isolated points: God acts upon every point of the infinite system at the same time. Surely, therefore, while God can act through nature in a supernatural manner, he can also, like us, only infinitely more perfectly, act through nature and in accordance with natural law in accomplishing his purposes. He can answer prayer, send rain or sunshine, turn into new channels rivers of water or currents of air, just as he turns the hearts of men, without violating natural laws.

Using the word " prayer" in this discussion in the specific sense of "petition/' "supplication for desired benefits, spiritual and material," we will proceed to discuss the following points:

I.What are the true conditions of acceptable prayer ?

II.In what sense and under what limits are we to expect to have our prayers answered ?

III.Answer objection drawn from the previous certainty of events determined by God's eternal purpose.

IV.Answer objection drawn from fixity of the laws of nature.

V.Show that the faith of the Christian Church in the efficacy of prayer is confirmed by uniform Christian experience.

VI.Apply these principles to the question of the modern "faith-cure."

I. What are the true conditions of acceptable prayer ?

1. The person offering the prayer must be in a state of reconciliation to God through Christ. This does not mean that God never answers the prayers of unregenerate persons; but the promise can be claimed only by those who have accepted the conditions of salvation and are loyal to their Christian engagements.

2.The prayer must be sincere, must express a real desire of the heart, and it must be offered and the answer sought only through the merits and intercession of Jesus Christ.

3.The prayer must be offered in absolute submission to the higher, broader knowledge, wisdom and righteousness of God. It must follow our Saviour's " not as I will, but as thou wilt." The only objects for which we have any warrant to press unconditional petitions arc:

(1) our own sanctification;

(2) the bringing on of the triumph of Christ's kingdom, because God has positively revealed both of these to be his " will.

" The unconditioned, unsubmissive demand for any other benefit, in relation to which the will of God is as yet unrevealed, is obviously a presumptuous sin, a ground of offence, and not an acceptable prayer.

4.In order that the prayer shall be acceptable, the person praying must in every case intelligently and diligently use the means provided by God himself in the great framework of second causes and natural laws for the attainment of the end desired. If a man who prays for a crop neglects to sow the seed; or if a man who prays for learning neglects to study; or if a man who prays for the cure of disease neglects to take the appointed remedies; or if a man who prays for sanctification neglects to use the means of grace; or if a man who prays for the conversion of sinners neglects to work for it as far as his power or opportunity goes,—then, in every case, he disobeys and insults God: his prayer is a mockery and an offence, and it can be answered only by rebuke and chastisement.

Means in relation to ends and ends in dependence upon means are as much an ordinance of God and as obligatory on us as prayer itself. If God shuts us up in a situation where no means are possible, we have a right to pray for what we want in the absence of all means, and God is perfectly able to give it to us without means, if it seem wisest and best to himself. But in every case in which means are available to us their use is commanded, and the poor fanatic who neglects them and petulantly cries for what he wants dishonors God, grieves rational Christians and gives occasion to the devil and to his friends to triumph.

5. We must believe in the efficacy of prayer itself as a divinely-appointed means of attaining blessings. We must believe that we do and will obtain blessings by means of prayer which we would not attain without it.

II, In what sense and under what limits are we to expect to have our prayers answered?

Agnostic and naturalistic critics of the Christian faith have admitted that prayer might be a power in the spiritual sphere, and that in every case its subjective effects upon the person praying, upon his state of mind and character, would be beneficial, but that it is absurd to admit that prayer could have any effect upon the mind or purpose or act of God, or any influence upon the course of events in the material world.

It is true that prayer is a power in the spiritual world, that it does secure spiritual blessings, and that it does produce valuable subjective effects upon the state of mind and character of the person praying. But Christ commands us to ask for our daily bread, which includes all desired temporal and material benefits. If we are to pray honestly for daily bread or for any other desired material good, it must be because we are assured that if we pray we may really and truly influence the mind of God to give it to us. To ask God for an objective material good when we believe that the only

possible effect of the asking is an internal and spiritual modification of our own feelings, is false and hypocritical, unworthy of either God or man, and sure to be of no effect. The Scriptures assure us, and all Christians believe, that prayer for material as well as for spiritual good is as real a means of effecting the end sought as is sowing seed a means of getting a crop, or as is studying a means of getting learning, or as are praying and reading the Bible means of sanctification. But it is a moral, not a physical, cause. Its efficiency consists in its power of affecting the mind of God and disposing him to do for us what he would not do if we did not pray. But it is plain that in order to be effectual in any given case the prayer must have all the conditions or elements of true Christian prayer stated under the former head. The person praying must be in favor with God: he must be sincere, must present his prayer only through Christ and trust only in Christ's mediation. He must desire the thing sought, and ask for it only in complete submission to the wise and righteous will of God. There is nothing more contemptible than the presumptuous claim that God has subjected the government of the universe to our dictation. Every really holy soul must prefer a million times that God should reign absolutely and do with him and his as seems best in his sight.

What child of an earthly father can judge in any case what upon the whole and in the long run is best for itself? How much more should we insist upon leaving every decision at the disposal of our heavenly Father! And lastly, the person praying must be diligent in using all the appointed means which are available to him to secure the end. When all the conditions are fulfilled God will with absolute certainty be moved to answer our prayer—to do for us what he would not have done if we had not prayed. He will, if he sees it best, give us precisely what we ask for, at the precise time, in the precise manner. Or he may give it substantially in a different time and manner. Or he may give us something better, something which we ourselves would desire more if only we had the eyes to see as God sees. How do you treat your little ones when they cry for unwholesome sweets? God never will give us a stone when we ask for bread, or a serpent when we ask for an egg; but he often does give us bread when we ignorantly ask for a stone, and an egg when we perversely desire a serpent.

III. But it is objected that the doctrine of prayer is absurd, because God has already from eternity determined whatsoever comes to pass; every event is already fixed in his eternal purpose; and this purpose is absolutely immutable and cannot be changed. What, then, is the use of asking him to do what we wish done ? If it is already decreed, there is no need to ask for it; if it is not already decreed, there is no use to ask for it.

We answer : 1. This is a theoretical objection hard to answer, simply because the human mind cannot comprehend the relations of time to eternity. But for practical purposes the objection is absolutely senseless. If God has eternally decreed that you should live, what is the use of your breathing ? If God has eternally decreed that you should talk, what is the use of your opening your mouth ? If God has eternally decreed that you should reap a crop, what is the use of your sowing the seed ? If God has eternally decreed that your stomach should contain food, what is the use of your eating? Prayer is only one means appointed by God for attaining our ends. In order to educate us he demands that we should use the means or go without the ends which depend upon them. There are plenty of fools who make the transcendental nature of eternity and of the relation of the eternal life of God to the time-life of man an excuse for neglecting prayer. But of all the many fools in the United States, there is not one absurd enough to make the same eternal decree an excuse for not chewing his food or for not voluntarily inflating his lungs.

2. The common difficulties men feel about the eternal and unchangeable decrees of God all arise from the absurd mistake of conceiving of God as determining the certain occurrence of a part separate from the whole, of an event separate from the causes and conditions upon which it depends. God's single decree determined the whole universe in all its successive ages as one whole. It has determined the cause and condition as well as the event. If a man will not believe, he shall not be saved; if he will not sow, he shall not reap. But if it is decreed that he shall reap, it is just as much decreed that he shall sow. If it be decreed that you shall have what you desire, it is decreed no less that you shall pray for it, and it is certain that you will not get it if you do not pray for it.

IV. But it is objected that the order of nature, the uniformities of natural laws, are fixed, and God will not violate them in order to make the whole course of nature turn out of its way, in order to make way for a poor praying sinner like you or me.

We answer: 1. The whole order of material nature has been framed from the beginning for the very purpose of providing for the mutual intercourse of the praying children and of the prayer-hearing Father. It is a matter of universal experience that earthly fathers find the order of nature, when intelligently followed; no barrier, but the most effective of conceivable instruments, in providing for the wants and in answering the petitions of their children. How can the order of nature be a greater barrier to our heavenly Father?

2. But it is answered that we can see our earthly parents use the order of nature so as to make it answer our petitions and provide for our wants, but we never see our heavenly Father so using nature. Our earthly parents leave their footprints while using means in our behalf, and in working for us always make chips which prove their work. But our heavenly Father never makes footprints, never leaves chips, so we have no visible evidence that he responds to our petitions or acts through the order of nature in our behalf.

We answer : The sculptor cuts the statue out of the block of marble, piece by piece, from without, and so makes chips. So earthly fathers work upon material nature from without. But when the vital principle of a tree gathers nourishment from soil and air and builds it up from within, it leaves no footprints and makes no chips. Thus our heavenly Father acts not on spots of matter from without, but upon the whole frame of material nature from within, and the whole is as obedient to his touch as are the nerves of the human body to the human spirit which inhabits it.

All nature with its mechanical causes and fixed laws, and all human souls with their instincts, struggles and articulate cries, form part of one eternally-designed system. Every prayer and every answer, every cause and every effect, every volition and every result, has been provided for from the first. But the relation between causes and effects is never disturbed. The effect immediately depends on the cause, the answer immediately depends on the prayer. If we do not work we cannot eat, if we do not eat we cannot live. If we do not pray we will not gain what we desire.

V. What is the testimony of human experience as to the actual fact of God's answering prayer for temporal and material good?

1.We appeal to the universal instinct of prayer inherent in men of all races and centuries. We claim the consent of all false religions with the true, and the involuntary testimony of dying infidels.

2.From the nature of the case the testimony of mankind in general on such a subject is incompetent. Any scientific " prayer-test," as that proposed by Professor Tyndall, is most incongruous to the case, and therefore unphilosophical. Prayer is not a physical cause; it is a moral cause. It acts upon our heavenly Father, disposing him to attend to our wants in the exercise of infinite wisdom and love, and to use his loving and wise discretion in complying with or refusing our imperfect desires. Who can enter into this region of intimate personal relations between the praying child and the prayer-hearing Father except themselves ? More than a million Christians prayed for the life of President Garfield. The world laughed, and said our Father did not hear us. We know that he did hear and answer us in the best way possible: we are completely satisfied.

Millions and millions of spiritual children of God have been ceaselessly trusting him, praying to him and proving him, from Adam to Moses, from Moses to Christ, from Christ to the present. Our Father knows our hearts: we know and he knows the real meaning of our prayers. We know our Father's heart: we know that when we were " in distress we called upon him, and he answered us and set us in a large place." The Christian is satisfied with what he knows as to the confidential relations between his prayer-hearing Father and himself. He can well afford to smile with pity when the stranger to the household criticises his Father's faithfulness and tries to convince the child against the witness of his own consciousness that his Father does not hear and answer his prayers. What can the stranger know about it? He has never truly prayed, and therefore he has never experienced any answer to prayer. Would it not be more scientific if these agnostic critics should confine their remarks to the sphere of their own experience ?

VI. Let us apply these principles to the subject of the modern doctrine of " prayer-cure."

It appears to me that we have settled this subject pretty clearly already.

1. All Christians must agree with our friends of the " prayer-cure " that it is our privilege and duty to pray for the healing of our bodies and the maintenance of our bodily health, just as it is for us to pray for any other material and temporal blessing. If we pray aright the true prayer of faith (which includes submission as well as confidence, for confidence without submission is presumption and not faith), if we pray the true prayer of faith, God will certainly answer, and either give us the very healing we ask when and as we ask it; or if it be wiser and kinder will give us the same health at a different time and in a different manner; or, if he sees it to be kinder and wiser, he will give us something far better, something we would ourselves much prefer if we had the eyes to see as God sees. But in order that our prayer be indeed the true prayer of faith, we who pray must be reconciled to God, we must seek only through the merit and mediation of Christ, we must pray for and desire health only subject to the infinitely wiser and juster will of God, and, finally, we must meantime seek for and use diligently all the means which Providence makes available to us in our actual circumstances. No believing Christian will use means without praying for God's guidance in their selection and for blessing on their use. If he does he will not be really blessed. Just so, no sensible Christian will pray for the cure of his diseases without using all the means available. If he does, he mocks God, and God will mock him as sure as he lives.

2. But our " faith-cure " friends differ from us in the following points, in which they are dangerously wrong ·

(1) They hold that all sickness is the immediate punishment of some particular sinful act or state of some of the persons directly or indirectly concerned. We admit that, in general, sickness is a consequence of sin. If there had been no sin there had been no sickness. But we deny utterly that in the case of Christians, whose sins are pardoned for Christ's sake, sickness is any part of the punishment of sin. It is always, in the Christian's experience, a fatherly chastisement—a proof of love for our good, not a mark of anger or displeasure for sin. " Whom the Father loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." Some of the holiest saints have been the greatest sufferers and for the longest time. No true Christian would be impatient; he would rather kiss the rod; he would rather take up his cross daily and follow Christ. Nor would any true Christian change his cross if he could. I would infinitely rather suffer the worst sickness my heavenly Father sends than be cured at once by the help of those who regard sickness as a proof of want of faith or as evidence of God's displeasure.

(2)These brethren appear to demand the cure of the disease in every case unconditionally. They say if the disease is not removed it proves that the sick man lacked faith. But continued disease is not a sign of the divine displeasure on account of sin; and faith, as we have shown, submits to God's will as well as trusts his grace. It always says, " Not as I will, but as thou wilt." Confidence without submission is the most offensive form of unbelief that disgraces man or offends God.

(3)These " faith-cure" friends err in praying while refusing to use properly God's appointed means to secure the health they desire. We have shown this to be always and everywhere unwarranted. It is the very spirit of restless disobedience. It is a refusal to submit to God's method. It springs from a spiritual pride which aspires to subdue the infinite God to their service and make him and his infinite power the poor instruments of their own will. The specific difference of a miracle is that it is wrought without means. The specific difference of a providential answer to prayer is that it is wrought as a blessing upon means religiously employed. The working of miracles, not as evidence of a divine commission, but for private good, is unwarranted and is a temptation to evil. When Christ, having fasted forty days, was an-hungered, the tempter came to him and said, " If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread." Christ of course refused.

(4) Our brethren of the " faith-cure" differ from us in maintaining not merely that God may work miracles now if he pleases—which, of course, none of us deny— but that God may as reasonably be expected to work miracles upon our call now as in the days of the apostles.

Answer : A. We have shown that a frequent and promiscuous occurrence of miracle would (a) defeat the purpose for which the frame of nature has been erected by God and confuse all our relations to him, and (6) would destroy the evidential force of miracles themselves, obscure the manifestation of God and lead to utter confusion of thought and of faith. Miracles are not to be rationally desired except in connection with the promulgation of a new religion. The reason of the prevalent infidelity in the present day is not the deficiency of the evidence, nor would it be removed by more evidence. The ground of unbelief is the evil heart, the moral alienation of man from God. It can be removed only by. the demonstration of the Holy Ghost. This was Christ's opinion. He makes Abraham say to Dives concerning his wicked brethren, " They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them. ... If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead " (Luke 16:29-31). The overwhelming preponderance of opinion among the intelligent Protestant churches affirms that miracles, as a matter of fact,

ceased with the initial struggles for life of the early Church, about the close of the apostolic Church.

B. The modern faith-cure miracles all belong to the same class with the Roman Catholic miracles of the mediaeval Church. There is just as much testimony, borne by as many persons—and persons every whit as intelligent, disinterested and pious—to those medieval as to any or all of these modern miracles. And yet these have all been rejected by the unanimous voice of intelligent Protestantism on grounds which, in every particular, apply with equal force to the case of the modern miracles of the so-called " faith-cure." These are—

(a) that they were not wrought to establish a new religion or to authenticate prophets sent immediately from God, and were therefore inconsequent and purposeless;

(b) they were associated with a mass of unscriptural assumptions and superstitions;

(c) they were wrought by men who lacked prophetical dignity and character, and were witnessed only by unbalanced enthusiasts;

(d) the works themselves lacked the simplicity and dignity which are the common character of divine acts.

(5) Our " faith-cure " friends base their doctrine upon the facts

(a) that in the Scriptures sin is symbolically represented by disease, and so Christ is represented as having vicariously borne for us our " sicknesses." Answer: So he tasted death for every man. To be consistent they should provide by faith that no man should die.

(b) They base their doctrine on the fact that miracles of healing were undoubtedly wrought during the entire first, and perhaps the second, generation of the apostolic Church, and that the apostle James (James 5:14) instructed the elders of the Church to anoint the sick and pray for his healing, with the expectation of his consequent recover-.

Answer: In reply to this we have only to say that they have no right to separate one part of the supernatural life of the early Church from the rest. The charismata of the apostolic period were an associated and inseparable system of supernatural gifts, designed to authenticate the truth of the new religion and to confirm its grasp on the heathen communities. These included gifts of supernatural knowledge, of healing, of government, of tongues and of interpretation, etc. They prophesied, they spoke with tongues, they interpreted, they worked divers miracles, they reigned over the Church of Christ in his name. By the unanimous consent of the educated and evangelical Church these charismata have ceased for almost eighteen hundred years. The anointing of the sick by the elders, recommended by James, survives in the sacrament of extreme unction of the Catholic Church. This proves that the ancient and mediaeval as well as the modern Church ceased to expect that this anointing and prayer would effect the miraculous healing of the sick. If after so long an interval the charismata of the early Church are to be received, all reason and consistency require that the entire system should be revived in its integrity. This Edward Irving honestly did in London (circum 1834) when he founded the " Catholic Apostolic Church." He had apostles, prophets and evangelists. They spoke with tongues, prophesied, interpreted, wrought miracles, appointed " angels " in all the churches. Since that date they have been silent again. If our "faith-cure" friends desire Bible students to recognize their modern doctrine as standing upon a

biblical basis of precedent, they should erect the whole platform and restore the era of miracles intact. When they do this we will promise a reinvestigation of their claims.

(6) Our faith- or prayer-cure friends differ from us widely in the value they put upon the testimony establishing the facts they cite in confirmation of their principle. The precise point in debate between us should be constantly kept distinctly before our minds. We believe-with all our hearts that God answers the prayer of faith in behalf of sick and suffering Christians, and that he brings relief (a) by directing them in the wise and profitable use of appointed means, and (6) in giving efficiency to the means used. But we deny that God authorizes us to expect him to heal our diseases miraculously; that is, in open neglect of available means. They cite a vast and ever-accumulating number of cases in which they claim that God has in answer to prayer permanently healed real and persistent diseases without the use of any means. We heartily acknowledge their honesty and the sincerity of their convictions, but we do not have an atom of confidence in the validity of their conclusions. The Rev. J. M. Buckley, D. D., in his admirable article on " Faith-Healing and Kindred Phenomena,"1 shows that this question of evidence falls under two heads: (a) What are the real facts? and (■) What is the true explanation of these facts ?

(a) The evidence with regard to the facts is unsifted, uncritical and utterly unsatisfactory. There have been, indeed, many cases of sick people who have become apparently, and some really, well without the use of any medicine and in connection with the prayers of these advocates of the " faith-cure " principle. But many diseases are self-limiting and tend to cure naturally. The reported cures in a great many cases have turned out to be temporary, and have been followed by relapse. In all cases of internal disease, where the mischief is out of sight, the diagnosis even of the most learned and skillful doctors is notoriously uncertain, and the non-professional judgment as to the nature of the disease on which this evidence is taken is utterly unworthy of respect. The diseases cured never have been proved to be other than nervous, and in most cases they are easily recognizied as such. In many cases other means have been previously if not secretly used, while only the fact of the prayer is mentioned. Besides, these brethren report only what they believe to be their successful cases. They say nothing of their failures, which are known to be far more numerous. It is necessary in order to maintain the logic of their position that there should be no failures, because they pledge God—nothing is impossible to God. But their failures are innumerable.

All this amounts to no more than can be validly claimed by any one of hundreds of advertised patent medicines; the history of which patent medicines as a class has justly put them all under the ban of both science and religion, meddling in which is unworthy alike of the gentleman and the Christian.

(b) Dr. Buckley demonstrates that all the alleged faots in relation to the faith-cure which remain after an intelligent sifting can be accounted for easily in connection with myriad kindred facts illustrating the power of the mind over the body; that when the attention is concentrated upon any part of the body, and when faith is exercised and strong expectation excited, with or without any religious reference, the most wonderful effects may be produced; that this is not a proof of specific answer to prayer, but of the far more general fact of the power of mind over body. In the case of the miracles of our Lord and his apostles there were no failures. The dead were raised and men born blind were made to see. Let the advocates of these modern miracles conform to the same

conditions. Let them cure in every case. Let them take cases in which there can be no question as to the previous state of the subject; i. e. let him be dead four days in hot weather, or be totally blind from birth to middle age, or let them restore lost arms or legs or teeth. When they show any disposition to submit to the ordinary common-sense tests of truth that all men apply to similar cases in worldly business, their fellow-Christians will be ready to discuss the evidence with them upon equal terms.

These our brethren are to be loved in so far as they trust and strive to exalt Christ, but the contagion of their spirit and example is to be spurned as fraught with much danger. Inflated self-consciousness accompanies all religious enthusiasms which are not grounded on Scripture and controlled by sanctified common sense. The invariable history of all such epidemics of unwarranted faith is that the reaction which necessarily follows ultimate disillusionment issues in malignant unbelief.

Chapter 92

03.06. LECTURE 06 - THE TRINITY OF PERSONS IN THE GODHEAD.

LECTURE VI THE TRINITY OF PERSONS IN THE GODHEAD.

We are to discuss this afternoon the revelation which God has made of himself in his inspired Word as three Persons. This we must do with bowed heads and reverent hearts, for the ground on which we stand is holy. The subject is transcendently sacred : it is the infinitely righteous and majestic God. It is immeasurably important as the foundation of all knowledge and faith. And for all our knowledge relating to it we are absolutely shut up to the matter which God himself has given us in his self-revelation in his Word. Consciousness, experience, observation or speculation cannot in this exalted sphere advance our knowledge one scintilla. We can know only just as much of this subject of the Trinity as is definitely set forth in the Bible, and no more. Our office here is that, simply, of humble disciples—to observe and interpret the self-exhibition of the Triune God in Scripture. This doctrine is properly a " mystery," and it is often by people not fully learned disparaged as such. These mistakenly understand by " mystery " some fact or principle of which we can have only a very vague notion— a sphere of assumption or of half-perceived shadow, in relation to which certainty is impossible, and which has no logical or practical relation to the great solid continent of human knowledge and of real life. But, on the other hand, the true meaning of the word " mystery " is that which cannot be known through the processes of discovery or invention, or of speculation, but which can be made known only by revelation, and so far forth only as unveiled. Such were the secrets of the Greek societies, which were known only as they were discovered to the initiated, as the Eleusiuian Mysteries, and those of the Masonic fraternity and of all the modern secret societies. But when these otherwise undiscoverable secrets are once revealed, then just so far forth as they have been disclosed they become part of the real knowledge of those to whom the revelation has been made; as much so as any other knowledge whatsoever which they possess, howsoever it may have been attained.

It is plain that as God is the Creator of all things, he must be the ultimate ground and centre of all things. Therefore our knowledge of God, no matter how we have gained it, must be fundamental and central to all our other knowledge of every kind. The fundamental questions in all science and philosophy, as well as in all religion, must always be—

(1) Is there a God?

(2) What is God ?

(3) What relations does he sustain to the universe ? The biblical answer to the second question includes two grand divisions: The nature of God is in the Scriptures revealed (1) through the attributes or energies, the perfections, of his essence as an infinite, rational and righteous Spirit;

(2) as eternally existing as three Persons, one in substance, in the most intimate unity of thought and purpose.

It is evident that if it is true that God does eternally exist as three Persons, that fact must underlie and give shape to all his counsels and to all his works in their execution. It must control his method of working in all spheres of creation and of providence and of grace; so that this doctrine, if true, is a necessary postulate of all philosophy and of all science, as well as of all religion.

We affirm that, instead of this threefold personality of God as taught in Scripture being a burden to our faith and a mere puzzle to our understanding, it is, of all views of God ever presented to human consciousness, the most symmetrical and harmonious, the most satisfactory to the reason, the one which renders the moral perfections of God the most comprehensible, the one which brings him most nearly within the sphere of human sympathy; which is the most profound and fruitful in important consequences; which is the most practical in its applications within the sphere of man's religious experience and duty.

I. In maintaining that the doctrine of the Trinity, as held in common by the entire historical Christian Church, is conformable to right reason we are mindful of the limited sphere of reason in relation to such questions, and of its liability to be abused. The frequent and disastrous abuse of reason has arisen

(1) from its being made the source of all knowledge in relation to things concerning which we are entirely dependent upon a direct divine revelation; and

(2) from its being made the measure and standard of that which transcends its measure, and which rests alone upon the authority of God. On the other hand, the important and necessary use of reason in such a study is (1) to apprehend the truth as the eye apprehends light;

(2) to study and judge of the evidences or credentials of the revelation claiming to be divine; and (3) to judge of contradictions if any such are involved.

There is an evident difference between that which is against reason or irrational, which can never be rightly believed, and that which is above reason, which all men do believe every day. The doctrine of the Trinity is above reason in respect to the facts (1) that it never could have been discovered, but rests entirely upon the authority of revelation ;

(2) that it cannot be fully understood or explained;

(3) that, like other data of revelation, it leads out into the region which transcends our knowledge on every side.

But, on the other hand, this doctrine involves no element which contradicts reason. On the contrary, when received as presented in Scripture it is eminently agreeable to reason. It is found to coalesce harmoniously with all other known truths, and, above all, it is found to harmonize with the most profound and fruitful religious experience. Truly our fellowship is not only " with the Father," but equally with " his Son Jesus Christ" and with the Holy Ghost. And every experienced Christian has an experimental knowledge of his relations to each divine Person.

II. The Scriptural Presentation of this Doctrine.— The entire Old and New Testaments are throughout perfectly in agreement as to the view which they present of the threefold personality of God. This disclosure is gradual and cumulative. The earlier instructions were so vague that, taken by themselves, they would never have suggested what we now signify by the term " trinity of

persons in the unity of the Godhead." But when the testimony of the Gospels and of the Epistles is gathered, and the light furnished is thrown back over the previous records of revelation, the obscure hint in the Old Testament is found to coincide fully with the fuller delineation in the New. It is one subject disclosed through a gradual process, unfolding itself continuously in the ever-increasing light. Taking the sum of these completed revelations together, we find Scripture clearly establishing the following points:

1st. There is only one God. The testimony of Scripture here absolutely accords with the witness of our consciences, and with the obvious unity of the universe in all its provinces and successions. There is but one plan, and but a single administration—but one sovereign authority either over consciences or worlds. There is but one infinite, self-existent Spirit, who reveals himself as the I am, from whom, and through whom, and to whom are all things. The three Persons are declared to be one, identical in substance, one in the depths of a common consciousness, one in thought and purpose, and equal in power and glory. This is a Trinitarian unity, which is moral and full of life, not a barren, non-ethical Unitarian oneness, which has no significance to our understandings nor attraction to our hearts.

2d. The Scriptures teach with equal clearness that " Father," " Son " and " Holy Ghost" are that one God. In the case of the Father no one doubts that he is that one God. In the case of the Son it is taught throughout the Scriptures in every possible form of suggestion and of assertion. Divine names and titles, attributes, prerogatives, works and worship are ascribed to him constantly. He is declared to be God, and from eternity to have been with God—to be one with the Father, and to be in the Father and the Father in him, so that he that hath seen the Son hath seen the Father. In the case of the Holy Ghost the fact that he is divine is not questioned; the only point of doubt with any is as to his distinct personality. But Christ applies to him the pronouns "he" and "him," and ascribes to him distinct personal will, sensibility, relations and agency, and the inspired apostles enroll his name with that of the Father and the Son as a distinct and equal constituent with them of the one Godhead.

3d. But these titles, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, all applied equally to the one God, are not mere differing titles of the same subject, as when God is called alternately Creator, Preserver or Father, but they are the several titles of three different subjects or distinct persons. We can know God only as his self-revelation presents him in his inspired Word. This Word is a history in which God is set forth as acting in the creation of the world and of men, in the providential and moral government of the world and of men, and especially in the redemption of sinful men. In all these spheres of action God is represented as acting, speaking, hearing, judging. He stands before man face to face; he speaks to us, and we hear him; we speak to him, and he hears us. We regard him as an object of reverence and love, and he regards us with affections determined by our characters and personal relations to him. In precisely the same manner the Father stands face to face with the Son as another person having distinct self-consciousness. They each look upon the other as a distinct object of love and thought. They each act upon the other as distinct agents. They use in reference to each other all cases of the personal pronouns. The Father loves the Son, speaks to him, speaks of him, gives him commandment, promises a reward for action, sends him and receives him when he returns. The Son loves the Father, speaks to him, receives his commission, returns to him and claims his reward. The Holy Ghost is sent by the Father and by the Son, acts for them as their agent, speaking of them, not of himself, and distributing their grace to men severally as he wills.

The several functions of the divinity in relation to the universe in creation, providence and redemption are distributed severally between these three as between separate though perfectly united and sympathizing agents.

4th. As to their mutual relations, of course we can know only the surface. There must be infinite depths in the conscious being of God to which no created thought can penetrate. It is plain, in the revelation God has made of himself in the history of redemption and in the record of it, that he exists eternally and constitutionally as three self-conscious Persons. But for aught we can know, in the depths of this infinite Being there may be a common consciousness which includes the whole Godhead, and a common personality. This may all be true; but what belongs to us to deal with is the sure and obvious fact of revelation, that God exists from eternity as three self-conscious Persons, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and that these sustain the following relations:

(1.) They all are modes of existence of one indivisible spiritual substance. " They are the same in substance."

(2.) Hence they must be essentially equal in power and dignity and glory. There can be no temporal pre-existence, no dependence of one upon the will of the other, no superior authority to which the others are subject. Therefore they are to be regarded and treated by all their creatures with equal love, gratitude, reverence, confidence and obedience.

(3.) Nevertheless, the Bible discovers a fixed order of existence and of operation between them. As to existence, the Father is first, the Son second, and the Spirit third. This order is of course not chronological, since all are alike eternal, but one of origin and consequence. The Father eternally " begets " the Son, and the Spirit eternally "proceeds from" the Father and the Son. Hence the second Person is eternally the " Son " of the Father, who begets him, and the third Person is eternally " the Spirit," or breath of the Father and of the Son, from whom he proceeds. The order of operation also from God outward on his creatures is the same. The Father is the source of all movement. To him the decrees are principally referred in Scripture. He sends the Son, and the Father and the Son send the Spirit. In creation and providence all movement is habitually represented in Scripture as from the Father, through the Son and by the Spirit. And in the return of man to God through the method of redemption it is always to the Father, through the Son, by the Spirit (Ephesians 2:18).

(4.) The terms " Father " and " Son " are reciprocal. We know these divine Persons in their personal distinctions and relations only so far as these are signified by these relative terms. The distinction of the personality of the first Person is that he is eternally the Father of the second Person; and the personal distinction of the second Person is that he is eternally the Son of the first. The personal titles of the second Person mutually throw light on one another. These are: ο λ■γος, the Word; ο υ■■ς, the Son; ο μονογεν■ς, the Only-begotten; ε■χ■ν του θεου του αορ■του, πρωτ■τοχος π■σης χτ■σεως, the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation; απα■γασμα της δ■ξης αυτο■, the radiancy of his glory; and χαραχτηρ της υποστ■σεως αυτο■, the very image of his substance. This divine Person, so designated as to his eternal and essential personal relations to the Father, has become incarnate by taking into his personality a germinant human nature in the womb of the Virgin Mary. Thus an eternal divine Person embraces in the unity of the one person a perfect human nature, so that he is both God and man in two distinct natures, and one person for ever. This seems impossible. Nevertheless, it is an historical

fact. We know that the one individual person, Jesus of Nazareth, was, and ever continues to be, at once perfect God and perfect man.

There is no more contrariety between the essential properties of the two natures than between matter and spirit. In our own persons—which we are certain are one and indivisible—we embrace both of these opposite substances in one. No act of consciousness, no analysis by microscope or chemical reagents, nor by knife, can penetrate to the dividing-line between soul and spirit. Both substances spontaneously conspire in one energy and coalesce in one consciousness. In some way like this the divine Spirit has penetrated the human nature and made it the obedient organ of its central personality. And everything done by him in execution of his mediatorial offices is due to the co-operating energies of both natures, divine and human.

There is no fourth Person added to the Trinity. The eternal second Person remains the same. On the inner side, that he presents to the Father and to the Holy Ghost, he is the same immutable divine Person. On the outer side, that he presents to mankind, the eternal Word has come down into time and space, and become visible and audible and tangible to us in the human nature he has taken into his Person. In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead .bodily, so that the apostles " heard it," and " saw it with their eyes," and " handled it with their hands" (1 John 1:1; Colossians 2:9).

(5.) The eternal third Person of the Trinity is always third in order. He proceeds from the Father and from the Son. He is eternally the " Spirit of the Father," and equally " the Spirit of the Son." He is the Author of beauty in the physical world and of holiness in the moral and spiritual world. Wherever he is, there the Father and the Son are. He is in all spheres of action, whether of creation or of providence or of redemption, the executive of God.

III. That these three are really distinct Persons is thus manifested and illustrated in Scripture in the most definite and indubitable manner possible. Xo words or terms of definition could make the facts so clear and certain as they are made by the simple narratives of the mutual discourses and relative attitudes and actions of these three Persons in the Scriptures. We know nothing except through these scriptural representations. If these are delusive, we know nothing. And if these three are not distinct, self-conscious Persons, then these evangelical narratives are utterly untrustworthy romances.

Moreover, we are the more ready to accept them as accurate inasmuch as they make the nature of God infinitely more intelligible to us. The condition of our knowing God at all is wholly that we were created in his image. Science, apart from our self-consciousness, which reveals to us person and cause and end, does not give us God. Except as illumined by the reflected light of our own self-consciousness the immeasurable machine of the material world gives no sign of God. We are spirits, persons and causes; therefore we know God to be a personal spirit and first cause. But Ave are no less essentially social beings, and to us all life and character, intellect, moral or practical, is conceivable only under social conditions. A unitarian, one-personed God might possibly have existed, and if revealed as such it would have been our duty to have acknowledged his lordship. But, nevertheless, he would have always remained utterly inconceivable to us—one lone, fellowless, conscious being; subject without object; conscious person without environment; righteous being without fellowship or moral relation or sphere of right action. Where would there be to him a sphere of love, truth, trust; of sympathetic feeling? Before creation, eternal darkness; after

creation, only an endless game of solitaire, with worlds for pawns. But the Scriptures declare that love is not only a possibility to God or an occasional mood, but his very essence. If love be of the essence of God, he must always love; and, being eternal, he must have possessed an eternal object of love; and, being infinite, he must have eternally possessed an infinite object of love. This of course the eternal Persons find mutually in each other. Nothing but this gives us a God and Father whose nature we can comprehend and with whom we can sympathize. A God essentially active—and active in the forms of infinite intelligence and righteousness and love—can be found nowhere except in the mutual society of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. The least rational and moral of all theistic systems is that of a bare, bald unitarianism. The least intelligent and spiritual of all heretical perversions of catholic truth is the pale fallacy which substitutes the phenomenal and superficial distinctions of a modal trinity in the place of the three self-conscious, loving, counseling Persons, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, eternally one, yet eternally several and threefold. The most rational, illuminated, genial and spiritually fruitful conception of God known among men is that conveyed by his self-revelation in the actual history of redemption as three Persons eternally loving and thinking and acting in the unity of one eternal Godhead.

IV. This catholic doctrine of the trinity of Persons in the one Godhead, moreover, fulfills another criterion of catholic truth in that it embraces, combines and reconciles all the half-truths of all the heresies which have ever attained to currency or power among thinking men, Christian or heathen. The false systems of religion which have prevailed among men may in a general way be grouped under the general heads of Deism, Pantheism, Polytheism. These have various grades of merit, yet they all alike embrace some elements of important truth, and yet are all, upon the whole, false and injurious.

1st. The deistic view of God regards him as an exalted Person, who has created the universe, and now in a general and distant way governs it, but who exists essentially outside of the world, and acts upon it only from without, and almost exclusively through second causes and the utterly inflexible sequences of natural law. The world is a machine which is wholly inexorable in all its movements, shutting in the struggling souls of men, separating them from their absent Father and holding them fast in the toils of fate.

2d. The pantheistic view regards God as the omnipresent substance of which all things consist, the irresistible current of force which flows through all movement and all life. He is not a Person who knows and loves us, for he has no existence except as he exists in the things continually coming and going which constitute the phenomenal world. His only thought is the sum of the thoughts of all finite things, his only life the sum of all creature life. He works in all things from within, and he reveals himself to us only as he emerges in our own consciences and reveals himself in us as essentially one with himself,

3d. Even the gross fictions of Polytheism have a tincture of truth to give them power over the human mind. If God is moral, there must be a personal distinction and a social basis in his essential nature. If the infinite and the absolute One is to exert a moral and educating influence on human life, he will appear to us self-limited under the conditions of time and space: "all the fullness of the Godhead" must appear to us "bodily"

It is easily seen how wonderfully the revealed doctrine of the Trinity comprehends in a harmonious and pure form all of the straggling and apparently conflicting rays of light preserved in these human systems of false religion. The Father sits apart as the distant and incommunicable God, the Origin and End of all things, the ultimate Source of all authority and power, but beyond all human thought and touch, separate on his eternal throne in the highest heavens. The truth of Pantheism is realized in the Holy Ghost, who, while of the same substance as the Father, is revealed to us as immanent in all things, the basis of all existence, the tide of all life, springing up like a well of water from within us, giving form to chaos and inspiration to reason, the ever-present executive of God, the Author of all beauty in the physical world, of all true philosophy, science and theology in the world of thought, and of all holiness in the world of spirit. The eternal Son has stooped to a real and permanent incarnation, and has done sublimely what the incarnations of the heathen mythology have only caricatured. We have what the polytheists merely dreamed of, and never really saw—the unfolding of the ethical constitution of the Godhead, revealing his existence in a plurality of persons, the actual and permanent dwelling of the absolute God in the form of human flesh.

V. This perfect self-revelation of God as a trinity of coequal Persons, moreover, completely fulfills, as none other can, all the demands of the highest philosophy and of the last suggestions of science. In the first lecture of this course we saw that when God was diligently sought, he was found in different directions and in different forms. These might be found to be mutually irreconcilable to human reason alone, while it was none the less the dictate of sound reason to persevere in the faith that in some higher region all these various aspects of the one God would be found to have a common ground. This common ground is evidently set before us by the revealed doctrine of the Trinity. Philosophy, natural religion and science together give us God as the unfathomable Abyss, as the transcendent and ineffable extra-mundane Person, and as the omnipresent immanent Spirit who is the ground of all being and the source of all life. The inspired Word and the incarnate Christ of God give us the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. The Father is the unknown and unknowable Source from which all things issue, and End to which all things tend. The Son is the personal Jehovah who reveals the whole Godhead in himself—in whom we see and worship the Father, and through whom all things consist. The Holy Ghost is the God within us, whose movement in space gives us the order of the suns and stars, and whose inspiration within us unveils the moral law and the glory of the spiritual world.

VI. This transcendent truth can never be understood and can never be proved; but when once received as truth on the ground of the testimony of the divine Word, it may be made clearer by felicitous illustration. I therefore ask you now to follow me while I present the Parable of Light.

Before this is presented I want to make two introductory remarks: First, it would be foolish as well as irreverent for mortals under our limited conditions to attempt to penetrate the awful secrets of the divine Being, and to throw the rushlight of our poor understandings over the impenetrable secrets of the interrelations of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost as they exist together eternally in the bosom of the one Godhead. It is of course very different when we come to what God has himself condescended to reveal to us as to the relations each divine Person severally sustains to the universe external to the Godhead, and as to the work which they each perform in their co-operative agency in the economies of creation, providence and redemption. Our illustration is confined to this distinctly-revealed region of the external relations of the different Persons of the

one Godhead to the universe. In the second place, we claim that our right to illustrate the revealed facts of the spiritual world by analogies drawn from the physical creation is founded upon a right view of the relation of the material and physical worlds as constituted by God. The object of God in all his works has been the manifestation of his own glorious perfections through the medium of his works. The heavens and the earth and the whole course of providence are a veil through which the perfections, designs and methods of the several Persons of the Godhead are more or less clearly shadowed forth to us. Hence our Saviour himself spoke in parables and metaphors. Both Old and New Testaments combine in making all nature a mirror reflecting the face and activities of God, the inmost operations of his grace being represented by such natural agencies as water, oil, salt, leaven, wind, fire, a hammer, a sword, and fullers' soap.

1st. Let it, then, be marked that light in its essence is absolutely invisible and passes all apprehension. Philosophers assume by hypothesis a great interstellar ocean of highly rarefied elastic matter called the ethereal medium, which no man has seen or can see. They tell us that light is a peculiar mode of motion transmitted in all directions illimitably in this ethereal medium. But whence comes this infinite throbbing whose restless waves, traversing the celestial spaces, break ceaselessly on the revolving worlds? They flow down upon us from measureless space through measureless time, and no genius can imagine whence they come and whither they go. Light makes manifest all things from which it is radiated or upon which it is reflected, but is itself utterly invisible and unknown.

Thus it is with God the Father. Through infinite time he fills infinite space, and he is the Abyss from which all things flow and into which all things tend; yet no man hath or can see God at any time: the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.

2d. Light itself makes all things visible on which it falls and from which it is reflected, but it becomes itself visible only in a radiant point or disk, like that of the insufferable sun from which it floods the world. Suppose some angel or other inhabitant of an outlying province of creation, who had often heard of the wonders and splendors of light, though he had never seen them,—suppose him to wander far afield through the nether darkness in search of this hitherto unseen wonder. If such an one suddenly should rise beyond the crest of some eclipsing shadow, and without transition stand face to face with our central sun, would he not with rapt wonder naturally hail the sun with language similar to that used in Scripture to express the essential relation of the eternal Word to God?—"All hail! thou art the very light I seek; thou art the Word of light, its uttered form; thou art its express image in which this invisible source of all life and knowledge may be beheld; thou art the radiancy of its inexhaustible glory. All its fullness dwells in thee bodily." Thus God the Father is never known except as he is seen in the Person of the Son. He that hath seen the Son hath seen the Father, and never otherwise or otherwhere is the Father ever seen. Angels and archangels and all the other sons of God who, impelled by a native aspiration, seek to know their Father, hear his voice only as it is uttered in his eternal Word, and see his image only as it is rendered visible in his express Image and is projected forth as the radiance or effulgence of his glory.

3d. That which makes the energy and influence of the sun omnipresent is the inexhaustible volume of its rays flooding space in all directions. The rays of distant constellations come down to us through millenniums and centuries and years. The rays of our own sun flood the successive

sides of the earth as it revolves daily on its axis, bearing down over the mountain-tops to the lowest valley and over the broadest plains heat, light and actinic energy, the source of all life and movement. If these rays should by any reason cease, or if they should be cut off by the interposition of an opaque mass, the sun would as to us virtually cease to exist. It would be utterly withdrawn from our consciousness, and it would entirely cease to be to us any more the source of light and life.

Thus the immanent Holy Ghost makes God the Father and God the Son, and so Christ the God-man, now glorified in heaven, omnipresent to all the Church in heaven and on earth. If the Holy Ghost were withdrawn, the Christ would be absent and of none effect to us. But if the Holy Ghost is present and active in us, we dwell in the full flood of the light and of the life of God and of his Christ.

4th. The rays of light radiated or reflected from any surface to another never reveal themselves; they only make manifest or reproduce by reflection the surface from which they come. Thus every one sees by means of the rays radiated or reflected the very image of the sun and moon in the water and all the features of the landscape in the mirror. So it is always in the work of the Holy Ghost. He never speaks of himself, but Ik; always receives of Christ and shows and communicates to us the Christ and his redemptive grace. The rays of light never picture themselves, but the stars from which they come. So the Holy Ghost never excites in our consciousness thoughts and emotions relating to himself, but always those which relate to the Godhead and to the incarnate Christ. Therefore it is that, although the Holy Ghost inspired the Scriptures, and although he is the immediately present and the constantly active Person of the Godhead in our hearts and lives, yet there is comparatively so little conspicuity given in Scripture and in Christian thought to the personality of the Holy Ghost. He is ever speaking, yet not of himself, but of Christ.

5th. All the fullness of light is exhibited and conveyed in the sun bodily; so all the fullness of the Godhead is exhibited and conveyed in the Person of the God-man bodily. The form is human, but all of God is here. The Infinite has kept back nothing, but has given us the all in giving us his Son.

6th. The sun conveys his fullness to the attendant spheres only ray by ray in successive periods of time. So we live only as we continue to live in God and receive from him our life " grace for grace." But the immeasurable ocean of the interstellar ether ever contains in its depths, latent yet potential, the infinite stores of historic light and heat Looking up athwart the evening sky, we see the inflowing streams of radiance which have been invisibly pulsing in the bosom of that ocean for years or centuries or millenniums. All the secrets of the worlds from creation downward through the aeons, all the heat or light or life-force they have ever received or shed forth, are beating in the depths of that impenetrable ether across the black bosom of which we look out at night. So is the eternal and infinite Holy Ghost an absolutely measureless and inexhaustible source of light and life. In him all the sources of our life lie latent as in the being of God; from him all the elements of the creature’s life, and pre-eminently of the Christian’s life, spring in spontaneous freeness and in transcendent perfection.

7th. The fullness of the sun, brought out into the circle of the dependent worlds by radiation, is brought into the knowledge of the creature only by the refractions and reflections to which this radiance is subjected in the worlds themselves. If we could place ourselves beyond the atmosphere in the interplanetary space, we would on every side except that toward the sun itself

behold the whole hemisphere absolutely black, with the stars simply as points without size—themselves visible, but spreading no light around. If we should turn and face the sun itself, we should see only a dull blue disk of lambent flame. It is only after we have descended within the volume of the atmosphere, and come to the surface of the earth itself, that the hitherto latent myrlad-hued beauties of the sun first come out to view. Refracted by every successive stratum of the earth's atmosphere and by the vapors of various densities which canopy our hills and streams, this hitherto latent radiance is broken and expanded into the infinitely varied hues of the rainbow and of the imperial retinue of clouds which attend the alternate rising and setting of the sun. And the whole earth, its hills and vales and plains, and all its innumerable tribes of plants and flowers and birds and beasts, reflect each one a separate color or shade or tone of light, and by their infinite variety collectively articulate the incalculable beauties latent in the sun's radiance, which could not otherwise be known.

Thus it is that the radiance of the effulgent Image of the invisible God—that is, the ever-present Spirit of the Son of the Father—exhibits to us the infinite fullness and variety of his grace, not immediately in himself, but by refractions and reflections through the intelligent spirits in which he dwells, in no single Church or person, but in all the endlessly varied spiritual beauties and graces of all the saints of all nations and ages, and in the angels of all ranks. Thrones and dominions, principalities and powers, circle the throne and reflect the first gush of the white light. But all down the lines of vision, in interminable perspective, poets and philosophers, artists and musicians, prophets and priests, and all the saints of very various shade and tone, analyze and reflect all the perfections of their Lord, which otherwise no eye hath seen nor can see.

8th. But the sun of our physical system is the inexhaustible source of all life as well as all light. When he moves southward toward the winter solstice he leaves all our northern hemisphere comfortless and dead. The leaves wither and fall, the birds depart for the genial south, the springing fountains are sealed up, the whole earth freezes into solid, obdurate stone, and death reigns supreme. When again, at the vernal equinox, the sun returns and pours his warm rays over the world, then all nature is quickened to life and wakes, the fountains are unsealed, the softened mould is impregnated, and every germ unfolds, and the singing birds come back, and the trees blossom, and all the earth rejoices and bears fruit. So when the Holy Spirit is withdrawn from our midst, and consequently God and Christ are absent, the fountains of our spirits close, our minds are darkened, our strength withers, and the winter of our souls enfolds us, and the whole Church with us, in death. But when the Holy Ghost returns again and sets for us once more the returning sun in our sky, new life from on high thrills through our veins, our hearts sing, our eyes take the heavenly light, our hands are made strong, and the work of the Lord prospers everywhere.

9th. Once again, it belongs to the mystery of light that each ray tends to reproduce everywhere in the object upon which it falls the image of that from which it radiates. This general secret of photography was known ages before the time of Daguerre. Engravings reproduce themselves upon the blank paper which shades them from the light. The sun, striking the wind-ruffled river or lake with its radiance, reproduces on every one of the myriad wavelets a perfect image of himself. As we stand face to face the image of each is reproduced on the eye and face of the other. This energy of light in the long run cuts deeper than the surface: in the sunny side of hospital wards it moulds anew the shrivelled limbs of the palsied, and like a sculptor fashions them after the forgotten ideal. So after long lives of mutual contemplation husbands and wives and familiar

friends, however dissimilar at the first, come to look, as well as to think, alike under the plastic and assimilating power of light. Often has the mountain-traveller seen this miracle wrought in a lake between the forest-clad hills. The sky is cloudless; the air as clear as crystal, and windless ; the water lying like glass, pure and placid as a mirror, under the bending skies. There you see the very heavens, the vast spaces, the great depths, the brilliant stars in their celestial perspective, all reproduced in the bosom of the lake. So when our souls lie in holy contemplation under the rays of Christ the heavenly Sun, our passions stilled, our hearts calm and purified from their lower springs, " we also with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory unto glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord " (2 Corinthians 3:18).

03.07. LECTURE 07 - PREDESTINATION.

LECTURE VII

PREDESTINATION. This is a subject which is very little understood, even by those Christians who profess to embrace it in their creed. This is due in part to the nature of the subject, to its profundity and to the infinite range of its complications with other important truths. But it is also in large measure due to inattention and to the general prevalence of a natural though an unfounded and ignorant prejudice. This prejudice has become in many quarters an epidemic irresistible to persons of more zeal than judgment. Now, I wish to urge a plea in favor of an earnest, frank, patient study of the subject. Vague prejudice unsupported by definite knowledge has no value. It is unquestionable that the Scriptures do teach some doctrine of predestination, and a very strict doctrine of unconditional election has been held by the greatest and most thoroughly biblical theologians, and by whole denominations of Christians most conspicuous for their evangelical character and fruitfulness. It will not do for any of us to dismiss such a subject with supercilious impatience. We should at the very least do our best to secure a clear conception of the doctrine, and of its relation to other doctrines, before we make ourselves sure that it is not true.

I. In the first place, it should be clearly understood that this great principle of divine predestination is held in two entirely different connections and interests. It has by a great many been discussed simply as a question of transcendental theology, as concerning the acts of God enacted in eternity in a sphere above and behind the external phenomena which are obvious to our senses. If there be a God, he necessarily exists in eternity, while the creation exists in the successions and limitations of time. The universe as a whole and all the parts of it originate in him and depend upon him, and therefore are determined by him. According to the precise language of the Westminster Shorter Catechism, Ques. 7, " The decrees of God are, his eternal purpose, according to the counsel of his will, whereby, for his own glory, he hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass." This sweeps the whole universe, and is a proposition of the highest and most general speculative importance. This position is unquestionably, in this form, true and logically involved in all scriptural views of the doctrine of grace in all its elements. It is therefore rightly embraced in our Confession of Faith, and the present lecturer with all his heart believes it to be true. It is in this spirit and from this speculative point of view that Zwiugle discusses this subject in his De Providentia. And it is this aspect of the question which is habitually considered by the general Christian public in their hostile criticisms of this doctrine. Now, I am perfectly free to confess that however true this view of the general principle of predestination is, and however much it is logically implicated in the essentials of the Christian doctrines of grace, nevertheless this transcendental way of conceiving of the matter is more speculative than practical. Although I heartily accord with the view in my own mind, I feel no disposition to insist upon the assent of any Christian brother as a matter of loyalty to the Christian faith. No element of the Creed is essential unless it practically determines the attitude of the soul in its relations to God through Christ. And only those aspects and modes of conceiving Christian truth should be insisted upon and imposed upon others as obligatory which do directly determine this God-ward attitude of our souls, or, in other words, which directly enter into and give

form to our religious experience. On the other hand, Calvin presents his characteristic doctrine of eternal election in living connection with the great practical experimental questions of personal salvation and of divine grace. If we are sinners, it is evident that the practically essential thing in religious experience is to appreciate truly our guilt, unworthiness and helplessness before God, and God's free grace toward us to its full extent. If God is infinitely gracious and just, if at measureless expense he redeemed us at the cost of the pain, shame and death of his own Son, it follows that any failure in our appreciation of our own unworthiness and helplessness, or of God's gracious activity in our salvation, would be absolutely insufferable. To claim more for ourselves or to ascribe less to God than the facts of the case justify would be the greatest of all sins, and would be the very thing to make salvation impossible. The sense of our own guilt, pollution and impotence, and of the absolute unconditioned freeness of the grace which saves us, is involved in every case of genuine religious experience. The expiatory work of Christ which is sufficient for, adapted to and freely offered to all men, being presupposed, the question of questions is, How, by what agencies and on what conditions, is it effectually applied to any individual ? The Scriptures make it plain that the condition of its effectual application is an act of faith, involving real spiritual repentance and the turning from sin and the acceptance and self-appropriation of Christ and of his redemption as the only remedy. But what will prompt a sinner in love with his sin, spiritually blind and callous, thus to repent and accept Christ as the cure of the sin he loves ? The first movement cannot begin with man. The sinner of himself cannot really desire deliverance from sin; of himself he cannot appreciate the attractive beauty, loveliness or saving power of Christ. The dead man cannot spontaneously originate his own quickening, nor the creature his own creating, nor the infant his own begetting. Whatever man may do after regeneration, the first quickening of the dead must originate in the first instance with God. All Christians feel this as the most intimate conviction of their souls. Yet it involves necessarily this very doctrine of eternal predestination or election. If God begins the work, if our believing follows his quickening, then it is God, not man, who makes the difference between the quickened and the unquickened. If we believe, it is because we have been first quickened. If any man do not believe, it is because he is yet dead in his natural sin. God's eternal choice therefore cannot depend upon foreseen faith, but, on the contrary, faith must depend upon God's eternal choice. As between the man who believes in Christ and the man who finally rejects him, the source of the difference is put by the Pelagian entirely in the inalienable, unassisted power of the human will. All that can be said in the case is that the one man has accepted Christ because he chose to do so, and the other man has rejected Christ because he chose to do so. Each has acted as he has done in the unfettered and unfetterable exercise of the human will. But Pelagianism makes no room for original sin nor for the necessity of divine grace. It is diametrically opposed to the Scriptures, to the religious experience of all Christians, and it has been rejected as anti-Christian by the unanimous consent of the whole historic Church. The Semi-Pelagian, admitting that man is morally sick, holds that every sinner must make the first movement God-ward spontaneously, in his own strength, after which, if his effort is sincere, however ineffectual, God will co-operate by his grace with him and make his effort successful. The Arminian, on the other hand, admitting that all men, being dead in trespasses and sins, are absolutely incapable of spontaneously originating any good desire or effort, yet holds that God gives the same sufficient grace to all men ; and he makes the difference between the believer and the unbeliever to lie in the fact that the former co-operates, and thus renders the grace in his case effectual, and the other fails to co-operate with it, and thus renders it ineffectual. The Lutheran,

who maintains that men are in such sense dead in sin that they are utterly unable to co-operate with grace before they have been themselves quickened to life by grace, yet makes the difference between the believer and the unbeliever to consist in the fact, that while no man can co-operate with grace previous to regeneration, every man is free to resist it. With the Lutheran, therefore, the believer is the non-resistant, the unbeliever is the resistant, subject of a common universal grace. The Calvinist, on the other hand, glorifies the free and sovereign grace of God by attributing to it alone all the efficiency in saving the believing sinner. It is God's grace which makes the believer all he is. He feels this; of this at least he is absolutely sure. He is nothing more than a poor wandering sheep. The Good Shepherd has sought him out, found him and carried him back on his breast. In himself and of himself in his entire history he is no better than his fellow-men who are lost. It is only God's free grace, therefore, which has made the difference. The faith he has cannot have been the precondition of God's choice, but God's choice must have been the precedent cause of his faith. In this form of the doctrine, we did not first choose him, but he first chose us. This truth enters into alt genuine Christian experience. It is of the essence of the universal Christian sentiment. It finds its expression in the sacred hymns and in the prayers of our fellow-Christians who call themselves Arminians, as it does in the prayers and hymns of those commonly styled Calvinists. All alike wrestle in prayer as if God's grace determined the decision. All alike cry, "Make them willing, O God, in the day of thy power!" It is the common confession of all alike that it is God who in all things works in us to do, by " working in us to will, of his good pleasure." All alike ascribe to him the prerogative of turning the hearts of men even as rivers of water are turned. All Christians with one voice cry, " Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto thy name give glory, for thy mercy and for thy truth's sake." In the theology of the heart all Christians are Calvinists; that is, all Christians ascribe all their salvation unto God. And this is the only form in which the doctrine of sovereign predestination should be insisted upon as of vital religious interest.

II. The real question remains, What does the Word of God say upon the subject ? In all matters of controversy between Christians, the Scriptures constitute the single court of last resort. This is an historical principle. To-day it remains as true as ever, no matter what crude theories of inspiration some parties may proclaim. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments have been for eighteen centuries, are to-day and always will remain, the only common authority of Christendom, acknowledged by all alike.

These Scriptures do certainly teach a divine election of persons and foreordination of events. This fact all educated persons acknowledge. The only controversy among Christians relates to the range of the foreordina-tion, whether it comprehends all events or is limited to certain classes; and to the subjects, the objects and the conditions of the election which the Scriptures teach.

1st. All Christians of course admit that the eternal Creator of the world, in the very act of creation, intelligently comprehending the end from the beginning, really, immutably and unconditionally determined all classes of events subsequently brought about by the necessary sequences of natural forces and laws. As far as the universe is a machine, God in bringing it into being, and in implanting its forces, and in ordaining its laws, necessarily determined all movements of the machine and its results from the beginning to the end. But there has been a natural shrinking from attributing to the foreordination of God all the free acts of men and angels, and especially the sinful acts of men and devils.

Nevertheless, the Scriptures are very explicit upon these points.

(1) The foreordination of God does include the free actions of men and angels, as it does all other classes of events whatsoever. God works in man freely and spontaneously to will according to his good pleasure (Php 2:13). Men and nations are the mere instruments (the axe, saw, rod) in the hand of God to do his will (Isaiah 10:15). God definitely predicts the free actions of men ages before the men themselves exist (Isaiah 44:28; Isaiah 45:1-4). All prophecy implies foreknowledge; and all foreknowledge on the part of a God who has intelligently and of purpose created all things out of nothing, of course implies the foreordination of all the foreseen results of that creation. If even one so limited in knowledge and power as you or I should place in the hands of a dependant a horse that we certainly knew would run away on that road and in the hands of that man, beyond question we would predetermine that runaway and all of its foreseen results.

(2) The Scriptures go even farther, and declare that even the sinful acts of men are foreordained by God. This does not mean that God regards the wicked acts with complacency, or that he will condone them, or that we are in any degree excusable for acting them, much less that God is their author or cause, directly or indirectly. It means, simply, that these wicked actions were a clearly foreknown part of a system of things which God freely chose, and the future existence of which he freely and righteously determined for good and sufficient reasons, the evil never being ordained as an end in itself, but always as a means to an infinitely greater and better end. Thus in the history of Joseph (compare Genesis 37:28 with Genesis 45:7-8; Genesis 50:20), Joseph said to his treacherous brethren who sold him into slavery, "So now it was not you that sent me hither, but God;" " But as for you, ye thought evil against me; but God meant it unto good" (Psalms 17:13-14, and Isaiah 10:5; Isaiah 10:15). The greatest crime ever committed in the universe was the crucifixion of the Son of God. To accomplish this, Gentiles and Jews in vast numbers and of all classes freely conspired. Yet their wicked act was " determined beforehand to be done " by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God : " Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain " (Acts 2:23); " For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done " (Acts 4:27-28; Acts 13:29; 1 Peter 2:8; Jude 1:4; Revelation 17:17).

2d. As to the doctrine of election, and of the confessedly various "elections" which are asserted in Scripture, there have been very different opinions held among Christians. Those who lay emphasis upon what has been entitled the " theory of national election," as eminently the late Archbishop Sumner, maintain that the only election taught in Scripture concerning human salvation consists in the divine predestination of communities and nations to the knowledge of the true religion and to the external privileges of the gospel. This form of election is an unquestionable biblical fact, and has been pre-eminently illustrated in the people of Israel in the ancient world and in the great English-speaking nations of modern times.

Those who, like Mr. Stanley Faber and Archbishop Whately, emphasize what they call the " theory of ecclesiastical individualism,,, hold that the only personal election taught in the Bible respects the election of individual men to membership in the external Church and the means of grace. This also is an unquestionable scriptural fact, realized in the experience of all the members of the Christian

community.

Both these types of election, both of nations and of individuals, to the external means of grace are obviously sovereign and unconditioned. Both men and nations are born to these privileges irrespective of any previous merits or actions of their own. And as to these forms of God's sovereign election, there is no difference of opinion between Arminians and Calvinists or other Christians of whatever name. But students of the Scriptures see that they do moreover teach explicitly that God does elect some individuals to eternal blessedness and to all the means thereof. Here the precise point of difference between Arminians and Calvinists comes in. The old Arminian statement was that God graciously elected the class of believers to everlasting life, and that if any individual man was included in the election it was because he was included in the class of believers. The more modern Arminian statement is to the same effect; in other words, that God elected certain individuals to eternal life on the ground of their faith as foreseen by him. But the question necessarily arises, Where did these individuals come by their faith? If they got the faith of themselves, then their salvation is not entirely of grace and of God. If God gave them their faith, then it was in his purpose. And if it was embraced in his purpose, it could not have been the condition on which it was suspended. But the Scriptures and Christian experience unite in affirming that " faith is the gift of God " (Ephesians 2:8; Acts 5:31; 1 Corinthians 4:7). The designed effect of this eternal election is " that we should be holy, and without blame before him in love" (Ephesians 1:4; Ephesians 2:10; 2 Thessalonians 2:13; 1 Peter 1:2), and therefore that holy state could not have been the foreseen condition of his choice. The very gist of the election is that of the children who "neither had done good or evil," "that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth." God chose one and rejected the other. The very gist was that " the potter hath power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor " (Romans 9:11; Romans 9:21). The order in which the Holy Spirit puts the matter is very clear: "As many as were ordained to eternal life believed " (Acts 13:48). It was the personal foreordination to eternal life which determined the believing, and not the foreseen believing which conditioned the foreordination. The true comprehensive statement of the scriptural teaching as to election includes all those just stated. The purpose of God is sovereign, absolute and all-comprehensive, relating to all classes of events whatsoever. All nations and communities aud individuals have been predestined precisely to all the relations and means of grace they experience, and to all the results thereof. But besides this, the Scriptures explicitly teach an election (a) of individuals (b) to salvation and to all the means and conditions thereof,

(c) founded, not upon the foreseen faith of the persons elected, but upon the infinitely wise and sovereign purpose of God alone (Ephesians 1:5-11; 2 Timothy 1:9; John 15:16; John 15:19; Matthew 11:25-26; Romans 9:10-18).

III. The difficulty which all feel in attempting to receive this unquestionable truth of revelation, and assimilate it to the whole mass of our own thinking, respects (1) the freedom and responsibility of man, and

(2) the holiness of God. How can man be free if from eternity all his actions have been certainly determined ? And if God by his decree makes the future occurrence of each sin absolutely certain, how can he be holy ?

These combinations doubtless present puzzles of considerable difficulty to our minds in their present state of enlightenment. But these do not in any degree differ from a large class of problems which the imperfection and narrowness of our knowledge prevent us from solving. God's decree, it is obvious, is not an immediate efficient cause which interferes with natural causes or which brings anything into being. It is simply an immanent plan or purpose in the divine mind which determines the certain occurrence of the events to which it relates. The same precisely is true with respect to the divine foreknowledge. All Christians believe that God eternally foreknows whatsoever shall be in the future. If his knowledge is real knowledge, it is certain, and if it is certain as knowledge, the events to which it relates must be certainly future. If the difficulty of reconciling certainty with the freedom of man or with the holiness of God does not move us to abandon his foreknowledge, it cannot be a rational motive for our denying the truth of his universal predestination. A God without foreknowledge would be only a blind force. Every argument which establishes Theism on the evident teleology of the universe by equal cogency establishes the divine foreknowledge. Without the foreknowledge of God there would be no intelligent creation, no wise moral government, no ground for religious trust, no confidence for the future, no basis either for the prophecies or the promises of God. The foreknowledge admitted, there is no logical reason for excepting to his foreordination.

1st. As to the bearing of this doctrine upon the freedom of man's will. It must be remembered that uncertainty is never essential to liberty. The essence of liberty is that the free act shall be self-originated and self-directed. The self-determination of an undeveloped child is uncertain. It is swayed every moment by external influences, and in just that proportion the child's action is uncertain and lacks the highest quality of moral freedom. But the choices of the educated and thoroughly developed man in his ripe maturity are far more certain both to himself and to others. He is not open to external influence or liable to internal whim or change, and exactly in that proportion does he rise to the highest level of moral freedom. He thoroughly understands himself and his permanent needs and wishes. His character is formed, and freedom is the genuine and adequate expression of character. God's purposes and self-decisions are the most certain, and at the same time the most free, of any actions that are conceivable. A drifting boat at sea, swept hither and thither by the winds and waves, is an admirable type of action utterly devoid of freedom and of certainty. It has no self-control, and therefore its action is equally unfree and uncertain. But a great steamship, at the same time self-propelled and self-steered, is an admirable type both of freedom and of certainty. Its action is predetermined, foreseen, and may confidently be relied upon, because it is free; that is, in the intelligent will of its navigator, acting through its powerful machinery, it possesses in the highest degree self-control and intelligent self-direction. The eternal foreordination of God, which determines at once the certainty and the freedom of man's free actions, can in no way interfere with man's freedom. The action is not free if it is determined from without, but it is free if determined from within a rational will. Now, this is precisely what God's foreordination of man's free action effects. The decree at the same time determines that man shall be a free agent, shall possess a certain character, shall be surrounded by a certain environment, shall be specifically solicited by certain external influences, shall be internally moved by certain spontaneous affections, shall deliberately canvass certain reasons and shall freely make a certain choice. The man thus is, as fur as a finite creature may be, entirely self-moved and self-determined, and therefore he is free. The fact that his act is also certain is, as we have seen, and as Richard Watson, the great theologian of the Wesleyan Arminians, admits, no ground of

presumption that it is not also absolutely free.

2d. As to the consistency of God's foreordination of sin with his holiness, we have nothing to say, except to admit the mystery, and to affirm that there is no possible escape except in denying the fact either of the existence of God on the one hand, or of the existence of sin on the other. If the cause which produced the universe did not foresee the sin which the present system embraces, then that cause was a blind, unintelligent force, and not God. If he did foresee it, and notwithstanding proceeded to bring that system, involving these sins, into existence, then he made their occurrence certain; he foreordained them. God did with his eyes open choose, out of a myriad of other possible systems, this actual system involving sin. He nevertheless is holy. He hates, forbids, punishes, restrains and overrules the sin for good. In the light of the cross of Christ, on which God lays upon his Son the penalty of human sin, in the light of the great white throne and of the Lamb which irradiates the eternal city, the mystery of the divine permission of sin loses its overwhelming force. We have no complete solution of the problem, and it is not to be expected in our present stage of education. But we do see the light underneath the curtain. We do possess pledges for the immaculate holiness of God, and for the future moral perfection of his realm, and for the moral vindication of his reign, which suffice for the perfect assurance of our faith.

IV. Everything depends, in all departments of human thought, upon the point of view. Every one knows that, when traversing the scenes of a great battle, what appears to be inextricable confusion to us while we are passing along the outskirts and through the lower grounds, falls into complete order and appears as clear as light when we overlook the whole field from the strategic centre from which the eye and mind of the field marshal beheld and controlled the contest. We all know that the heavens continued through all past ages to be an insoluble riddle to all looking upon them from the exterior and shifting standpoint of the earth. The movements of the sun and moon and of the wandering planets could be reduced to no intelligible plan. But the moment that in imagination the great Copernicus transferred the point of view from the earth to the central sun, all the hosts of heaven fell into rank, and have ever since been seen to march onward in a symmetrical order absolutely divine. In the morning, if we look eastward over a vast landscape with the sun before us, Ave see all things obscurely on their shadowed side. But if we look from the same point eastward in the evening, with the sun behind us, we see all the objects contained in the vast panorama glorified on the sunlit side. In like manner must it be with all men, when looking over the vast reaches of Jehovah's plans or works from below. No matter how intellectual they may be personally, no matter how vast their knowledge otherwise, it is just a matter of course that, from their human, changing outlook, as they are themselves swept along in the current of events, the relations of all objects should be confused. And especially must the relation of the several parts to God be misconceived, seen as they are on their shadowed side.

But, on the contrary, if we take our mental stand at the centre, and from God's point of view look down upon the events of time from their common centre, with their eternal side illumined, as far as our vision goes we shall see them fall into perfect order, and especially will we discern their symmetrical relation as a whole to the Source from which they issue, and the presiding authority by which they are marshaled on their way.

It is self-evident that if we look out at any time and from any point upon our environment, we must see things in the accidental relations in which they happen to group themselves along our line of

vision as we sweep past on our course. "We must also, by the same necessity, see things in partial groups detached from their surroundings. If we conceive of any one event being caused by any other single event, we are led to confusion, because all things that exist constitute one articulated system, and every event is determined not by one single antecedent cause, but by the whole system of things, the entire equilibrium of the universe, that precedes it. So if we conceive of God as absolutely foreordaining individual events disconnected from the entire system of causes, conditions and consequents of which they form a part, Ave shall necessarily be embarrassed by contradictions. God could not certainly foreordain one event without foreordaining every event—without tearing the system to pieces and bringing utter confusion into natural law and human thought. For instance, a chronometer is a whole consisting of many parts rigidly articulated and exquisitely adjusted to each other. It would, evidently, be impossible for the most skillful mechanic to run his fingers into the plexus of the wheels and springs, with the intent of controlling the action of one part irrespective of the rest, without working confusion and ruin. Nevertheless, the chronometer as a whole, with all its contents freely working according to their law, undisturbed, may be lifted and carried round the world without changing the relation or interdependence of part on part. In like manner, if we will only make the effort to look upon the universe from God's point of view as one all-comprehensive, complete system in itself, much of the apparent difficulty attending the principle of eternal predestination will disappear.

We can possibly conceive of the intelligence of God only so far forth as its laws are analogous to those of the intellect of man. We can only think of his mind as eternally teeming with all possible systems, embracing all possible creatures, grouped in all possible relations and subject to all possible laws. By the " possible " we mean every existence that can be under the limits of God's infinitely wise and righteous nature. Out of all possible systems as wholes God chose the existing system of the universe, including all existence, spiritual and material, that has been, is or will be, constituted as it is, with all its parts mutually interdependent as they are, as one whole. Viewed in this way, there is no conflict. The cause produces its effects, the event depends on its conditions; necessary agents act according to their nature, and free agents exercise spontaneously their perfect freedom: all the parts of the system act according to their several kinds $ nevertheless, the system as a whole, including all its parts, has been from eternity made certain by the sovereign choice of God. The point of view from which all difficulty disappears is infinitely higher and commands infinitely wider reaches of thought than the point of view from which foreordination and free-will are seen to be inconsistent. The new theology, asserting the narrowness of the old, is discarding the foreordination of Jehovah as a worn-out figment of the schools discredited by the advanced culture of to-day. This is not the first time that the owls, mistaking the shadow of a passing eclipse for their native night, have prematurely hooted at the eagles, convinced that what is invisible to them cannot possibly exist.

V. It is often objected to the biblical doctrine of predestination that, however much it may be apparently supported by the language of Scripture, it is utterly antagonized by all established truth in every other department of human thought—by all the united testimonies of philosophy and science. This preposterous claim is loudly voiced, even by some of the professed advocates of progress in theology. But the facts are all absolutely to the contrary. So much is this the case, so universally do all the real governing currents of modern thought outside of Christian theology run in the direction of universal determinism, rather than in that of the admission of the indeterminate, the

contingent, the spontaneous and free, that many of us who arc the staunchest Calvinists feel that the need of the hour is not to emphasize a foreordination, which no clear, comprehensive thinker doubts, but to unite with our Arminian brethren in putting all emphasis and concentrating all attention on the vital fact of human freedom. That our consciousness of personal freedom is reliable, that Ave in a true sense stand outside of the current of necessary causation and do truly originate and give direction to our own actions, is a principle fundamental to all morals and all religion. Its permanent vindication is the one only and effectual solvent of all Pantheism and all Materialism. So strong does the current set on all sides throughout the sphere of human speculation, in favor of the conviction of universal preordination, that we can afford to leave its vindication to others, while we support with our suffrages the neglected though essential counter-truth of the real freedom of the human soul.

All the philosophy and science of the century is deterministic. The great argument of Jonathan Edwards against the liberty of contingency and in favor of the liberty of certainty has been taken up and intensified by John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer to support the doctrine of necessity. The universally received scientific principle of continuity involves this principle of foreordination. The now almost universally prevalent scientific doctrine of evolution in all its infinite variety of forms, and in every form alike, involves this principle of foreordination. The funniest reading accessible even in this humorous age is that in which a progressive theologian, committing himself everywhere to the evolution method, yet declares that the doctrine of divine foreordination is false because unscientific. All philosophies which are either materialistic in tendency or pantheistic or purely theistic necessarily involve the principle of foreordination.

Every conceivable philosophy must ultimately found the universe upon mechanism, chance or upon personal intelligence and will. If mechanism be the ultimate self-existent principle out of which the universe is developed and operated, then fatalism is true. If chance be the ultimate principle^ then accident, contingency, uncertainty must be in the method, and chaos the ultimate goal. If a personal, intelligent will be the ultimate principle, then Providence is the executive in time of an eternal purpose. All philosophies may be classified under these heads. All the possibilities of speculation must lie within these limits. Instead of our doctrine of fore-ordination being the same with the heathen doctrine of fate, it is its absolute opposite and only alternative. We are shut up to a choice between the two—either a fatalism which results from mechanical coaction, or a fatalism which results from a mindless and purposeless chance, or an all-controlling providence of a heavenly Father who in the exercise of his own personal freedom has made room for ours. All thinkers who understand themselves know that they run along one or other of these lines. The wiseacres who plead the authority of philosophy and science as inconsistent with the scriptural doctrine of predestination may be safely left to themselves. They will not be found to be dangerous enemies even behind our backs.

VI. Here, as everywhere else, there is essential truth on both sides of every controversy, and the real truth is the whole truth, its entire catholic body. Arminianism in the abstract as an historical scheme is a heresy, holding half the truth. Calvinism is an historical scheme which in its best representatives comprehends the whole truth with considerable completeness. But the case is essentially different when we come to consider the great coexisting bodies of Christian people calling themselves respectively Calvinists and Arminians. Each of these parties hold all essential truth, and therefore they hold actually very much the same truth. The Arminians think and speak

very much like Calvinists when they come to talk with God in either the confession of sin or the supplication for grace. They both alike in that attitude recognize the sovereignty of God and the guilt and helplessness of men. Indeed, how could it be otherwise ? What room is there for anything other than essential Calvinism on one's knees? On the other hand, the Calvinist thinks and speaks like the better class of Arminians when he addresses the consciences of men, and pleads with them as free responsible agents to repent and believe in Christ. The difference between the best of either class is one of emphasis rather than of essential principle. Each is the complement of the other. Each is necessary to restrain, correct and supply the onesided strain of the other. They together give origin to the blended strain from which issues the perfect music which utters the perfect truth.

VII. It is now-a-days frequently predicted by men in high places that the distinctive doctrines of Calvinism are doomed. The future is uncertain. The role of prophet is unprofitable and unbecoming. But the history of the past stands fast. The doctrine of predestination, with its associated system of truths, has had a wonderful history. All world-movers have believed it surely and have taught it clearly—Paul, St. Augustine, all the Reformers without exception. During the eleven hundred years which elapsed from the time of Augustine to that of Luther all the best of the Schoolmen, all the great missionary movements, the revivals of true religion, the extension of popular education, and all great healthy political reforms had their common inspiration in Augustinian theology.

All the great national movements in France, Germany, Switzerland, Italy and Britain in the era of the Reformation, and all the great national leaders, as Luther, Zwingle, Calvin, Craumcr and Knox, were distinctively Augustinian and were rooted in predestination. The most moral people of all history, the Puritans, Pietists, Huguenots, Reformed Dutch of Holland and German of the Palatinate, and the Scotch and the Scotch-Irish of Ulster and the United States, were all Calvinists. Calvin, William of Orange, Cromwell and the Presbyterian and Congregational founders of the government of the United States, and all the great creators of modern civil liberty, were Calvinists. All modern provision for universal education sprang from the Scotch parochial school and the New England college. The patriots, Free-State makers, martyrs, missionaries of all the modern era have been, in nine hundred and ninety-nine parts out of the thousand, distinctively Calvinist. This history is glorious and secure past all contradiction. It is natural also—a natural outgrowth of consequences out of principles. Predestination exalts God and abases man before God. It makes all men low before God, but high and strong before kings. It founds on a basis of eternal rock one absolute Sovereign to whose will there is no limit, but it levels all other sovereigns in the dust. It renders Christ great, and the believing sinner infinitely secure in him. It establishes the highest conceivable standard of righteousness, and secures the operation of the most effective motives to obedience. It extinguishes fear, it makes victory certain, it inspires with enthusiasm, it makes both the heart and the arm strong. The Ironsides of Cromwell made the decree of predestination their base; hence they never lost a battle, and always began the swelling chorus of victory from the first moment that the ranks were formed. The man to whom in all the universe there is no God is an atheist. The man to whom God is distant, and to whom the influence of God is vague and uncertain, is an Arminian. But he who altogether lives and moves and has all his being in the immanent Jehovah is a Calvinist. There is, thank God! room for Arminians in the Church on earth while the faces of so many look earthward and we are sadly oppressed by the current of the things

which are seen and temporal. But who will doubt the truth of Calvinism when we stand with open eye and ear in the world of spirits, before the unveiled front of the great white throne, and God is all and in all

03.08. LECTURE 08 - THE ORIGINAL STATE OF MAN.

LECTURE VIII THE ORIGINAL STATE OF MAN.

Theology, as a science, has to do with the great questions which concern God and man and their relations. Consequently, it has been the habit of theologians to group these together under different classes, in this order. First, we have the topics which come under the head of Theology proper, which concern the being of God, the thinking or willing of God, and the acting of God. The second great province is that of Anthropology, which concerns man, his origin, his nature, his original condition, his apostasy, and the consequences thereof to the race. The third great division is that of Soteriology, which concerns God's plan of redemption, the divine Saviour whom he has provided, and his gracious work as our Prophet, Priest and King. The fourth and last group is Eschatology, that which relates to the last things which remain still before the Church, such as the second coming of Christ, the millennium, the general judgment, the resurrection of the dead, the intermediate state and the rewards of happiness and of punishment which are to come after.

What we have had to say in the preceding seven lectures fell under the first great department of theology— Theology proper; to wit, God, his attributes, his relation to the universe, his providence, the method of it, and the plan of it and his constitution as a divine Person.

Now we begin the department of Anthropology, and of course the first question which emerges must be necessarily as to the original state of man. Those questions which concern man's origin and fall come under various heads, which might, if we had time, be discussed for many days, such as the origin of man, so called; second, the nature of man, what elements constitute man, what constitutes the soul and body, or spirit, soul and body, etc. Then as to the origin of the human soul itself: is it created by God ? is it generated by the parent from the parent? or is it from God, created by God, in each individual case? And then the great question as to the unity of the human race, and whether all these great diversities, physical, intellectual and moral, have been generated from the same parents ?—first from the original pair, Adam and Eve, and then from Noah and his family ? And lastly, What was the original state of man ? what was his condition—the man who had no yesterday, who had no father and mother, who came to consciousness as an adult individual, without previous infancy and without education? The answer the Bible gives as to the origin of man is very explicit and very plain, and yet it does not satisfy all questions. And I want to say—and say it as a man who has devoted his life to systematic theology—if any class of men have ever erred in the direction which I am going to speak about today, systematic theologians have erred when they mapped it out so sharply. It is one thing to stand faithfully by what God says; it is another thing to draw inferences from what God says. Our principles as Protestants make us deal with the Bible alone, and not with systems of divinity and not with inferences from what the Bible says.

(1) Now, the Bible asserts, in the first place, that God made the body of man out of the dust of the earth. The questions which arise are, What do we mean by " made "? and what do we mean by " dust of the earth" ? Obviously, we do not mean absolute creation. The only instance of this

absolute creation that we find recorded in Scripture is in the first verse, " In the beginning" in the absolute beginning, which marks the emergence of time out of eternity, which marks the first step in the order of creation under the conditions of time and space —" In the beginning God created," gave origin, being, to all the elements out of which the stellar universe is formed. First it is the great Eternal; afterward you have "chaos."

There is a wonderful accord between the general findings of modern science and the true meaning of revelation. You have first the creation of the elements out of nothing. You have then the abyss without form and void, the chaos; and then you have the Spirit of God, the informing spirit of life and thought and power, operating over the face of the abyss; and then you have, not the sudden, but the gradual movement of the elements ; and from them the building up, through successive ages, by the power of God, of this wondrous Cosmos, this harmonious universe. The immediate creation is the making all things out of nothing by the word of his power; but the mediate creation is the making of new things out of old things; that is, the building up of new things out of old elements—new entities, new species, the origination of new forms, new constitutions out of the elements of which they are composed. The Bible says God made man out of the dust of the earth. He first makes dust, and then he makes man out of it. So God is the entire maker of man. It would be very childish to put a literal meaning to this word "dust," which is translated from the Hebrew, another language. It does not mean simply "dust;" you could not make man out of common clay, because it does not contain all the elements which constitute man. When you analyze the body of man you find it consists of lime, phosphorus, iron, carbon, nitrogen, hydrogen and a great many other elements. These do not all exist in clay. What is meant is, that God made man out of pre-existing elements, which God had himself first created. These are everywhere: they are in the atmosphere; they are in the water; they are in the soil; and they were ever present from the time of the first creation, existing, possessing qualities with which God originally endowed them; and it is out of these pre-existing elements of the material universe that God formed, by his own power and will, the body of man.

(2) The second point which is taught in Scripture clearly is that God breathed into man the breath of life, so that he became a living soul. Now the question is, of course, What is here meant by breathing, God’s breathing, into man ? There is a conception that God, as it is expressed, " breathed " into man a part of his own Spirit, and that the human soul, proceeding from God immediately, is a part or particle of God and of the divine Spirit. Now, I confess that seems to me metaphysically absurd, and also profane in its tendency. I do not like that idea. In the first place, God is a spirit and cannot be divided. It is of the very essence of matter that it has extension; that it has length and breadth and thickness; that it is composed of the union of elements, and that these elements can be united together or separated one from another, or that matter can be divided into its parts. It is not rational to believe that a spirit can be divided into parts; therefore, it is not rational to believe that God breathed a part of his own Spirit into man. And besides this, reason teaches that the attributes are the active powers of the substance of spirit and cannot be separated from it.

Now, if God should give to me a part of his Spirit, I should have infinite attributes, the attributes of the Spirit of God. These are eternity, omniscience, omnipotence and absolutely perfect and undeviating righteousness; therefore, if the spirit of man were a part of the Spirit of God, the spirit of man would be eternal, unchangeable, omniscient, omnipotent, etc., which we know absolutely to be untrue, and the very thought of which we reject. Or, God might have created the spirit of man

out of nothing: that is what we believe; but the difference between soul and body is just of course the essential difference between matter and spirit. Matter consists of its parts, its potency, its capability of position, its capability of division. The body can be built up part by part; the body can be dissolved part by part; but the soul of mau is an absolute unit of consciousness. When my body acts, it acts by reason of the organs which are external to one another; my hand is in one place and my foot in another, my brain in one place and my stomach in another. But the whole soul of man, with its functions, is a single organ; the one soul thinks, feels, wills and acts, and therefore the soul in its particular essence is indivisible; therefore it cannot be made. I cannot conceive how the soul can be generated. The body is generated, but the soul is created. This is the doctrine of the Church.

God, at the moment of conception, creates a new soul out of nothing by the word of his power; communicates to the germ new life, and this soul, existing in the germ, builds up the body; so the body comes to be the expression of the soul. That is the ground of physiology: that the body develops because of the soul, and that the soul ab initio is the building principle by which it is built up. Just as your tailor configures your coat to your body, so by the principles of growth your soul configures your body, so that your soul is expressed in your body as the souls instrument. That is what is understood by God " breathing the breath of life "—that is, creating the soul within us. You may ask why use the word " breath " ? That can easily be answered. God must speak to man, not philosophically, but according to the laws of humanity and the limits of human thought Now, it is a remarkable fact that the word for " spirit" in all languages, so far as I know, was originally based upon the figure of breath. The Latin spiritus, the Greek pneuma, the Hebrew ruah and our word " spirit," all mean breath, and the reason for this is that men get their ideas from their conditions. Men originally were like children, and when they saw a man die the first thing they noticed was that he did not breathe. When they began to look around and to think, they found the only thing which indicated life or the absence of it was just the presence or absence of this fleeting breath. Thus men came very naturally, as the breath was invisible, to associate the thinking, feeling and willing principle with the breath. To think and to breathe was to have a soul; and to put the soul into man was therefore very naturally described as breathing into him the breath of life. Man is a living, breathing thing. .But the points clearly taught are that God made the body by his power out of pre-existing material, and that he created the soul by his power and put it into the body.

(3) There is a third point we have to consider at this time: The Bible teaches that, seeing Adam needed a companion, it was necessary that God, having made him male, should complete his being by making for him a wife, and that this should not be a new creation, because from the nature of man we constitute a race: there is a solidarity in our race. When Jesus Christ became incarnate, it would not answer to make him a body like man, for then he would not have been a human being. The only way Almighty God can make a human being is by generation. In order that there should not be two absolutely independent creations united together, God put a deep sleep upon Adam, and, taking from him a rib, made out of it a woman. That is what the Bible says distinctly and clearly, and it cannot be got rid of. Therefore, I maintain that these three points arc true: that the body of man was made out of pre-existing materials; that the soul of man was created by the mighty power of God; and that Eve was made from Adam by the miraculous power of God. And these are given here, not simply as so many facts, but they are inwrought into the whole subsequent scheme of redemption, and you cannot take them out. When I read the Bible I

confess I am never absolutely convinced by one text. It is a habit of the mind perhaps, because the thought will arise. How do you know that text is sure? How do you know there is no error in the transcript ? How do you know there is not some error in the interpretation ? I do not believe God ever meant us to believe in a great doctrine upon a single text But when the truth is interwoven and associated, as it is here, in the historical book as a condition of the history; when it is taken up and interwoven in the whole scheme of redemption, and afterward is the very basis of God's treatment of man under all conditions, under the covenant of works and man's apostasy, and the covenant of grace and its execution and application,—why, I say, you cannot touch this truth without destroying the whole scheme of redemption; and it is just because it has been interwoven into the whole scheme.

You have heard a great deal in recent times about the application or the so-called application of the scientific doctrine of Evolution to the question of the origin of man. This word " evolution," as used in the language of philosophers and scientists, does not mean necessarily to indicate always an opinion, but a certain tendency of thought, a way of looking at certain phenomena. But the word evolution has come to stay among us, no matter what we intend to do with it It does represent a certain mode of thinking, which unquestionably you yourselves hold, and which men have always held more or less, and which is true. Now, the fundamental idea in the general experience of men in the present and past is just this: that the things which are have been produced by the things which were, and the things that are, are producing things that will be, and that this proceeds in lines of absolutely unbroken continuity and by stages almost imperceptible. This is so, is it not ? Remember, I am not advocating evolution, but I show to you what I believe: I want to put you in possession of the facts. The truth is just this: look around you; see the growing of the chicken out of the egg, the growing of the tree out of the acorn, the progress of the foetus from the germ, the babe from the foetus, the child from the babe, and the man from the child; the progress of the nation from the tribe, the progress of the tribe from the family, and the gradual movement everywhere, just as I have shown you in the Bible, through successive stages. Why the first book in the Bible is called Genesis. The Greek translation that gives us that title calls the work of creation " the genesis of the heavens and of the earth "—i. e. the gradual procedure along the lines of unbroken continuity and by changes of almost imperceptible degree, and this whole cosmos coming to be what it is from the original elements which God created by the word of his power. And when you go out into the universe you see these things. You look up and you see, for instance, the sun growing old, and certainly growing colder. And you see the light coming from Jupiter; Jupiter is nothing more than an old sun. And the earth, growing older and colder, is nothing but an old Jupiter; and the moon, grown colder through successive ages, is nothing but an old earth. The moon an old earth, the earth an old Jupiter, and Jupiter an old sun, and these by imperceptible degrees. The earth has been growing colder through time which can be historically traced. The fauna and flora of every zone have been gradually changing, and continually adjusting themselves to constantly changing physical conditions, and that in absolutely unbroken continuity and by transitions almost imperceptible. The same thing has been going on in the human race. God created it; God made man, one man, and one woman out of the man, one simple family, like any other family; with this qualification, that they were made by an unbroken progress and by slight imperceptible changes, under the influence of climate and social and moral changes, into a human race which through ages has been differentiated into all the varieties of all the families, tribes and nations that exist upon the face of the earth. The word " evolution " applies to this phenomenon.

I am going to ask you this afternoon to make the distinction between evolution as a working hypothesis of science and evolution as a philosophy.

What is science ? Science is something which is very sure, but very narrow. Science has to deal simply with facts, phenomena—things to be seen and heard, etc.—and with their qualities, their likeness, or unlikeness, whether they have a common existence, coexist or have a succession. That is the whole of it. The reason science speaks with such authority is this: science is verifiable, and what is verified you must believe: you cannot get around facts. Science is verifiable, and therefore has authority; but it is very narrow. Now, there are a great many things you may call science which have not any science in them. Remember, therefore, that science is to be confined to phenomena, their likeness and unlikeness, their coexistence or succession; and that science has nothing whatever to do with causes, has nothing whatever to do with ends or objects.

Science is authoritative within its sphere, because it can determine qualitatively what a thing is and quantitatively how much a thing is, and such results can be expressed in numbers. In this way science has gained its wide dissemination and its great authority. I feel I have a right to say what I shall say now, because I have been associated with a good many men of science who were also devout Christians. This doctrine of evolution, when it is confined to science as a working hypothesis, you may let alone, Christian friends, all of you. You need not be afraid of it. It cannot affect any of the questions of religion; it cannot affect any questions of revelation; it cannot lead you wrong; it must in the end go right. It has a narrow track on grooves, but truth is eternal and must prevail; a lie cannot prevail. On the other hand, what you have been accustomed to call evolution is not a science. Now, when Tyndall and Huxley go to a great scientific meeting they talk science, they confine themselves to science. When they write books for the public and to circulate about, they give themselves to speculation, and it is this doctrine of evolution run wild which is the evolution of the day, the general talk of the people. You hear it talked about in the newspapers and find it discussed in all circles. It is only a philosophy. Philosophy is different from science. Science is applied to facts, philosophy has to do with causes. Now, I say, do not fear evolution in the department of science, but do fear and oppose evolution with all your might when it is given to you as a philosophy. As a philosophy it explains everything with one solvent; with one theory it would explain universal being.

These men begin, for instance, with a postulate, the simpie inorganic atom. Then by this postulate, which they know nothing about, and which science knows nothing about, they postulate that the living is evolved from the non-living. From that they infer the doctrine of spontaneous generation; an inference, an hypothesis. Then this living thing is found to possess the property of heredity, the power of transmission, the power of variation, and so by constant transmission and constant variation it is held that from the original germ proceeded other germs, continually varying under the influence of habit; and thus they hold of all living things that they proceed from this original atom, self-generated out of non-living matter.

Now, this is not science, no matter what it teaches. It is nothing but speculation, and as a speculation it ought to be separated from science. Science confines itself to facts. This speculation in regard to evolution has no more authority than any other wild speculation that exists among men; it has no scientific facts to begin with. Science will tell you that there are absolutely no facts with regard to spontaneous generation. It will tell you, at the same time, that there is no missing

link between the highest known order of creation and the lowest. You cannot, therefore, take this speculative evolution as a fact; the testimony of science thus far, with regard to the facts, is against it. It is a vain, vapid, pretentious philosophy of evolution, which has no scientific basis and is absolutely devoid of any scientific authority. You must oppose this, first, in the interest of the convictions of your own reason and of the fundamental principles of human thought and intuitions; secondly, in the interest of natural religion; thirdly, in the interest of revealed religion. It is to me intuitively certain that a thing cannot be evolved out of that which does not contain it.

It is certain the chicken must be potentially in the egg before it can be hatched out of it, that the oak must be potentially in the acorn before it can be germinated out of it. You must have the thing that is to live in the seed or the germ. It would be a contradiction to the first principles of reason, an impossibility, to conceive of the living coming from the non-living (if it does come, God must be living in it), or of the conscious coming from the unconscious (if it does, God must be conscious in it), or of reason coining from the irrational (if it does, God must be the reason in it), or of the moral coming from that which is destitute of morality (if it does so come, it must have a moral sense in it). If it were found to be true that successive species have been produced by generation from existing species—if it could be proved, as it cannot be—it would follow that it was not the natural process, but there must have been a series of definite divine interventions all along the line. First, you would have life, then consciousness, then reason, then will, and last the conscience; and thus you will determine that God has at last "made man in his own image."

I am as sure as I am of my existence that there is nothing in the discoveries of science which can give Christians any ground for fear as to the utter integrity and truth of the declarations of God in the first chapter of Genesis. Now, what do the learned men of science say about this?

(1.) First, as to the antiquity of man. Undoubtedly, human remains have been discovered under conditions in which it is impossible to believe that God created man only six thousand years ago. I have no doubt of that. I have no doubt you will have to extend the time of creation back farther than six thousand years. But remember that God never said he created Adam six thousand years ago. Our chronology exists in two forms, that of Usher and that of Hales, and it differs by a thousand years. Two scholars taking up this chronology have made the difference simply by following out the genealogical tables.

I am sure that you will think with me that my colleague, Dr. Green of Princeton, as an interpreter of the Old Testament is conservative and as much to be relied upon in the interest of historic truth as any man living. I can remember when his book on the Pentateuch appeared. In a note with regard to two passages as to the time the Bible gives in certain utterances he said, " The time between the creation of Adam and ourselves might have been, for all we know from the Bible to the contrary, much longer than it seems." I was in Princeton, in my father’s study: I was living then in Allegheny. I can well remember my father walking up and down, and saying, " What a relief it is to me that he should have said that!" Professor Guyot lived in Princeton then—a man of great genius, as highly educated a man of science as I ever saw. He was for many years professor of history in the University of Lausanne, before he gave himself up to material science. He was one of the most devout Christians who ever kindled the flame of holy love from the light of nature and revelation ; he was absolutely a believer in the Bible as it stood in every way.

He went to Europe about twelve years ago, and when he came back, after visiting the great museums, he said, " I was surprised at the amount of evidence I saw there of the antiquity of man; still, I think that thirteen thousand years instead of six thousand would cover it." Now, what difference does it make? Do you not know if you take history at all, with its chronology merely, that it is the most indifferent and utterly insignificant of all revelations? The only questions which can be of importance are, Did a thing occur first or last, before or after? Then of course it affects the question of cause and effect, and it becomes a question of great importance. Chronology in history is what perspective is in a great painting. When you stand before a great historical picture, a great painting—a battle-piece, for instance—you have the forefront of the picture presented to you in proportion, and you measure everything by the stature of men as they stand there, and so you form your judgment, as everything is in proportion; but when you cast your eye into the background—the great background with life behind it—it makes little difference to you whether it is one mile or two miles, ten or twenty miles. Now, the Bible was written not for the sake of satisfying curiosity, not for the sake of addressing the intellects of men, but it was written for the purpose of giving us a history of redemption. The first thing we see in the history of redemption begins with Abraham, and if you will look back of that time and see what the Bible says, it is merely the putting of chronological events into position. But begin with the birth of Abraham: after that we have biography, we have appointed times, we have history—a history that goes back only to the birth of Abraham. All before that is the simple introduction crowded into some ten or twelve chapters, designed to teach us these tremendous facts: first, creation ; second, the fall; thirdly, the general dealing of God with men in preparation for redemption to come; but these great facts are dropped in by the great artist of revelation as an introduction merely to the history beginning with Abraham. Everything back of this is piled up like the background in front of which the history stands. I say neither you nor I have any reason to know how long it is since Adam was created. There is no reason to believe it was more than fifteen or sixteen thousand years; but whether more or less, revelation has not informed us.

(2.) The second question is, What has science found to be the original condition of man?

It is found by the testimony of men of science that wherever man is found he is a perfect man. The most ancient and primitive of skulls and of skeletons indicate intelligence equal to any of the present barbarous races now existing upon the face of the earth. The whole testimony of history is therefore not that we were developed out of animals, but that when we began to exist it was in the fullness of our organization, in the fullness of our powers. On the other hand, it is true that these skeletons indicate that men lived, as far as they have been discovered, in a savage condition. Now, the reason Guyot gave was to me perfectly satisfactory: he wished me to think that God created Adam in his full capacity as a man, but not with habits matured and formed. Adam was created with faculties and powers very much in the state of a child, capable of development in the right direction, but without education.

Adam was on trial of faith, and as soon as he fell his family are introduced in the narrative. Cain sinned and his family are abandoned; but the children of Seth were elected to salvation, and God introduced the covenant system into the family. Now, said Guyot, when you go out into the world and find in one of the old caves the fossil remains of primitive men, you will find, of course, barbarians; not because the children of Adam were created barbarians, but the children of Cain necessarily became barbarians because they had sinned and were abandoned of God; but the

children of Seth,—you have their history in the Bible. The Bible is true, and it is given to be a simple history of the race. Therefore, as far as it alludes to primitive races it alludes to the history of those races who were subjects of redemption, who were the covenant people of God.

Now, what does the Bible teach as to the primitive condition?

(1) First, the Bible teaches that Adam was brought into existence, not gradually, but suddenly and in a state of maturity. It is a very curious thing for you to consider: I never can understand it thoroughly, and it is because we have had no experience in it. You and I wake up men and women every morning—mature men and women. We wake up with a history—a history in which we can go back to years and years upon years with the assistance of the story of the generations which has come down to us. Then we came into existence as germs, we grew on our mother's breast until we became conscious, and then from early infancy we have been building up habits continuously. When Adam first waked he had no conscious destiny, for he had no history, he had no inheritance. You and I come into existence every morning, not only as men and women, but as Caucasians, and not only as Caucasians, but as Americans; not only as Americans, but as Philadelphians; and not only as Philadelphians, but as Smith or Jones,—and we have all the characteristics inherited from Adam. But when Adam waked he had no history, he had nothing behind him; he was just Adam, and he had no yesterday. A case occurred which is nearly analogous to this. There was a young lady in Western Pennsylvania. I knew her nephew. The history of the case has been written by Dr. Plumer, and was published in 1855 or 1856 in Harper's Monthly Magazine with great fullness and certainty, and I know it to be true. This lady when she got to be twenty years of age, while away from home, waked up one morning with her mind absolutely disconnected with the past; she absolutely remembered nothing —did not know her father or mother. Undoubtedly there were retained by her in her natural consciousness certain habits which she had formed. She did not wake up a babe, she waked up a woman; but she knew absolutely nothing; she had to learn the language again ; she had to learn the names of things; she had to learn words; she had to begin again at the beginning of knowledge. Now, when she woke up on that day she was like Adam in this : that she had no yesterday; she knew nothing; everything was fresh to her, just as it was to him.

Yet, do you not see, he did not wake up to the consciousness of a babe; he waked up as a man, he came to consciousness as a man, and as a man of maturity. It seems to me unquestionable that God must have communicated something to him, communicated some knowledge for him to work on. I cannot conceive of anything else. It would be like a grist-mill without grist. You could not run a grist-mill without grist in it. I cannot conceive of Adam's mind running without something in it. Adam waked up, and he began to speak to God. He had ideas about some things, just as I suppose this lady had. If Adam knew anything, God must have taught him; he could not have invented things himself; he could not have said, "This is so." If I understand it right, what knowledge he had God gave him. Then he gave to man a perfect body; he had a heart and a mind; he could talk and he could breathe. I do not know that he had higher qualities of a human body; I do not care. I do know that God gave Adam a good trial, and if he had not sinned he would not have died; and that is all the Bible says, and that is all that you and I have a right to make out of it.

(2) The second fact is, the Bible says God made Adam in his own image. Now the word " image " here means two things, which you can easily see. There is a good deal taught in that saying, " Let us make man in our own image." There is a constitutional image of God, and there is a moral or accidental image. Now, when God made man in his own image, he made the spirit rational and moral, and he made it capable of free will; in doing so God made man in his own image. That image of God was not lost. Why, the sinner is in the image of God. The devil is in the image of God, because he is an intelligent spirit. Sometimes there are certain sinners who are in this respect more in the image of God than certain saints; that is, there is more of them—more will, more strength, and in that respect they are more like God. This constitutional image of God never was lost and never will be lost. But besides this, God created Adam in the moral image of God; that is, " in knowledge, righteousness and true holiness that the new-created man was in the image of God. And when we take on the new man in Christ Jesus we take on his image, as in the creation; that is, by regeneration. It was the moral image of God which was implanted in the will which made Adam holy and good. The last point is his "dominion over all creatures." Now, this dominion over God's creatures is founded on two grounds: First, because of the constitutionality of it; even bad men can govern on the earth. But it is founded on the higher spiritual likeness to God, of which we have spoken, real although differentiated from the Creator, and which will never be completely developed until man adds to his constitutional likeness the original spiritual moral image of God which he has lost; not until man becomes not only rational, but holy, can he regain this image.

I now wish to occupy your attention for a very short time in talking about free-will. It is a question of great interest. I do not assert, nor is it necessary that I should, what are the essential elements of free agency. Men may differ about that; but we know we have a conscience, and that a person is not a mere machine; for that a machine cannot have an obligation, cannot be subject to command, is certainly proved; but that a person is subject to command, is subject to obligations of conscience, is a matter of universal consciousness. This is very true, more so than any fact of science. The most certain things in the world are not the things you can prove. You say, "I have proved this, and therefore I believe it to be true." The fact that you have got to prove things shows that there Is doubt, for it is only doubtful things you have to prove. The things which you cannot prove are the eternal verities.

How do you prove things ? You prove things by deducing the unknown from the known, the uncertain from the certain, by referring particulars to general laws. That is, you prove through a medium, but how do you prove the medium? Now, logic is a great thing. How does logic work? Of course, step by step. You know that in logic you cannot separate the links; if you get hold of one end of the chain, you keep following it up. But what is the force of the chain ? You have got a chain of logic hanging down, and you climb up that chain link by link ; but what supports the chain at the other end ? Logic is like a ladder; by means of it you go up step by step. But how are you going to prove that the bottom of it is all right ? The ladder rests on the ground, but what supports the ground ? You prove this by that; but what proves that f You must have a starting-point, an ultimate fact, and these ultimate principles are the most sure, because if the ground is not steady the ladder is not steady; the ground must be more steady than the ladder. The things which you start from, which are the means of bringing us results, are more sure than other things which are proved by them. You and I know that we are free. You and I know that we are responsible. You

and I have that assurance of knowledge, which is before all science. This matter of free-will underlies everything. If you bring it to question, it is infinitely more than Calvinism. I believe in Calvinism, and I say free-will stands before Calvinism. Everything is gone if free-will is gone; the moral system is gone if free-will is gone; you cannot escape, except by Materialism on the one hand or Pantheism on the other. Hold hard, therefore, to the doctrine of free-will. What is it ? I say to my class, but I do not know whether it will do to say it here, " I have my will, but my will is not free; it is myself that is free." Now it makes a difference whether you have freedom of will or the freedom of man in willing. I am conscious that my will is free. But am I free when I will ? That is what I mean to indicate. Consciousness tells me that I am free, therefore I am responsible. Then I have this freedom ; it is not an abstract quality, it is not an abstract faculty—it has a whole meaning. It is the J that is free; the reason is free, as free as the consciousness. It is the I that is free and has got a will; it is the I that is free and has got a character.

Now, so understanding this freedom of the /, not of the will, but of the whole soul, what is freedom ? I say it is just this, as far as I know anything about it, that it is just the self-originating, self-directing J, and that is the whole that it is. Let me illustrate. Suppose I should put upon your table, or you should see resting there, with nothing to interfere with it, a ball of something. It is a ball of yarn. Now suppose you begin to see the yarn moving; you would be sure to say, " Some one is moving it." It is yarn ; nothing is more certain than that the thing cannot move itself; if it moves, it moves by reason of some life connected with it, and you settle that question right off. You look again and you say, " It is not a ball of yarn; it is a mouse." The thing started itself; it could not move unless it had life from within; that is self-originating motion. Now, has the mouse free-will? No, because the mouse has not reason and conscience; therefore I would amend my definition. The mouse has self-originated action; the mouse has self-electing action, but it has not reason and conscience. I say it is self-originated, self-elected action, with the illumination of reason and conscience, that makes free-will.

You are sitting in a summer house, you sec something darting about. What is it? It is nothing but a speck of dust. That is not self-directed action; it is governed by the wind. Suppose that you look and see that it is motion directed from within, that this darting and stopping is self-moved. Why, that is not governed by the wind; it is governed by instinct, which is not reason or conscience. Suppose that you or I at sea should observe a great ship at a distance just carried about; we look at it; Ave take our glasses; and you say, u It has no life about it;" it is moved by the current; and you say that it is an abandoned thing that is carried about and swept along by controlling circumstances and outside causes. But instead of this object floating about, suppose we see a steamship; the steam is on, the wheels are revolving, the action that you see is controlled from within; and you have there self-originated action; the action comes from within the ship. A gale is blowing, and the waves are dashing against the vessel; but you see the royal mail steamship fully manned and equipped; the forces arc all at work, and there is a man at the helm; and there you have free-will in its highest form, self-originated force, self-directed force, under the lead of reason and conscience; that I believe to be free-will.

Now, the second question is the influence of character on the will. A great many seem to think free-will a simple matter. I believe it is the greatest mystery of the world. Man has a fixed character which determines all in a certain track, and yet that man is free; whereas, you say a man to be free ought to be perfectly uninfluenced. Suppose I bring up before you to-day in illustration a child. It

has no past, no history; it can do what it pleases of course; and if I say to it, "Will you do this?" it replies, "I will." The child does just what any one wishes it to do. Now, take a man of education and of character, a man of principle, a man of convictions, a man of purpose, a man of fixed habits, and you cannot make him do this or that. What he does is already determined by the character of the man, habits which have been crystallized into character. The child is unformed: he can do anything; but the character of the man is fixed, and he cannot do what is against his conscience, and he cannot do what is improper in his mind or view.

It is uncertain what the child will do, but it is very certain what the man will do. Now, I ask you, Which is the more free ? Is it the child or the man ? Is the child free, or is the father free, who can stand up in the most trying times, determined from within by the forces of his character and by the good habits of his life? You take a man; take a father and compare him with God ; concede the father to be a man of high character, such as General Grant, and sanctified by the Spirit of God, firm as a rock. Yet, after all, the strongest human being may be tempted, may be overcome by seduction. But when you look up at Jehovah, whose character is not uncertain, whose character is eternal, who cannot do that which is foolish, and who cannot do that which is wrong; which is the more free? Is Jehovah freer than man ? Is the man freer than the child ? Therefore, I hold that a man is free just in proportion to his convictions, just in proportion to his capability of determining his action from experience, just from his fixedness and crystallization of character. A man is free in proportion to the direction and development of his character. A holy character is the highest form of freedom.

I believe a sinful character leaves man responsible, for the sinner is just as free as the saint; the devil is just as free as Gabriel. Now, what is freedom? It is self-originated, self-directed action under the law of reason and conscience. But the devil has all that, just as much as Gabriel. The sinful man has all that, just as much as the saint. The difference is here. I have the power of willing as I prefer, but I have no power of creating a holy character for myself. If I have a holy character, my character coincides with my views, my judgment, my reason, my conscience and my spontaneous affections; they all go in one direction; but if I am a sinner I have no right-directing heart. Reason says go one way, conscience says go the same way, the affections and the dispositions say go another way; and therefore the sinner, according to the language of the Bible, although really free and morally responsible, is in bondage to corruption; the impulses of his heart are in the wrong direction.

Apply that to the fourfold state of man. There are only four states, and there have been only two human beings who occupied all the four states—viz. Adam and Eve. There is the state of innocence, the state of sin, the state of grace and the state of glory.

Now, we know what it is to be sinners. But can we cease to be sinners? and can we obey the law of holiness? We know what it is to be Christians through divine grace. How was it with Adam ? Adam was created, according to the Bible, with a perfectly holy nature, without sin; and yet he was able to sin, and he was able to do right. You have not had that experience. No one but Adam ever had that experience or ever can have it.

If you will read the ninth chapter of our Confession of Faith, on the " Freedom of the Will," you will find it one of the most wonderful treatises you have ever seen.

You are familiar with the fact that theologians always escape from difficulties by using the word " mystery," and that the mystery of mysteries is the origin of sin. The great mystery is a theological one. How is it possible that a God of infinite holiness, of infinite compassion, of infinite knowledge, of infinite power, ever allows sin to exist? Why, sin is the very thing he hates. This is an absolutely insoluble mystery. How did sin begin? Why did God permit it? If we are all free, if we are created by God, and there is nothing which exists which God did not create except himself, how did sin come? That is an insoluble mystery. St. Augustine attempted to account for it, and I believe his suggestion is the very nearest to it possible. It is that sin in its origin is not a positive entity, but it is a defect.

Take this for an illustration : Suppose you have a fiddle that has been out of tune; you hang it up on the wall, and a year after you come back and take it down, and the fiddle is all in tune. You know that the fiddle must have been put in tune; it could not have got into tune spontaneously. But suppose your fiddle is perfectly in tune when you hang it up, and you go away, and when you return you find that it is out of tune. It dots not follow that somebody did it. You do not say that somebody did it, but that it got out of tune. Now, in the case of Adam I have no doubt sin began in that way; not as sin; but it began to be through inattention, it began to be through defect in love, through defect in faith; it was an omission, and it wras thus through a rift in the lute, through a crack here and another there, with a want of harmony. And with this want of harmony came the awful discord that has sent the world into a bedlam and made a division between God and man. Adam sinned, and then we got into the condition with which we are familiar, with a will to sin, and with a power only to sin; and then, through the cross, we are lifted into a condition of grace, in which we have power to obey; and the power grows stronger and stronger, and the disposition and desire to sin grow weaker and weaker. That is before us; thank God we shall come at last to the stature of perfect manhood in Christ Jesus, when the character, amplified and regenerated, shall come to its full, divine crystalline beauty; and then we shall partake of the divine nature and have a perfect freedom of will, as free as Adam, yet certain as God.

Chapter 95

03.09. LECTURE 09 - GOD'S COVENANTS WITH MAN-THE CHURCH.

LECTURE IX GOD’S COVENANTS WITH MAN—THE CHURCH. The subject to-day is a wide one; it comprehends the covenants of God, his covenant of works and covenant of grace. It is very obvious that because God is an intelligence he must have a plan. If he be an absolutely perfect intelligence, desiring and designing nothing but good; if he be an eternal and immutable intelligence, his plan must be one, eternal, all-comprehensive, immutable ; that is, all things from his point of view must constitute one system and sustain a perfect logical relation in all its parts. Nevertheless, like all other comprehensive systems, it must itself be composed of an infinite number of subordinate systems. In this respect it is like these heavens which he has made, and which he has hung before our eyes as a type and pattern of his mode of thinking and planning in all providence. We know that in the solar system our earth is a satellite of one of the great suns, and of this particular system we have a knowledge because of our position, but we know that this system is only one of myriads, with variations, that have been launched in the great abyss of space. So we know that this great, all-comprehensive plan of God, considered as one system, must contain a great many subordinate systems which might be studied profitably if we were in the position to do so, as self-contained wholes, separate from the rest.

Now, the great system of human redemption must in some respects stand alone, conspicuous and pre-eminent, above all other plans and systems of God. Even though God work through eternity, even though he work through infinity, God has but one Son. The incarnation of the Son of God cannot be repeated. This is an event even in the annals of eternity and in the annals of the universe without precedent, without parallel, without equal. And this incarnation of the Son of God, this taking upon himself the very nature of man, this uniting himself through the body of man with the whole material universe, and through the soul of man with the whole moral and spiritual universe, must in its very nature have wrought a change affecting universally and intimately all the provinces and kingdoms, and all the individuals which it embraces. Besides this, a system which is worthy of the incarnation and the death of the Son of God must be something transcendently superior. I do believe that among all the commonwealths of the sons of God—and I believe these are infinite in number, in extent and in variety—this commonwealth of redeemed humanity must occupy a central and interior position; that it is something unique, unparalleled, which cannot even in the universe of God be frequently experienced by any of his creatures. And this which seems to us to be possible and probable appears to be absolutely confirmed by the apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians, when he says, as you will remember, that in the fullness of time this great undiscovered secret, which God had hitherto kept to himself, he had now begun to unveil gradually and slowly through the gospel; to wit, his purpose to make men "accepted through the Beloved," his purpose to bring us under one Head in Christ, and to consolidate under one Head in Christ all things which are in heaven or upon the earth, i(even in him."

Now, this plan is in effect a covenant. A great many, comparatively recently, have come to doubt whether it is proper to apply terms so human to the transactions and relations of God. And yet I do believe that I cau show to you that the very facts of the case justify this language, and that they

implicitly and necessarily contain all these principles. The term " covenant" is not commonly found in ancient or mediaeval theology. Hints of it—that is, the recognition of God's plan and purpose—began to appear in the century preceding the Reformation in the Roman Catholic Church, and then among the first Reformers. It was developed very distinctly afterward by one of the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism. That form of theology itself is generally attributed to the agency of Dutch theologians, who introduced it about the middle of the seventeenth century. But it is found in the early part of that century in a book of great simplicity, called The Body of Divinity (compiled by Archbishop Usher, who was a man of very great learning), which I believe had more to do in forming the Catechism and Confession of Faith than any other book in the world; because it is well known that, although Archbishop Usher was not himself present in the Westminster Assembly, he was twice invited to attend and sit there, and that this book, which he compiled as a young man, was in circulation in this Assembly among the individuals composing it. And if this is true, you could easily see how much of suggestion there is in it which was afterward carried into the Catechism—the Larger Catechism especially—of that Assembly.

Now, I believe that some foreign divines, and some in England, carried out this covenant form of theology in detail in a manner that might be called anthropomorphic. Yet it is evident that if God's dealings with man are ethical, if in their essential nature the system of redemption grew out of the relations of persons, and if the process consisted in the way of teaching, of commandments, of promises, of threatenings, of the presence of motives addressed to the will and of determinate actions of form and character, then, in its last analysis, all the dealings of God must necessarily come back to this form of a covenant What is the essence of a covenant between equals except a mutual understanding and the agreement of two wills? What is the essential nature of a covenant formed between a superior and inferior but this—a conditional promise? The promise is a reward on the condition of obedience, associated with threatening of punishment on the condition of disobedience. It follows from this, necessarily, that if you begin with an eternity, an eternal plan of God must be a mutual one in which the three Persons come to an understanding and knowledge of that common purpose in which they distribute among themselves reciprocally their several functions. Then when God comes to deal with any intelligent creature, whether it be an angel or man, under any circumstances, if he commands or promises, or if he threatens, you have there all the elements of a covenant, because a covenant is simply a mutual understanding, and the covenant imposed by a superior upon an inferior is simply a conditional promise. Hence we have the covenant of works, the covenant of redemption and the covenant of grace.

Now, the covenant of works is so called because its condition is the condition of works; it is called also, and just as legitimately, the covenant of life, because it promises life; it is called a legal covenant, because it proceeded, of course, upon the assumption of perfect obedience, conformity in character and action to the perfect law of God. And it is no less a covenant of grace, because it was a covenant in which our heavenly Father, as a guardian of all the natural rights of his newly-created creatures, sought to provide for this race in his infinite wisdom and love and infinite grace through what we call a covenant of works. The covenant of grace is just as much and just as entire a covenant, receiving it as coming from an infinite superior to an inferior.

Now look precisely to the facts in the case. Let there be no speculation, let there be no inferences, but take the facts as they are. In the first place, God created man, as we saw in our last lecture, a newly-awakened being, intelligent, moral, with free-will, with a natural character through which he

was able to do right, able to do wrong, apparently. In the second place, we know it to be a universal principle—and as it is of God it seems to us to be a very just principle—that holy character is made to depend upon personal choice. But it does not seem to me that this is always and absolutely essential. We know that the immutable, holy character of God did not originate in personal choice; that God's existence is eternal ; his existence is absolutely necessary, absolutely immutable, and that God is from eternity and essentially God, rational, holy and wise. And yet it does seem as if God had determined to make the moral character of all the subjects of his moral government to depend upon personal choice, and it seems to us as if that was right. He made man, in the first place, holy and capable of doing right, but without a confirmed character he was liable to fall. Ought this confirmed character to result from and depend upon his own personal actions?

I say that this seems to be God's plan everywhere, because we find it true, without exception, wherever. we-have any record of God's doings. In the first place, he created the angels, and gave the angels an opportunity of obedience or an opportunity of falling. Each one of them seems to have stood in his own person, and those who fell remained fallen. Those who maintained their first state continued afterward absolutely and eternally in the image of God. Then when God brings forth the gospel his method is to preach the gospel to every creature, and to offer to all men this amazing gift of eternal life which covenants confirmed moral character, and which we may receive or refuse according to our personal choice.

Then, if this were so, obviously man must have had a probation—a probation in its very essence, because a time of trial and state of trial must be given. That is, God put man in a state of existence in a state of moral equilibrium. He was in equilibrium because he was holy. His heart was disposed aright; his impulses were right. God endowed him thus with original righteousness; but he was in a state of freedom. His character was not confirmed; he was capable of either obeying or sinning.

Now, it would have been an infinite loss to us, an inconceivable danger, if God had determined to keep us for ever, throughout all the unending ages of eternity, hanging thus upon the ragged edge of possible probation, and always in this unstable condition, this unstable equilibrium, able to do right, and liable also to fall; and therefore God offered to man in this gracious covenant of works an opportunity of accepting his grace and receiving his covenant gift of a confirmed, holy character, secured on the condition of personal choice.

God gave Adam and Eve the best chance he could, and he put them surely under absolutely the most favorable conditions that we can conceive of. He brought them into a new garden, and he introduced them under the most favorable circumstances, with one exception: he allowed the devil to go into the camp. Why he did that I do not know; but with that exception the conditions were the most favorable we can conceive of. Then he reduced the test to the simplest and easiest—the test simply of a personal violation of law, a test simply of loyal obedience. He did not make the condition, Thou shalt not lie; which, under the circumstances, would have been utterly impossible to Adam, who was a holy, honest man. He did not make the condition, Thou shalt not abuse thy wife Eve; which would have been impossible with Adam in his state as he was originally created. But he reduced the condition to one of specific obedience to a positive command, in itself absolutely distinct. Now, the only difficulty that seems to inhere in this view of man's original condition lies in the fact that the destinies of all Adam's descendants were made to be suspended

upon his action. We all inherit what we call " original sin." And two questions here start up, the question as to how original sin comes upon us; and the question why original sin, under the government of a holy God, is allowed to come upon us.

These are two entirely distinct questions. You do not answer the question why when you explain the method by which original sin comes down to us in the order of generation; you must carry the question up to a higher plane and solve it in the light of divine choice. Undoubtedly, this bringing down upon each individual this original taint of our nature, which is the fontal source of all evils—moral, physical, temporal, eternal— is the greatest of all judgments, and it is either a tyrannical act of the Creator or it is a sublime act of justice. Every angel was created a spirit; every angel was constituted self-determining in his own person. But constituted as we are, possessing a responsible and moral nature like angels, which comes into existence in connection with propagated animal bodies, such an individual probation is absolutely impossible. From the very constitution of the human body and from the nature of the case anything that Adam did must determine his destiny and that of his children. As Hugh Miller says, " It is a universal law, just as wide as the providence of God and as the history of man, that God has so constituted men everywhere that the free-will of the parent becomes the destiny of the child." If this be so, we must believe in the covenant of works, and that God has ordained this relation not only in infinite wisdom and in infinite power, but in infinite justice and righteousness. But this fact of the covenant of works does not stand by itself. It is a part of a great whole, and if you leave out any element of the system you will not get an understanding of the covenant. This covenant of works which God introduces, and the subject of which is the government of man and his whole career in this world, is part of that greater system which culminates in the covenant of grace, with its headship in the first Adam introducing us into the headship of the second Adam. There has been no Christ except among men. " Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same. .... For verily not of angels doth he take hold, but he taketh hold of the seed of Abraham." Angels had a nature, but angels did not have a seed. Christ’s relation to the seed of Abraham results from the generic nature of man, from the very constitution of the covenant of works. If there had been no covenant of works, there could have been no covenant of redemption; if there had been no fallen Adam, there could have been no redemption in Christ. You must study the covenant of works always in the light of that larger system wherein it is established that where sin abounded grace has infinitely more abounded.

Further we say, then, that if the Father and Son and Holy Spirit constitute one Trinity, the plan must be a mutual one, and must contain within it all the elements of such a plan. According to the intimation of this plan given in the Bible, the Father must be an absolute God; the Son must .represent his own people, whose nature he was to take. We know such an arrangement was made. Christ often speaks of the work which his Father, God, had sent him to do. He says," This commandment have I received from my Father." Then he says, "All that the Father giveth rue shall come to me." Here are all the elements of a covenant. There was an understanding between the Father and the Son as to the reward which the Son was to gain, so that we have all the elements of the covenant of redemption. The Father undertook all the providential conditions; the Son was to do all the work in the world, and to that end the world is to be prepared for it, and that he might have the proper conditions of life, and afterward that he should see his seed and be satisfied with the results, with the crowning fruits that he should receive.

Then the Son undertook, on behalf of his own people, to take upon himself their nature, to meet their obligations and to suffer the penalty which had been pronounced upon them. The Holy Ghost undertook also afterward to apply these benefits, and undertook this part of the work because it is the covenant of three Persons, you must remember. He undertook the work of generating the body of the Son, of preparing his human nature, an entire human nature in its fullness, so as to render him, on the human side, a proper being. The Holy Ghost undertook to co-operate with him in every part of his earthly being, and then to constitute himself the other Advocate, which completes the whole work of redemption. He comes to us and takes the things of Christ and applies them to us. He makes continual intercession within us as Christ makes continual intercession for us.

Now, what is commonly called the covenant of grace as distinct from the covenant of redemption is just the human and external side of this eternal covenant of redemption.

Both the covenants are executed in our behalf, both under one name, the covenant of grace. It is better, however, to distinguish them, and to call the covenant between the Persons of the eternal Godhead the covenant of redemption, which is eternally transcendent, and which is full of light and love and life and power, the provisions and scope of whose grace transcend the imaginations of man or the tongues of angels. But the covenant of grace is just the human temporal side, which makes human redemption possible and gives its benefits freely to us. In the case of every one to whom the gospel comes, and to whom it gives salvation, it is done upon the condition of faith. Now, here is a covenant with a condition—whosoever believes shall be saved, whosoever belie vet h not shall be damned.

Then the Lord Jesus Christ comes to view and is represented as the Mediator of the covenant, because it all depends upon his mediatorial work, and, above all, he is represented as the Surety. We promise and he indorses. You promise faith upon your knees, and the Lord Jesus Christ indorses for you. You promise service upon your knees, and the Lord Jesus Christ indorses for you. You see how much it is that God asks of you. He says you shall be saved. If we have no belief we are utterly incompetent to attain to that salvation; Christ gives us faith : we promise-trust, and Christ indorses it. We are offered salvation if we will serve; but we have no strength, no merit. Christ gives us the grace; we promise, since Christ indorses it; we are offered salvation if we fight the battle and persevere unto the end; we make our pledge, Christ indorses it. Thus our salvation is absolutely and infinitely secure.

Now, of course this covenant sustains to the whole work in the whole sphere of redemption the same relation as the constitution of a republic or of a limited monarchy sustains to the government of a land. Potentially, all the powers of government, all the elements of political society, are represented and granted in the provisions of our constitution, and so potentially all the elements of salvation, everything that can be experienced in the body of Christians in the earth, everything that can be distinct to the soul of the Christian on earth, everything that can be experienced throughout all eternity, everything that can be realized in the individual, everything that can be realized in the community, the whole body of the redeemed,—all this is contained potentially in the provisions of the covenant of grace. But this covenant, like all other covenants and constitutions, must be administered, and there is a difference between the covenant and its administration. The covenant is one; it is the administration which varies continually. This is a form of language which it would have been very well for the translators of our Bible to have adopted. The Greek word diatheke

means constitution as much as anything else in the world. It is a constitution. In the old classical language it was used to express that kind of a constitution which a man makes when he makes a will, a testament. You have the unalterable inheritance, and you can never get rid of it. I prefer the old Latin word " dispensation " to the words New Testament and Old Testament. These are not proper terms. The word diatheke occurs dozens of times in the Bible; you can see the use of it and determine the sense—the constitution, the administration of the constitution. That is, it is a covenant or it is a dispensation of God. You are familiar with the fact that the government of the United States has but one Constitution, and has had for one hundred years that which has constituted us a nation and provided for all its functions through the whole history of our wonderful development. And yet this Constitution may be administered differently by different administrations: it may be in the hands of Federalists, or it may in the hands of Republicans, or it may be in the hands of Democrats, but continually and all the time it is the same Constitution thoroughly administered. If you will then just go back to your Greek concordance and take up your New Testament where this word first occurs, and carry it through, you will find how exactly it has this meaning. You see that covenant, or constitution of grace in the form of a covenant, which provides for the salvation of man from the beginning of the history of the human race to the present. So there has been but one redemption, there has been but one atonement and one offer of justification, there has been but one offer of regeneration, there has been but one principle of sanctification, there has been but one operation of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, from the time that the first gospel was preached to the woman in the garden until the present day; but then this wonderful constitution has been administered in an infinite variety of ways, and it is capable of twofold unfolding. You take up this constitution and subject it to a logical unfolding, and you have in it, of course, all possible theology. It has been shown over and over again how all the unfolding of God’s plans, as far as those plans have been disclosed to us and can be exhibited, makes manifest infinite variations and provisions for the redemption of men which can be exhibited under this form, logically and unvaryingly.

There is a second unfolding of the covenant of grace which is chronological; not only is it unfolded logically in itself, but it brings out all the different elements in time. It has been unfolded chronologically from the Garden of Eden up to the present time in the wonderful development of the Church of the first-born, the Church of the covenant, the Church purchased by Christ’s blood. The Church and its Unity.

What is the Church? There is one thing certain about it: the Church has a great many attributes, but that which is absolutely essential is its absolute unity. There is no doubt if there be but one God there is but one Church ; if there be but one Christ, there is but one Church; if there be but one cross, there is but one Church; if there be but one Holy Ghost, there is but one Church. This is absolutely settled—there can be but one Church. We have heard about the visible and invisible Church, as if there were two churches. There cannot be two churches, one that is visible and another that is invisible. There is but one Church, and that Church is visible or invisible just according to the eye that is looking, just according to the point of view taken.

Now, I take the true distinction to be, the Church as we see it, the normal Church, and the Church as God sees it. In respect to this matter our vision is limited in the way of discrimination. You and I cannot discriminate in regard to the Church; we have to take presumptions, we have to take the outward indications when we make an examination. God’s eye is absolutely discriminating.

Looking down, he sees the line of demarcation which separates the Church and the world; his vision is sharp and keen. Then, again, our view is not very comprehensive; we see what we call the Church, and we conclude that it is the Church. I have often thought of this as an illustration. I ask a man, " Have you seen the planet, the Earth ?" he would say, " Yes, I live on it." That is one of the reasons you never saw it. You never saw the planet Earth as you see the planet Jupiter; you never saw the planet Earth as you see its satellite, the moon. It is absolutely impossible; you arc too near it; you see but one little segment of it; nothing but a fraction—a very little at a time. You must get away from the object in order to take it in as a whole, and you must have the advantage of perspective. So in regard to the Church; it is so vast, it has been gathering through the ages, through the centuries, through millenniums; its members come from the ends of the earth; and myriads, ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands beyond the calculations of angels, have been gathering there in white robes around the throne of Christ. Can you see it? We arc too purblind, too earthly in our conditions; but we may see a part of it. What is called the invisible Church is the most conspicuous object in the universe; it has come to shine, to be like the sun, and like an army with banners. What is called the invisible Church is the only Church that exists.

We see ports of it; it becomes visible to us in sections, in partial glimpses; but yet it is the same Church. Now, the distinction I make is, the Church as God sees it and the Church as man sees it.

There have been two distinct conceptions of the Church: one is the theory that the Church consists of an organized society which God has constituted, that identity consists in its external form as well as in its spirit, and that its life depends upon continuity of officers from generation to generation. This is held by a great many able men, men of intellect, and by many respectable, level-headed Christians as well.

I hold this to be simply impossible. The marks of the Church are catholicity, apostolicity, infallibility and purity. Now, apply that to any corporation—to the Church in Jerusalem or to the Church in Antioch; to the Congregational Church, to the Presbyterian, or to the prelatical churches. I do not care as to the form; but there never did exist, and there does not now exist, any organized society upon the face of the earth of which these qualities could be predicated. Not one of these societies has apostolicity—that is, precisely the apostolic form as well as the apostolic spirit; not one of these societies has had an absolute organic continuity, or has, without modification, preserved it. Societies like the Church of Borne, which are most conspicuous in claiming these marks for themselves, are most conspicuously unworthy of them, because there is no comparison between their ritual of service, their organization, and the apostolic Church with which they claim to be identified. The only possible definition of a Church is that it consiste of what is termed " the body of Christ"—that is, human souls regenerated by the presence and power of the Holy Ghost, kept in immediate union with Christ Of this you can predicate apostolicity, catholicity and the sanctifying power and perpetual presence of the Holy Ghost, which belongs to the Church of Christ. This is the true Church which exists through all the successive generations of men, which is united to Christ, and which shares in the benefits of his redemption through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. This great body is one because the Holy Ghost dwells in it and makes it one. This Church is apostolical, because it is unchanging as to apostolic doctrine; it is catholic, because it contains in one body all of God’s people in all worlds and in all time; it unites all from the creation of the world to the coming of Christ, and all from the coming of Christ to the end of the world, in one

body—absolutely one, both visible and invisible. But you may ask me, as a good Presbyterian, a High-Church Presbyterian—because we have a High Church as well as a Low Church—you may ask me, Do you not think there is a visible Church ? Yes, I believe the true Church is visible. It consists of men and women who are regenerated, who have divine life, and whose divine life is shown in their holy walk and conversation. You ask if the Church must not be organized? I say yes, but organization is never an essential of the Church. Organization is a simple accident; it is a necessary accident; it is a very important one with us; it is, according to our mode of thinking, obligatory, because it is commanded* By means of organization we have solidification and growth, and it is a great means of self-propagation in accomplishing the great missionary work of carrying the gospel to the ends of the earth. But Christ never did make organization needful in the sense that our being Presbyterians is an essential of the Church.

You and I believe that immortality is provided for all souls before birth, as well as after birth, and for infants that have not come to free moral agency, irrespective of their knowledge of Christ. Now, think of the history of the world since Adam: all the souls of those that have died before birth or between birth and moral agency have been redeemed in Christ. You see that organization cannot be the essence of the Church. I tell you that the infinite majority of the spiritual Church of Jesus Christ come into existence outside of all organization. Through all the ages, from Japan, from China, from India, from Africa, from the islands of the sea, age after age, multitudes flocking like birds have gone to heaven of this great company of redeemed infants of the Church of God; they go without organization. Now, this is demonstration: that if the great majority of the Church always has existed outside of organization, then organization, while of assistance, is not essential to the Church. You may add church to church; these are but the incidental forms which the universal Church of God assumes on different occasions under the guidance of the Spirit, under the guidance of God's providence as a great propaganda for the purpose of accomplishing the great and divine work of carrying the gospel to the ends of the earth. The Church had its beginning in the family. The plan of redemption assumes and presumes the original state of human beings as in the family. How has the Church been logically and chronologically composed? In the first place, we have what is called the patriarchal administration in the original constitution of the race. There was no organization of the Church then; there was not much organization in the world, none of the state as distinct from the family. The father was the sovereign; the great father—that is, the patriarch— was the head of the Church; and just as Adam had led his descendants away from God, so under the covenant of redemption did these patriarchal fathers, these prophets, priests and kings, lead their people back to him. In that age there was no priesthood, there were no sacraments. The next form was the Abrahamic dispensation, which was a more specific promise to the Church, the promise connected with the covenant of grace. There was more light, more doctrine, and we have here the specific sacrament of circumcision which was added to the specific covenant.

Then we come, in the third place, to the Mosaic dispensation. It is well recognized that the wonderful phenomena of this dispensation must be understood as presenting a threefold aspect or character, and it becomes very much more simple when we do this. In the first place, these Jews were a people who, in their own time, constituted a distinct nation. God was their God, and a large portion of his providences toward them had reference simply to their temporal interests and to their relations as a specific people. They had a government which guarded the relations they sustained

to other nations; therefore you must understand a great many of their laws with reference to this specific characteristic. The Jews were constituted a kingdom, and God was their God.

Another far more important aspect of the Jewish system was this: it was a promulgation of the covenant of works which was introduced at Sinai, and the design of this promulgation was to lead those generations to the gospel, for the gospel presupposes the law; the law has been from the beginning the schoolmaster to lead us to Christ. Therefore in this aspect it was a missionary institution, and must be understood as preparatory; it was the preaching of the doctrine of sin and condemnation in order to prepare man for the preaching of the doctrine of grace and salvation.

Then, again, it did most characteristically in the specific form of its administration outline the covenant of redemption; it was the setting forth of Christ—Christ as the Prophet, Priest and King—in the method of his redemption and our personal reception of its benefits. The conditions of salvation were the same, and salvation was secured by the same plan. The Jew, if he believed in Christ's coming, was justified and received the Holy Ghost, although without understanding it, and was regenerated, sanctified and justified; and being thus justified and sanctified, when he died he went to be, not with Christ—there was at that time no incarnate Christ; he did not exist—but he went into that happy place in which God gathered all his Old Testament people—in Abraham's bosom.

Now, how shall we regard the logical unfolding of the covenant from the time of Moses to the time of Christ ? First, we have the breaking down of the middle wall of* partition by the taking away of the limitation presented by the institution of the Church as a nation; it was confined under these circumstances to one people; it was incapable of being expanded among the nations of the earth. It is a remarkable fact that the Old Dispensation opened with the tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues, and the New opens with the Pentecost and the gift of tongues. The Old Dispensation began with the process of selection and exclusion: there was an election of the children of Israel out of all mankind, and a rejection of all the rest; a selection of the Israelites out of the Hebrews, and the rejection of the rest; and the selection of Judah out of Israel, and the rejection of the rest. But now see how the principle changes. Under the Old Dispensation it was exclusion and segregation; under the New Testament it is expansion and comprehension. The new Church begins in a little upper chamber in Jerusalem. The Church becomes the Church of the Jews; it becomes the Church of the Roman empire ; it becomes the Church of Europe; it becomes the Church of the world.

Now, as to the unity of this Church I have something to say. A great many are agitated at present with regard to Church unity and its manifestations, and I think there is a great deal of confusion of thought as to the original conception of the Church itself. If the Church were an external society, then all deviation from that society is of the nature of schism; but if the Church be in its essence a great spiritual body, constituted by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost through all the ages and nations, uniting all to Christ, and if its external organization is only accidental and temporary and subject to change and variation, then deviation of organization, unless touched by the spirit of schism, is not detrimental to 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; the higher the order of unity, the greater must be the multiplicity. This is so

everywhere. Go to the ocean; every drop of water is the repetition of every other drop, and there is union simply without diversity. Go to the desert of Sahara, and every grain of sand is the duplicate of every other grain of sand, but there is no unity, no life. You could not make a great cathedral by piling up simple identical rhomboids or cubes of stone. It is because you differentiate, and make every stone of a different form in order to perform a different function, and then build them up out of this multitudinous origination into the continuity and unity of the one plan or architectural idea, that you have your cathedral. You could not make a great piece of music by simply multiplying the same tone or sound. In order to obtain the harmony of a great orchestra you get together a large number of musical instruments, or you have a great number of human voices in a choir, and you combine them; then you have an infinite variety of quality and infinite variety of tone. You combine them in the absolute unit of the one great musical idea which you seek to express. But if this is true of such things, it is more true of Christ's Church. If God had followed our idea, how simple a thing it would have been to make a united Church descending from Adam and Eve! We might think that was all that could be done, and there would be then no stones of stumbling. You could then watch this Church, and it would go on indefinitely and without limit.

Now, what has God been doing? He has broken humanity up into infinite varieties. This has been his method. He has been driving it into every clime. He has been driving it into every age through the succession of centuries. He has been moulding human nature under every variety of influences through all time, until he has got men in every age, every tribe, every tongue, every nation, every color, every fashion—in order to do what? Simply to build up a variety, to build up the rich, inexhaustible variety which constitutes the beauty in unity of this great infinite Church of the first-born, whose final dwelling-place is to be in heaven.

I say, under this dispensation God has left us free to form organizations. He has left us free to experience Christianity under all the conditions in which he has placed us; and the Christian religion which we receive takes various colors and tones from the nationality, from the tribe and from the race. Undoubtedly, there is such a thing as schism. Schism is a great sin. But if the Church is a spiritual body, the sin is a sin against spiritual unity.

All high-churchism, all claims that our Church is the one Church and only Church, are of the essence of schism; all pride and bigotry are of the essence of schism; all want of universal love, all jealousy, and all attempts to take advantage of others in controversy or in Church extension, are of the essence of schism; but surely it is not schism for each one of us to go out and develop in our own way. What is the result? I trust in this I am not narrow, I am not making any claim for Presbyterian-ism ; I am talking of the whole Church of God that is truly loyal to Christ, animated by one spirit, comprehended in one body. On the other hand, I hold that it is our interest to have denominational differences in order to maintain what God has given us.

I believe the Church is like the world, and consists of many forms, many races. I say to every race, Maintain the integrity of your race, and to every nation, Maintain the integrity of your nation, that it be not antagonized by other nations. This is the duty which God has historically devolved upon us. I say, then, if Presbyterianisim be true, maintain the type which God has given you; and I would say the same to our Baptist friends and to our Episcopal friends and Methodist friends. I believe all our denominations are historically justified; that they all represent great ideas, either theoretically or practically, which God commits to them in order to have them act upon them; that our duty is to

maintain our true inheritance and to prove true to the stock from which we came. 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 working from without, but from within outward; by taking on more of Christ, more of the Spirit,—that we will realize more and more the unity of the Church in our own happy experience.

03.10. LECTURE 10 - THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

LECTURE X THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

It is the grand distinction of Christianity that all its doctrines and all its forces centre in the Person of its Founder and Teacher. In the case of all the other founders of philosophical sects and religions the entire interest of their mission centres in the doctrines they teach, the opinions they disseminate. This was obviously true in the case of Zoroaster, Confucius and Buddha, of Plato, Aristotle and Cicero, of Moses and Paul. In the case of each of them the question was not what they were, but what they taught. But in the case of Christianity the entire system, from foundation to superstructure, rests upon and derives its life from the Person of its Founder. The question of questions is what he was, rather than what he taught. This can be proved:

(1) From an examination of each of the doctrines of Christianity separately. All that the Scriptures teach of the Mosaic dispensation and its typical character; of the burden of all the prophets; of the new birth; of repentance and faith; of justification and sanctification; of holy living and of the Christian Church ; of the state of the soul after death; of the resurrection from the dead; of the general judgment; and of heaven itself,—takes its meaning and force from its relation to the person, offices and work of Christ

(2) From the experience of Christians. We believe Moses and Paul, but we believe in Christ. To be a Christian is to be in Jesus. To live a Christian is to have fellowship with the Father and the Son. To die a Christian is to sleep in Jesus.

(3) The same is proved, in the third place, from the present attitude of the great controversy between Christianity and its opponents. In this age, in which secular philosophy oscillates between Materialism and Pantheism, when advanced thinkers disdain all the old questions of theology, natural or revealed, even the most inveterate skeptics acknowledge the necessity of presenting some solution of that miracle of all ages, the Person of Jesus of Nazareth. It is impossible to explain that unique phenomenon which emerged on the hills and valleys of Judea eighteen hundred years ago, whose life, character and works are truly inexplicable unless we accept the account of his nature and his origin which is given to us in the Word of God. The press groans with Eccs Homos and Lives of Christ, and with new versions of rationalistic theories, mystical and legendary. Thus the infidel is constrained to unite with the believer in bearing testimony to the greatness of that mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh. And here, in the very heart of our religion, all true Christians agree. The entire historical Church, in all its ages and in all its branches—Greek and Roman, Lutheran and Reformed, Calvinist and Arminian—are here entirely at one.

While this is true as far as the public faith of the Church is concerned, as expressed in its great confessions, liturgies and hymns, a great variety of opinion and diversity of speculation and definition have prevailed at different times among the various schools of theology. This diversity of speculation naturally arose from the following facts:

1.The Person of the incarnate God is unique. His birth has had no precedents and his existence no analogy. He cannot be explained by being referred to a class nor can he be illustrated by an example.

2.The Scriptures, while clearly and fully revealing all the elements of his Person, yet never present in one formula an exhaustive definition of that Person, nor a connected statement of the elements which constitute it and their mutual relations. The impression is all the more vivid because it is made, as in a picture, by an exhibition of his Person in action—an exhibition in which the divinity and humanity are alike immediately demonstrated by the self-revelation of their attributes in action ; and

3.This unique personality, as it surpasses all analogy, also transcends all understanding. The proud intellect of man is constantly aspiring to remove all mysteries and to subject the whole sphere of existence to the daylight of rational explanation. Such attempts are constantly ending in the most grotesque failure. Even in the material world it is true that omnia exeunt in myeterium. If we cannot explain the relation which the immaterial soul sustains to the organized body in the person of man, why should we be surprised to find that all attempts to explain the intimate relations which the eternal Word and the human soul and body sustain to each other in the Person of Christ have miserably failed?

Before proceeding to the historical illustration of this doctrine I call your attention to the following general remarks:

1. The doctrine of the Person of Christ is intimately associated with the doctrine of the Trinity. It is obviously impossible to hold the orthodox view with respect to the divine-human constitution of our Lord unless we first believe the orthodox doctrine that the one God exists as three eternal Persons, Father, Son and Holy Ghost. At the same time, few hold the true doctrine as to the tri-personal constitution of the Trinity without at the same time holding the corresponding catholic doctrine as to the Person of the God-man.

Indeed, I happen to know that the great objection which the most able and influential Unitarians entertain to the Trinitarian system is not originated by their difficulty with the Trinity, considered by itself, but because they regard the doctrine of the Trinity to be inseparable from that of the Person of Christ as held by the Church, which to them appears impossible to believe. And undoubtedly we freely admit just here that in the constitution of the Person of the God-man lies the, to us, absolutely insoluble mystery of godliness. How is it possible that the same Person can be at the same time infinite and finite, ignorant and omniscient, omnipotent and helpless ? . How can two complete spirits coalesce in one Person ? How can two consciousnesses, two understandings, two memories, two imaginations, two wills constitute one Person ? All this is involved in the scriptural and Church doctrine of the Person of Christ. Yet no one can explain it The numerous attempts made to explain or to expel this mystery have only filled the Church with heresies and obscured the faith of Christians.

2. The Scriptures do not in any one place or by the means of distinct, comprehensive formulas give us complete definitions either of the doctrine of the Trinity or of that of the Person of Christ. They do give us, most explicitly and repeatedly, all the elements of both doctrines, and then leave us to put all the several teachings relating to the same subject together, and so to construct the

entire doctrine by the synthesis of the elements.

Thus

(1) as to the Doctrine of the Trinity.—The Scriptures tell us, first, that there is but one God. Then we would naturally conclude that if there is but one God, there can be but one divine Person. But, again, the Scriptures teach us that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are that one God. Then, again, we would naturally conclude that the terms Father, Son and Holy Ghost are only different names, qualitative or official, of one Person. But yet again the Scriptures prevent us and teach us that these names designate different subjects and agents. The Father is objective to the Son, and the Son to the Father, and both to the Spirit. They love each other and are loved. They converse, using to and of each other the personal pronouns I, thou, he. The Father sends the Son, and the Father and Son send the Spirit, and they, in that order, act as agents, proceed from and return to, and report. The Scriptures also teach that there is an eternal constitutional relation of order and origin between three Persons. The Father is the fountain of Godhead. He eternally begets the Son (the process is without beginning or end or succession), and the Father and Son eternally give origin to the Spirit.

(2) In the very same manner the Scriptures teach us all we know of the Person of Christ. Pointing to that unique phenomenon exhibited biographically in the four Gospels, the Scriptures affirm —(a) " He is God." Then, we would naturally say, if he is God, he cannot be man ; if he is infinite, he cannot be finite. But the Scriptures proceed to affirm, pointing to the same historical subject, "He is man." Then, again, we would naturally say, if that phenomenon is both God and man, he must be two Persons in reality, and one Person only in appearance. But yet again the Scriptures prevent us. In every possible way they set him before us as one Person. His divinity is never objective to his humanity, nor his humanity to his divinity. His divinity never loves, speaks to nor sends his humanity, but both divinity and humanity act together as the common energies of one Person. All the attributes and all the acts of both natures are referred to the one Person. The same " I" possessed glory with the Father before the world was, and laid down his life for his sheep. Sometimes in a single proposition the title is taken from the divine side of his person, while the predicate is true only of his human side, as when it is said, " The Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." The same Person is called God because of his divinity, while it is affirmed that he shed his human blood for his Church. Again, while standing among his disciples on the earth he says, "The Son of man, which is in heaven." Here the same Person, who is called Son of man because of his humanity, is declared to be omnipresent —i. e. at the same time on earth and in heaven—as to his divine nature. This, of course, implies absolute singleness of Person, including at once divine and human attributes.

Again, the Scriptures teach us that this amazing personality does not centre in his humanity, and that it is not a composite one originated by the power of the Spirit when he brought the two natures together in the womb of the Virgin Mary. It was not made by adding manhood to Godhead. The Trinity is eternal and unchangeable. A new Person is not substituted for the second Person of the Trinity, neither is a fourth Person added to the Trinity. But the Person of Christ is just the one eternal Word, the second Person of the Trinity, which in time, by the power of the Holy Ghost, through the instrumentality of the womb of the Virgin, took a human nature (not a man, but the seed of man, humanity in the germ) into personal union with himself. The Person is eternal and

divine. The humanity is introduced into it. The centre of the personality always continues in the eternal personal Word or Son of God.

Let me illustrate this by your personality and mine. We consist of soul and body, two distinct substances, but one person. This personality, however, is not composed of the union of soul and body at birth. The personality from the first to the last centres in the soul and is only shared in by the body. By soul we mean only one thing—i. e. an incarnate spirit, a spirit with a body. Thus we never speak of the souls of angels. They are pure spirits, having no bodies. Put a spirit in a body, and the spirit becomes a soul, and the body is quickened into life and becomes a part of the person of the soul. Separate soul and body, as death does, and the soul becomes a ghost and the body becomes a corpse. When death takes place the body passes out of the personality, is called "it," and placed in the grave; while the soul, still continuing the person, goes at once to be judged of God. At the resurrection the same personal soul will return and take up the same body once discarded, and, receiving it again into its personality, will stand before God a complete man. So the divine Word, which from eternity was the second Person of the Trinity, did eighteen hundred years ago take, not a human person, but a human nature into his eternal personality, which ever continues, not a human person nor a divine-human person, but the eternal second Person of the Trinity, with a human nature embraced in it as its personal organ.

3.There is one obvious respect in which the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Person of Christ agree, and one in which they no less obviously differ. They agree in that both alike utterly transcend all experience, all analogy and all adequate grasp of human reason. But they differ in that, while the mystery of the Trinity is that one Spirit should exist eternally as three distinct Persons, the mystery of the Person of Christ .is that two distinct spirits should for evermore constitute but one Person.

4.If you give due attention to the difficulties involved in each of these divinely revealed doctrines, you would be able a priori to anticipate all possible heresies which have been evolved in the course of history. All truth is catholic: it embraces many elements, wide horizons, and therefore involves endless difficulties and apparent inconsistencies. The mind of man seeks for unity, and tends prematurely to force a unity in the sphere of his imperfect knowledge by sacrificing one element of the truth or other to the rest. This is eminently true of all rationalists. They are clear and logical at the expense of being superficial and half-orbed. Heresy, from the Greek α■ρεσις, means an act of choice, and hence division, the picking and choosing a part, instead of comprehensively embracing the whole of the truth. Almost all heresies are partial truths—true in what they affirm, but false in what they deny.

Take, for instance, the doctrine of the Trinity. One eternal Spirit exists eternally as Father, Son and Holy Ghost, three distinct Persons. This the rationalists cannot understand, and therefore will not believe. They proceed, therefore, to deny one or another element of the whole truth, and try to hold the dead fragment remaining.

Thus

(1) they attempted to cut the knot by denying the divinity of Christ, and had pure lifeless Mohammedan Unitarianism left;

(2) they pressed the unity so close that they had but one Person as well as one God, and the terms "Father," "Son" and "Holy Ghost" became different descriptive or official titles of the same Person : as Grant while in office was one person, and yet at the same time was husband and father, commander-in-chief of the army and navy, and President of the United States, so the Sabellians say Father, Son and Holy Ghost are different titles of the same Person in different characters and functions;

(3) or, lastly, they ran to the other side of the enclosure and pressed the distinction of Persons to such a degree that they had three Gods instead of the mystery of one God in three Persons.

Take, for another instance, in like manner the doctrine of the Person of Christ. The mystery is that two spirits, one divine, the other human, two minds, two wills, are so united that without confusion or change or absorption of one in the other they constitute but one Person. Scrutinize this, and you can predict beforehand all the possible heresies or one-sided half-truths, (a) The Unitarian cuts the knot by denying half the facts of the case and leaving out the divinity.

(b)The Gnostics held that a man Jesus was temporarily possessed by the supernatural AEon or Angel Christ.

(c)The Docetie cut the knot by denying the other half of the truth, that Christ was a man, holding that the reality was a simple divinity and the humanity a mere appearance, (d) The Eutychians pressed the unity of the Person to such an extent that they confounded the natures, holding that the human was absorbed in the divine, (c) The Nestorians went to the other extreme of emphasizing the integrity of the several natures after their union so very far as to dissolve the unity of the Person, and to set forth Christ not as a God-man, but as a God and a man intimately united. These, if they do not cover, at least indicate the direction and spirit of all possible heresies relating to these two fundamental doctrines of Christianity.

Let us proceed to the historical development of the doctrine in the consciousness of the Church.

I. In the Council of Nice, a. d. 325, there were three parties. The Arians, led by Arius, maintained that the superhuman element in the Person of Christ was heteroousion, of a different substance from God the Father. The Semi-Arians, led by the two bishops Eusebius, held that the superhuman element was homoiomion, of a like substance to that of the Father. The Orthodox, led by Athanasius, held that the divine nature of Christ was homoousion, of identically the same numerical substance with that of the Father. This last doctrine was embodied in the creed of that council, which, in the form afterward perfected at the end of the fourth century, is received by all Christians, Catholic and Protestant From this time the doctrine of the Trinity and that of the absolute divinity of Christ have been universally held in the Church.

II. But from that time forth men began to question how the substance of God could be uuited in one Person with the substance of humanity.

Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, in all sincerity attempted about a. d. 370 to maintain the truth by the following explanation, which really sacrifices an essential part of it. He supposed that the Scriptures (1 Thessalonians 5:23) and true philosophy teach that every natural human person is composed of three distinct elements—soma, body; psyche, soul; and pneuma, spirit —that the psyche is the seat of the animal life and appetites and the emotions and logical understanding,

and the pneuma is the seat of the reason, the will and the moral and spiritual nature. These three put in personal union make one complete human person. He held that in the Person of Christ the soma and psyche arc human and the pneuma is divine. But this view secures the unity and simplicity of Christ's Person at the expense of the integrity of his humanity. If Christ does not take a human pneuma— that is, a complete human nature—he cannot Ik* our Saviour, our High Priest, who feels with us in all our infirmities, having been tempted like us. Indeed, the view of Apollinaris degrades the doctrine by maintaining that the eternal Word took not a complete human nature, but an irrational human animal into personal union with himself.

III.During the fourth and early part of the fifth century theological speculation in the Eastern Church re vol veil around two great centres, Alexandria in Egypt and Antioch in Syria. The tendency of the Alexandrian school from Origen to Cyril and Eutychius was mystical and theosophical. With this school the divinity of Christ was everything, and into it the humanity was represented as absorbed. The tendency of the school of Antioch, whose great representatives were Theodore of Mopsuestia and Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, was to rationalistic clearness—to the emphasis of moral duties and of the distinctness and independence of the human will. The Alexandrian party generated Eutychianism, which absorbed the humanity in the divinity, in order to maintain the unity of the Person and absoluteness of the divinity; while the Antiochian party generated Nestorianism, where the unity of the Person is sacrificed to the separate integrity of the natures, and especially of the human nature. Nestorianism was condemned by the ecumenical council held at Ephesus, a. d. 431, and Eutychianism was condemned by the council which met in Chalcedon, a. d. 451.

IV.In these decisions the whole Church, Eastern and Western, concurred. The advocates of Eutychianism endeavored for a time to maintain, as a compromise position, that although the two natures in Christ remain entire and distinct, nevertheless that as they coalesce in Christ in one single Person, so that Person can possess but one will, divine-human, and not a divine and a human will combined in one personality. This party was then known as the Monotlielite, the one-will party. After this heresy was condemned at the sixth ecumenical council, held in Constantinople in 681, the controversy was closed, and the faith of the Church remained as represented by the old definitions until the time of the Reformation.

V. After the Reformation the Lutherans, in order to establish their doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ's human nature in the Lord's Supper, introduced a new-view as to his Person. The Eutychians taught that the humanity of Christ was absorbed in his divinity. The Lutherans taught that his humanity was exalted to an equality with the divinity. This they attempted to explain by the Communicatio Idiomatum—i. c. the communication of attributes from one nature to another, or the communion of one nature in the attributes of the other. The Lutherans held the formula Gommunieatio idiomatum utriusqm natures ad naturam—i. e. the communication of the attributes of each nature to the other nature. The Reformed churches, on the other hand, admitted that the attributes of each nature are communicated only to the one Person, which was common to both natures. The Lutherans thus held that at the moment of the incarnation, in virtue of the union between the divine and human natures, the human nature of Christ became omniscient, omnipotent and omnipresent. This doctrine is evidently not supported in Scripture —is not consistent with the integrity of Christ's human nature, for that which is omniscient, omnipotent and omnipresent is divine, and not human, and is plainly inconsistent with all the facts related in the Gospels as to our Lord's earthly life. He is there represented in all respects, as to knowledge,

power and space, as literally finite as other babes and men. This theory originated in the desire to lay a foundation for their doctrine that the body and blood of Christ are always present in, with and under the bread and wine in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. But it is evident that this foundation, instead of supporting, invalidates the sacramental presence. If his body and blood are omnipresent, then they are in, with and under all food and drink, and indeed in and under all material forms of every kind in all worlds. What they needed was not essential, constant, universal omnipresence, but " voluntary multipresence that is, the power upon Christ's part of rendering his body and blood present at many places at the same time at his own good pleasure. To reconcile their doctrine with these facts, one school of Lutheran theologians—viz. that of Tubingen, led by John Brentius—held that while on earth the human nature of Christ was really omnipotent and omnipresent, only that he hid the use of these attributes from man, like a king travelling incognito. Another school, that of Chemnitz, held that the use of these divine attributes of Christ's humanity was dependent upon his human will —that in his estate of humiliation on earth he voluntarily abstained from their use. This speculation of the Lutherans was the latest and most elaborate attempt ever made by theologians to explain how the two natures of Christ can coalesce in one person.

VI. The Eutychians held that the human nature was absorbed in the divine; the Lutherans, that the human nature was exalted to equality with the divine; the Reformed held that the eternal divine Person humbled himself to be united with humanity; the advocates of the modern German doctrine of Kenosis hold that the eternal Word himself became man—that Christ was and is both God and man, but that he is but one single nature as one single Person. They build on such texts as John 1:14 and Php 2:7, "He emptied himself." Kenosis means the act of emptying or the state of being emptied. They start with the orthodox doctrine that the Person of the Word, or Son, is eternally generated of his own substance by the Father. This generation makes the Son partaker of all the fullness of the divine nature, and is, they say, dependent upon the will of the Son, his voluntary act conspiring with the act of the Father. At the incarnation the eternal Son, of his voluntary act, emptied his person of the divine fullness, and became an unconscious human germ in the womb of the Virgin. From that point, and under the ordinary conditions of human birth and life, this divine germ developed through all the stages of human experience—infantine, youthful and mature. After his death and resurrection this same nature, the self-emptied Word, the divine germ, developed as a man, again expands into infinity and fills all things as God. His nature hence is one, because from first to last it is the divine substance communicated by the Father to the Son, who in turn voluntarily empting himself of all except the merest point of existence, which after his glorification expands again into infinity. He is one Person because he is one single nature. He is from first to last God as to Substance, but he has become, by passing through the womb of the Virgin Mary, man as to form. Thus he ever continues God in the form of man,—always God, because he subsists of the one eternal, self-existent Substance ; always man, because retaining the human form and experience acquired on earth.

This, confessedly, rests upon the assumption that the divine nature Is capable of taking upon itself humanity, and that the human nature is capable of receiving the properties of divinity. Hence it is evidently of a pure pantheistic descent. God is immutable, incapable of becoming unconscious and of passing through the limitations of the finite. To be man is to be finite and dependent. To be God is to be infinite and self-existent. Christ was both at the same time, because his Person

embraced two distinct natures, the divine and the human.

VII. The common doctrine of the Church, then, is as follows:

I. As to the incarnation.

1.Substance is that which has objective existence, permanence and power. Attributes are the active powers of their respective substances, and are inseparable from them. Only a divine substance can have divine attributes. Only a human substance can have human attributes. In the Godhead the one infinite divine Substance eternally exists in the form of three equal Persons.

2.In the incarnation the second Person of this Trinity established a personal union between itself and a human soul and body. These substances remain distinct, and their properties or active powers are inseparable from each substance respectively.

3. The union between them is not mechanical, as that between oxygen and nitrogen in our air; neither is it chemical, as that between oxygen and hydrogen when water is formed; neither is it organic, as that subsisting between our hearts and our brains; but it is a union more intimate, more profound and more mysterious than any of these. It is personal. If we cannot understand the nature of the simpler unions, why should we complain because we cannot understand the nature of the most profound of all unions?

II. As to the effects of the incarnation.

1.The attributes of both natures belong to the one Person, which includes both.

2.The acts of both natures are the acts of the one Person.

3.The human nature is greatly exalted, and shares in the love, adoration and glory of the divine nature. It all belongs to the one Person.

4.The human attributes of our Redeemer are the organ of his divine Person, and are through the divinity rendered virtually inexhaustible and ubiquitously available for us. When you put your babe to bed and leave him to go your own way to a distant place you say, " Love, fear not; Jesus will be with you while I am gone." You know Jesus will be with you also at the same time, and with all believers. By this you do not mean simply that Christ’s divinity will be with you and the babe. You mean that the Person who is very man as well as very God will be with you both. You want his human love and sympathy as well as his divine benevolence. If he were a mere man, he could be only at one place at one time, and his attention and sympathy would soon be overwhelmed by our demands. But he is at once God and man, and as such, in the wholeness and fullness of both natures, he is inexhaustible and accessible by all believers in heaven and on earth at once and for ever. The best illustration of this mystery is afforded by the union of soul and body in the unity of our own persons. The body is matter, the soul is spirit. Matter and spirit are incompatible, as far as we understand as incompatible as divinity and humanity. Matter is inert, extended and the vehicle of force. Spirit is spontaneous, inextended and the generator of force. Yet they form in us, under certain circumstances, one person. This is the person of the soul, not of the body, as shown before. The soul by this union is virtually confined to and extended in space, for wherever the body is, there the soul lives and feels through their union. The body, which is of itself inert and dead, is through its union with the soul palpitating with life, throbbing with feelings and instinct with energy.

Every act of each nature is also the act of the one person, and both natures concur in our actions, organic and voluntary. Even digestion is possible to the body only through the indwelling of the soul. But in all our higher actions, when the orator speaks or when the singer pours forth his soul in melody, both soul and body penetrating each other, yet distinct, constituting one person yet unconfused,—both soul and body act together inseparably. As human voice and instrument blend in one harmony, as human soul and body blend in each act of feeling, thought or speech, so, as far as we can know, divinity and humanity act together in the thought and heart and act of the one Christ.

I adore a Christ who is absolutely one, who is at the same time pure, unmixed, unchanged God, and pure, unmixed, unchanged man, and whose Person in its wholeness and its fullness is available throughout all space and throughout all time to those who trust him and love his appearing.

03.11. LECTURE 11 - THE OFFICES OF CHRIST

LECTURE XI THE OFFICES OF CHRIST. His Offices of Prophet and of Priest.

I am to open this afternoon the great subject of the Offices of Christ. In the last Lecture we discussed the great mystery of his Person as God and man in two distinct natures and one Person for ever. These three, Christ's Person, his Office and his Work, are absolutely inseparable. One of them cannot be understood as separated from the other two. He assumed humanity and became God and man in one Person in order that he might assume his office as Mediator between the holy God and sinful man, and his office and work are alike inconceivable except when viewed in connection with the unparalleled constitution and comprehensive range of his Person.

I. The office of Christ as Mediator is obviously one. He occupies the whole of it at the same time. He discharges exhaustively all the parts of it. All its parts have one end, and are mutually interdependent. The English word " office " unfortunately has come to have two meanings. In ordinary usage it stands for a concrete whole, a man occupying a position defined by law, involving many correlated functions, as the office of judge or of governor or of president. But, nevertheless, it continues to be used in its ancient classical meaning of function or duty, the exercise of which is involved in the office. This distinction is well marked by the Latin words munus and officium. The munm expresses the position defined by law, involving a destination and obligation to the accomplishment of a certain work. Officium, on the other hand, expresses the idea of function. Thus, Christ undertook but one munus or office, that of Mediator between God and man, in order to secure the salvation of his elect. But in doing this he necessarily discharges all the officia or functions which the work necessarily involves. The munus or office of Mediator involves all the three functions of the prophet, of the priest and of the king. These are not separate offices, as are those of president, chief-justice and senator, but they are the several functions of the one office of Mediator. They are not separate functions capable of successive and isolated performance. They are rather like the several functions of the one living human body —as of the lungs in inhalation, as of the heart in blood-circulation, and as of the brain and spinal column in innervation ; they are functionally distinct, yet interdependent, and together they constitute one life. So the functions of prophet, priest and king mutually imply one another: Christ is always a prophetical Priest and a priestly Prophet, and he is always a royal Priest and a priestly King, and together they accomplish one redemption, to which all are equally essential.

All these functions, moreover, equally involve the possession and exercise by Christ of the attributes of both his divine and his human natures. It was necessary that he should be God in order that he should be the original Prophet of prophets and Teacher of teachers of the secrets of the divine will; that he should as Priest and Sacrifice render an obedience in the stead of men which he did not owe for himself, and render by his vicarious sufferings a satisfaction to the justice of God of expiatory value equal to the sufferings of all men to all eternity; and that as King he should reign in the hearts and over the lives and destinies of all his people. It was no less necessary that he should be man in order that he should take man's place and obey and suffer in

man’s stead, and that he should become " a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people so that he himself, having suffered, being tempted, " is able to succor them that are tempted" (Hebrews 2:17-18).

II. This office or munus, having for its end the complete salvation of sinful men, is designated in the New Testament by two comprehensive titles:

(1) Μεσ■της, Mediator. This is applied in a lower sense to Moses, as a mere messenger or go-between, through whom the law was given to the Church from Sinai (Galatians 3:19-20). But it is applied in the highest sense to Christ, as the efficient Peacemaker, the Daysman, having full power to make the peace between God and man, and to deliver man efficaciously and with infallible certainty from all his dangers (1 Timothy 2:5-6).

(2) The second and more comprehensive title applied in Scripture to this great undertaking of Christ is παρ■κλητος, Paraclete. The word paraclete is the Greek equivalent for the Latin advocatm, advocate. The words advocate and παρ■-κλητος, mean one called in to help. The Roman " client’ the poor and dependent man, called in his " patron " to help him in all his needs. The patron thought for, advised, directed, supported, defended, supplied the necessities of, restored, comforted his client in all his complications. The client, however weak, with a powerful patron was socially and politically secure for ever. We are lost, we have nothing, and we need everything. "We are guilty, righteously condemned, held under sentence. We are ignorant, blind, weak, helpless. Christ undertakes for us just as we are, and he docs everything for us as our Advocate or Paraclete, called in to help us and deliver us. If any man sin, he has a Paraclete with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous (1 John 2:1). But even Christ cannot do the whole work alone. So when the Saviour, having finished his earthly work, was ready to depart, he said to his disciples, " I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another παρ■κλητος, (Paraclete, Advocate, unhappily translated Comforter), that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth " (John 14:16; John 14:26; John 15:26; John 16:7). In this munus or office of saving men the incarnate God-man and the Holy Ghost work together, the function of one being as essential as that of the other, and mutually depending upon that of the other. The God-man is our Patron, who undertakes for us in the functions of teaching, redeeming and ruling. The Holy Ghost is our other or co-ordinate Paraclete or Advocate, who unites us to Christ by dwelling in us, communicating his life to us, and executing in us all the beneficial and sacrificially merited stages and elements of Christ’s salvation. The two are together our perfect Paraclete. The one is our objective, external, transcendent Paraclete, sitting in, and reigning from, the heavens; the other is our subjective, internal, immanent Paraclete, dwelling in us and inspiring in us a divine life and hope. The essential parts of our salvation are regeneration, justification, sanctification, resurrection, glorification. These obviously involve, upon the part of the two divine Persons who together have undertaken the munus of our salvation, the distinct offices or functions of making reconciliation by atonement, of intercession and introduction to the Father, of teaching, of reigning over and disciplining the individual and the community of which he forms a part, and finally of quickening to life and communicating to the regenerate sinner his part in the benefits of Christ’s work, and preserving and perfecting him therein. These are distributed under the heads of the threefold functions of Christ as Prophet, as Priest and as King, and of the functions of the Holy Ghost, the immanent Paraclete ever dwelling in the hearts of his people.

III. The Function or Office of Christ as Prophet.—A prophet is one who speaks for another. In religious concerns a prophet is one who speaks to men for God. Hence he must be for this purpose a seer, one who sees, and therefore knows, and hence is qualified to speak in God's name. The absolutely necessary qualifications for the office are competent information, adequate powers of expression and unquestionable authority.

Every human prophet necessarily presupposes an infinite, eternal, divine Prophet from whom his knowledge is received, just as every stream presupposes a fountain from which it flows. As there must be a first mover in all movement and a first cause in all efficient causation, so there must be a first Teacher of all teachers and a supreme Lord of all lords.

Father, Son and Holy Ghost are equal in knowledge as well as in power and glory—equal, i. e., both in the sense of originality and of universal comprehension. All things involved in the divine Being; all things spontaneously emergent in the divine imagination; all things embraced in the divine purpose; all things that have been or shall be actually existent in the past, present or future,—are all in their inmost essences, as well as in their phenomena, present within the universal sweep of the intuitional consciousness of God for ever. But it is the function of the second Person in the constitutional economy of the Trinity to communicate objectively any portion of this divine knowledge to his intelligent creatures. He is the eternal Word of God. He, as to his divine nature, is the express image of the Godhead, otherwise invisible, and he is the radiant glory of the divine essence. No man hath seen God at any time save the Son and he to whom the Son reveals him. He that hath seen Christ, the incarnate Word, hath seen the Father. He is at once the Word in God, for eternally the Word was with God, and he is the Word from God, exhibiting the glories of God in the whole range of creations, providences and objective revelations. All the lights of nature, the broken fragments of tradition, the secrets of the ethnic temples, the wisdom of the schools, the crescent moons of philosophy, science and the arts, the broader daylight of modern civilization,—all these, and far more than these, the brightest constellations of supernatural revelation, the rising sun of the inspired Scriptures from the first dawn growing brighter and brighter to the perfect day, and the unparalleled radiance of the celestial throne within the circle of which the archangels stand,—all these are but the reflections of His inexhaustible light whose function it is to make manifest the otherwise hidden light of God. But as in all vision there must meet at once the complementary gifts of light and eyes—light the instrument and medium, eyes the organs—so in this communication of the light of God to his creatures the complementary functions of Christ radiating the light and of the Holy Ghost opening the intellectual and spiritual eyes must meet together. And especially in the case of fallen men, where this spiritual vision has been lost, the subjective eye-opening work of the Spirit is the more necessary. And these two have been working together in this prophetical function of the work of human redemption from the first. Abraham saw the day of Christ, and all the prophets spoke of him. The priesthoods of Aaron and of Melchizedek, the temple service in all its parts, were shadows of which his Person and work were the substance. The Spirit of Christ testified within all these holy prophets, and inspired their words and generated their religious experience, which in their immortal psalms have become normal to the Christians of all times. After his incarnation Christ's human nature became the most effective organ through which his teaching function was wrought out. His all-perfect human life, standing alone, the conspicuous anomaly of all history, is the transcendent lesson he has taught us—a lesson, alike as to the nature and prerogatives of God, and as to the possibilities and

responsibilities of man, which after the lapse of nearly two millenniums remains the acknowledged lesson of all the ages, acknowledged as well by foe as friend. In the appointed testimony of the twelve apostles, in the inspired text of the New Testament, in the special dispensation of grace which has led his Church forth through all the changes of two thousand years, in his general providence comprehending the evolution of all nations, in the ceaseless, everywhere active operations of the Holy Ghost in our hearts, in the new light breaking in upon each wondering soul at death, and in the revelation of unutterable things in the third heavens of which Paul had a transient glimpse which it is not lawful for a man on earth to utter,—Christ has been fulfilling the teaching function of his great work as Redeemer. And throughout all the eternal ages he will never cease. In the New Jerusalem, the city of gold and crystal, wherein the unending career of God's perfected sons shall be continuously run, he will still continue the inexhaustible Source of all their knowing. For for ever and for ever " the Lamb is the light thereof."

Even in this life this precious office of Christ in behalf of his people surpasses all estimate. It is to be feared that while taking refuge under our Lord's mediation as Priest, Christians now-a-days make far too little of his function in them as Prophet. The condition of our experiencing the full measure of this benefit is, that we should implicitly submit our whole intellects to him as our Teacher, that we follow him without question in our thinking as much as in our acting; that the entire encyclopaedia of human knowledge be brought under the regimen of his teaching; and that his doctrine in every department of thought be central and regulative to all other truth. On this condition, and on this condition only, he will grant us that unction from the Holy One whereby we shall know all things (1 John 2:20). Spiritual-mindedness is the crowning grace of a Christian character, and is the unquestionable evidence of the presence of eternal life. A new and celestial light is let in broadly over the whole horizon of our thought. The entire rational world is transfigured. Even in the case of some of the intellectually least highly endowed of Christ's people the telescope of faith reveals the deepest and most ravishing secrets of his kingdom. Just as in the material astronomy the telescope of highest power takes into its field the narrowest segment of the sky, so in the disclosures our divine Prophet makes to his redeemed on earth often the in-tensest insight into the glowing centre of the heavenly world is vouchsafed to those whom the world regards pitifully as the unlearned and foolish, and whom even the Church recognizes as only babes in Christ.

IV. The Office of Christ as Priest.—The unity of the human race and the universal sense of sin are proved by the fact that in all ages and nations all historical religions provide a priesthood to stand between God and his worshiper. A priest is a man divinely chosen, qualified and authorized to appear before God and to act in behalf of men. A prophet, we have seen, comes down from God manward. A priest goes up from man Godward. Bishop Butler (Analogy, pt. ii. ch. 5) and Michaelis declare that the universal prevalence of priests and peculiar sacrifices demonstrates the existence of a sensus communis essential to human nature as it now is, establishing the facts of human guilt, of divine justice, and of the absolute need of mediation and expiation. The entire state of the case stands pictured to us in the Jewish ritual with the utmost vividness as in a vast historical object-lesson. God created man in his own likeness; a weak creature, but with the potency of the highest powers, with the possibilities of the grandest destinies, and consequently the responsibility of maintaining a record and of achieving a character in conformity to the law of absolute moral perfection, armed with the alternative sanctions of the blessing of God which is life, or the curse of

God which is death.

Man, abusing all the conditions of a favorable probation, sinned, and fell under the inexorable condemnation of the immutable law which sways the moral universe in all cycles and in all realms. The judgment of this law was immediately and consistently executed upon the entire existent human race, inwardly in the conscience of man and outwardly in the providence of God. Ashamed, conscious of his defilement and nakedness, afraid, conscious of his guilt and alienation from God, man was driven out of the garden to wrestle with the wild forces of nature for a living, under the frown of God. Death and pain seized him, and the farther he wandered through the continents and down the ages, the farther he went from God, the more corrupt his nature and hopeless his condition. All along this line the Spirit of God strove with men, and under his inspiration men chose their best and wisest and sent them up to God as priests, with gifts and the blood of atoning sacrifices in their hands, if by any means per-adventure God's justice could be satisfied and his just wrath appeased.

All this ritual of mediation and of expiation was gathered together into one divinely-ordered system in the Mosaic tabernacle and ceremonial institution made in all things according to the pattern God showed to Moses in the mount (Hebrews 8:5). All members of the human family, as such, were judicially excluded from the divine favor and presence. But as God graciously purposed to redeem men and restore them to life in union with himself on certain conditions, he forthwith graciously selected the Israelites out of all the nations of the earth, and made them, in behalf of all nations, a priestly nation to represent all nations before God, and ultimately to be the organ of the reconciliation and restoration of all. Out of the nation of priests he chose the tribe of Levi to be a priestly tribe, to represent the whole nation before God and to act as the organ of its communion with God. Out of the tribe of Levi he chose the family of Aaron to be in the strictest sense the priestly order in successive generations, and of this family of priests the head by the law of primogeniture was the one high priest, in whom the whole body of priests, and through them the whole tribe and nation, and through them all the families of man on earth, are ceremonially summed up—who is the one absolute priest, the one adequate type of Christ, able to perform in his own person every part of the typical service.

According to this symbolism, God, although he is omnipresent and everywhere active in his natural relation, yet as Moral Governor and Source of spiritual life is withdrawn from the world and sits apart. But to give visible objective expression to his willingness to have men brought back to his favor and fellowship, he directed Moses to erect a tabernacle, afterward rendered permanent in the magnificent temple of Solomon—a place of meeting and communing between God and man (Exodus 25:22). This sanctuary was essentially a large parallelogram embracing three successive courts. The inner one of all, called the Most Holy Place, was entirely enclosed, shut in darkness, a perfect cube. Here God sat alone enthroned over the ark of the covenant, the foundation of his throne, containing the moral law expressed in the ten commandments, which were at once the foundation of his own government and his official indictment of all men as condemned sinners, and enthroned between the cherubim, or symbols of redeemed humanity as it will be in the end, when the true heavenly temple is consummated. This most holy seat of God holding aloof, yet willing to meet men on conditions consistent with his perfections, was separated from the next court by a close curtain, which none but the high priest, and he only once a year, could lift. Exterior to this was the Holy Place, which contained the table of shewbread, the golden candlestick and the altar

of incense, all symbolizing the Christian life redeemed, sanctified and offered as an acceptable sacrifice to God. Exterior to this was the outer court, sacred to the Jews or to the priestly nation, from which the uncircumcised Gentiles were excluded. A believing Israelite, conscious of sin, proposing to return to God and seek eternal life in him, had his way of return distinctly marked out. He must come first to the altar of burnt-offering and make expiation, and then to the laver of regeneration and seek spiritual cleansing, and then approach through the Holy Place to the veil which divided it from the immediate presence of God. On every occasion of sin he was directed to obtain a lamb perfect in age, sex and condition; take it to the priest before the altar; lay his hands upon its head, siguifying the transference to it of his guilt or obligation to endure the penalty; give it to the priest, who then executed upon it, in the stead of the sinner who presented it as his substitute, the capital penalty of death. Then the blood of the victim was sprinkled upon the sinner and upon the horns of the altar, in token of the expiation of sin upon the one hand and the propitiation of God upon the other. The promised effect of this service was, as is constantly asserted (Leviticus 4:20; Leviticus 5:10; Leviticus 5:13; Leviticus 5:16; Leviticus 5:18, etc.), that " his sin shall be forgiven him." On the great day of atonement, once every year, this priestly work was done, so as to exhibit the principle most perfectly. The high priest was the one whose office included and superseded that of all other priests. He represented the whole redeemed Church, the entire body of the elect, bearing the titles of all the tribes engraved upon his shoulders and upon his breast. He took two goats ceremonially perfect—two, yet constituting one sacrifice, to symbolize the entire function alike after and before death. On the head of the one goat he laid his hands and confessed all the sins of the whole people. The other goat he executed and sacrificed on the altar of burnt-offering. The first goat was then sent forth into the trackless wilderness bearing into absolute and final oblivion the sins of the people, now expiated by the vicarious death of the other goat. With the blood of the second goat and with a censer kindled with coals from off the altar of incense the high priest now passed through the otherwise inviolable curtain into the presence of God enthroned over the mercy-seat between the cherubim. This blood was now spread over the golden lid covering the ark of the covenant, shutting out the vision of God looking down upon the tables of the law, witnessing against the sins of men. David hence sings of the blessedness of him " whose transgressions are forgiven, whose sins are covered "—i. e. covered out of the sight of justice by sacrificial blood. The high priest represented the people. What he did, they did in him. And he, and they through him, could at best pass that veil but once a year, and then only with the fresh blood of the goat judicially slain in their stead. This was because God is just, and without the shedding of blood there is absolutely no remission. The restrictions which limited it to the one day in a year and to the freshly-repeated sacrifice originated in the incompetency of the blood of bulls and goats really to expiate the guilt of sin. The sacrifices of bulls and goats were like token-money (as our paper promises to pay), accepted at their face value until the day of settlement. But the sacrifice of Christ was the gold which absolutely extinguishes all debt by its intrinsic value. When, therefore, Christ by the one sacrifice of his divine-human Person had put away sin (Hebrews 9:26; Hebrews 10:10-12), the veil which shut off the Most Holy Place, the dwelling-place of God in the temple, " was rent from the top to the bottom "—that is, utterly and for ever removed (Matthew 27:51), so that not high priests only, but every trusting Christian fleeing from sin and the wrath which follows it, has boldness to enter, not once a year, but in every instant of need, " into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh" (Hebrews 10:20). The

entire religious life of the Jewish Church and of every individual believer centred in the priests, and preeminently in the high priest. He was the head of the nation and of the Church. He was the ever-living organ of their living union and fellowship with God. Cut off from the high priest, they were without God in the world, and without access or opportunity for any possible communication of prayer or sacrifice. But when in fellowship with the high priest they not only had peace with God, but they were at once translated into the sphere of divine life and relations; their prayers and sacrifices were accepted, and the presence of the Holy Ghost made their whole sphere alive with spiritual fruit-fulness and blessedness.

V. In all essential points this Mosaic ritual system was truly and designedly representative and expository of the mediatorial office, and especially of the priestly function, of Christ. The two correspond as shadow and substance, as token-money (paper promises to pay) and real money ; as type—u e. prophetic symbol—and antitype. 1st. Christ was a real priest:

(1) He possessed all the qualifications really, intrinsically and in the highest degree. He was absolutely righteous and holy; he had an absolute right of intimate access to God and the right of bringing near to God; he possessed in his own person on its human side the most intrinsically valuable and acceptable of all offerings; he was divinely appointed to this end (Hebrews 2:16; Hebrews 4:15; Hebrews 5:5-6; Hebrews 7:26; Hebrews 9:11-24 ; John 16:28; John 11:42).

(2) He performed all the parts of the priest's official work: (a) He mediated, in the general sense of the word (John 14:6; 1 Timothy 2:5); (6) he offered a propitiatory sacrifice (*Ephesians 5:2; Hebrews 9:26; Hebrews 10:12; 1 John 2:2); (c) he appeared in the true Most Holy Place, of which the inner court of the tabernacle was only the figure, and presented his sacrificed body for v&, and ever liveth to make intercession for us (Hebrews 9:24; Hebrews 7:25; Romans 8:34; 1 John 2:1).

(3) He was also the sacrificial victim. His characteristic designation is " the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." The Lord laid upon him the iniquity of us all: he was made a sin-offering for us (2 Corinthians 5:21). 2d. The Mosaic ritual was designed to be expository of his method of saving men. He does essentially and exhaustively that which the ritual services only symbolized.

These things " are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ" (Colossians 2:17; Hebrews 8:5). The whole New Testament, and especially the Epistle to the Hebrews, is a continuous commentary upon the truth of this assertion. The same is conspicuously proved by the fact that the veil of the temple (the key to the entire ritual order) was " rent in twain from top to bottom " the moment Christ's real sacrifice was offered. The instant the debt was discharged by the real payment the token-money was cancelled. The instant the real expiation was "finished" the whole symbolical system provisionally representing it became necessarily functum officio. Soon afterward, consequently, the temple was razed to the ground and the ritual rendered for ever impossible.

VI. On the other hand, the perfect priesthood of Christ and his one intrinsically efficacious sacrifice infinitely and in manifold ways transcend all created and finite types. Thus Paul, having shown abundantly that the priesthood of Aaron is typical of that of Christ, proceeds to show that he was too large and perpetual a priest to be one of a series included under the Aaronic order—that, on the contrary, he was an "everlasting priest" after the order of Melchizedek, who was without

predecessors or successors. The Aaronic priests came in succession, a series of many individuals. Christ abides a Priest for ever. The entire mediatorial and priestly work was, under the Mosaic system, distributed among many priests and Levites, each of whom did only his appointed part, while it was not the separate parts, but the coherent organic whole, which sufficed to effect the end designed. On the other hand, Christ discharges the entire priestly work alone, and he does it for all believers and during all time completely. " It is finished." Each of that series was morally impure, only ceremonially pure. Christ was absolutely pure and righteous. Each of that series was under the obligations of law, and owed obedience and expiation on his own account. Christ was God himself, above and personally independent of all legal responsibilities, able therefore to render a perfectly free vicarious service and penal suffering in the stead of others. The victim offered under the ceremonial institute had no intrinsic value. Christ is of infinite intrinsic value. The victim suffered without choice or conscious comprehension of the part it was taking in the drama of God's spiritual kingdom. In the case of Christ the real moral value of his expiating work as Priest, its power to make amends, to repair the offence of sin to the justice and law of Jehovah, did not reside in his mere sufferings, abstractly considered, either in their quantity or their quality, but in their connection with the moral attitude and exercises of the Person suffering. He in the sinner's place and suffering the penalty due the sinner, he in the mortal agonies of his soul, justified God's justice. He consented to the law which condemned him vicariously. His cross was not, like the final lake of fire, a scene of mere capital execution, a Golgotha. On the contrary, it is a greater and more glorious Mount Sinai on which the absolutely perfect moral law is affirmed and made venerable. It is the great white throne on which the Moral Governor of the universe sits regnant, revealed in immaculate whiteness ; it is the point wherein alone, in all the realms of space and all the successions of time, the inmost heart of the great Jehovah has been opened as through a wide window to the sight of his creatures; it is the focus in which all the divine perfections are blended in their most intense radiance. Here "mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other" (Psalms 85:10). And here the holy angels, the elder sons of God, experienced in all mysteries of the innermost " third heavens," gather in intense expectancy, and with faces veiled to shield them from the insufferable light "desire to look into" (1 Peter 1:12) this uncovered heart of God.

Besides, in the type the sinner was one party, the offended God another party, the mediating priest a third party, and the unwilling victim substituted in the place of the sinner is yet again a fourth party. From this the utter misconception has been inferred that Christ is a Friend of sinners, while God the Father is a stern, inimical Judge determined to crush them according to the forms of law—that Christ gives himself to suffer so as to excite the compassion of the angry Father and dispose him to open a way of escape to the objects of his wrath. AH love and mercy are attributed to Christ, while all inexorable justice and wrath are attributed to the Father. The Father is conceived of as relenting only in consequence of the effective satisfaction offered by the Son. But the truth is that the love and tenderness of the Father is the cause, not the effect, of the sacrificial death of his Son. " God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life."

Christ in his single Person unites the three parties of the offended God, the mediating priest and the substituted victim. It is not one divine Person offering satisfaction to another divine Person. But the divine nature in Christ, which is numerically one with that of the Father, is the very nature that

both demands and furnishes the satisfaction. The merciful God out of his infinite compassion assumes to himself, and inflicts upon himself in his own personal humanity, the penalty in the stead of the sinner. "Ipse deus, ipse sacerdos, ipse hostia, pro se, de se, sibi satisfecit" (John Wessel, 1419-89). Himself at once truly God and truly Priest and truly sacrificial Victim, he made satisfaction for the sins of men to himself, by himself, by means of his own agonies. The Father, Son and Holy Ghost equally love the sinner, while they equally demand punishment for the sin. The Father gives his well-beloved Son; the Son voluntarily and suijure puts himself in the sinner's place to receive the judicial blow; and it is by the eternal Spirit (sympathizing and co-operating) that he offered himself without spot to God (Hebrews 9:14). The whole Godhead in all the adorable Persons is revealed in this transcendent act of human redemption. They exhibit a common holiness tolerating no sin, and a common love sparing no sacrifice to deliver the beloved object from destruction. But to us this is especially revealed in the divine-human Person of Christ As he can the most fully sympathize with us because he is a man and has suffered, so we can most fully sympathize with him. In him we see the signs of sacrifice we understand—the bloody sweat, the crown of thorns, the pierced hands and feet and side. But he and the Father are one. The Person we see and love, the tears and blood we understand, are those of a man. But the man is God, and the blended righteousness and love which his death reveals are the righteousness and the love of God.

VII. This Priesthood of Christ is Absolutely Perfect.— 1st. He has been the medium of communication between God and man from the beginning through all stages of human history. His kingdom was prepared from the foundation of the world (Matthew 25:34). He has been Priest ever since the foundation of the world (Hebrews 9:25-26). He is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Revelation 13:8). The gospel which Paul preached and we believe is the mystery (secret) which from the beginning of the world had been hid in God, who created all things in Jesus Christ (Ephesians 3:9). Through him have all the scattered rays of true religion in all ages and to all people been revealed. In him all true believers of all dispensations have been accepted, and found the standing-place and life. Through his atonement not only all adult believers, but all dying in infancy, all idiots and all who have been saved by any extraordinary means known only to God, are reconciled to God and stand absolved from guilt.

2d. He is, in the complete and permanent and saving sense, the Priest only of his own people, his sheep, those from the beginning given him by the Father, those who believe on him through the effectual calling of his Spirit Nevertheless, it is true that in a very important sense he has always been the Priest of the whole historic human race. He is the second Adam. He took upon himself human nature, the seed of Abraham. He was made under the law and fulfilled the obligations, perceptive and punitive, which rest upon all men alike. He arrested in behalf of the whole race as a body the immediate execution of the legal penalty. The whole course of human history, of all peoples and nations, of all religions and civilizations, has been evolved under the shield of his cross, under a dispensation of arrested judgment or forbearance, secured through his mediation. He by his expiation removed utterly out of the way of all men alike the objective hindrances in the justice of God and in the judgment of the law which rendered their salvation absolutely impossible. In this general sense Christ, as the man whom God has appointed Priest, is the common bond of the whole human race, and his meritorious service the common basis of all human history.

3d. But while he, in his priestly work, has made the salvation of all men possible on the condition of their accepting it, he has made the salvation of those whom the Father has given him certain by purchasing for them that faith which is the condition of their personal participation in his work. He rendered his obedience and suffering in the stead of those whom he represented under a covenant with his Father. The Father from the beginning " gave to him " his sheep. These, by the very act of Christ's atonement, are secured to him. When it pleased the Lord to make his soul an offering for sin, it was also provided that he should see his seed —that he should see of the travail of his soul and should be satisfied (Isaiah 53:10-11). Our Confession of Faith declares (chap. viii. § 5): " The Lord Jesus, by his perfect obedience and sacrifice of himself, which he through the eternal Spirit once offered up unto God, hath " not only " fully satisfied the justice of the Father," but also " purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven for all those whom the Father hath given unto him." Not merely forgiveness of sins, but all that we shall ever experience: regeneration, justification, the adoption of sons, fatherly discipline, perseverance, increase of grace, deliverance in death, the resurrection of our bodies and all the unimaginable beatitudes of heaven,—all these, kingdom and priesthood and glory, are parts of " the purchased possession" secured for us through the priesthood of Christ.

4th. And the perfection of Christ's priesthood is this, that he is a Priest for ever. We rest not upon an historic fact long passed, upon a priestly office transacted in our behalf two thousand years ago. But we rest upon a living Priest, an absolutely immortal Priest, whose entire priestly work, past, present and future, is all one. We rest on a Priest who is not only living, but who is the omnipresent, immanent Source of eternal life to all who accept his mediation. He is ever appearing in the presence of God for us. He is ever making intercession for us. He sits enthroned at the right hand of all power, making all things work together for good to them who love him. He is at the same time, through his Spirit, omnipresent as our Priest in all hearts and throughout all lives—in our hearts and in our lives, in our closets and in our homes, in our markets and in our temples, making intercession for us and making intercession with-iu us (Romans 8:26-27). And he is our only Priest. The Christian ministry is not a priesthood. This is a fundamental doctrine. The titles by which this ministry is called in the New Testament, and all the inspired definitions of the office to be discharged by these ministers, fall under the two categories of teaching and ruling. Absolutely nothing else is provided for; absolutely nothing else is even hinted at; absolutely no place is left for a New Testament priesthood. Christ occupies the office, and discharges all the functions of it exhaustively. Before Christ came there was a place for a symbolical priesthood as types or prophetical settings-forth of his priesthood. But there is no place for the token-money when the gold has been paid. There is no place for the type when the antitype has come, no place for the shadow when the sun shines at noon. It is error to suppose that Christ's work can be rendered more complete, is supplemented, by an earthly priesthood. It is error to suppose that we need many or any other earthly mediators to go between us and Christ, who is our Brother, our own flesh and blood, within us and around us all the time.

Dear friends, take my advice in this. In maintaining our evangelical position against Romanists, Ritualists and exclusive Churchmen, do not waste your force by laying emphasis upon any subordinate question as to church government, liturgies or parity of the clergy.

Stand up only for essentials. Strike right at the heart of error. The three central dangerous errors of Romanism and Ritualism are these:

(1) The perpetuity of the apostolate;

(2) the priestly character and offices of Christian ministers;

(3) the sacramental principle, or the depending upon the sacraments as the essential, initial and ordinary channels of grace.

These are three radical heresies which exclude the truth, derogate from the honor of Christ and betray souls by inducing them to build upon false foundations. But if these three pestiferous roots of error are excluded, there can be no difference of radical importance between bodies of Christians who hold to the historic faith of " the holy catholic Church."

5th. Being a Priest for ever, he will be the organ of our communion with God, and his merits the foundation of our standing during all eternity as well as upon earth. In the New Jerusalem the " Lamb shall be the light thereof." As a " Lamb that has been slain " he stands in " the midst of the throne." And of all the redeemed it is said that " the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters" (Revelation 7:17).

6th. And, finally, we are rendered complete in him, "for in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and in him ye are made full, who is the Head of all principality and power" (New Version, Colossians 2:9-10). Having identified himself with us, he identifies us with himself. We are endowed with both the qualifications and prerogatives which distinguish himself in relation to God. We receive an unction from the Holy One, and know all things. We receive as the priests of God the right to draw near to the inmost heart of God and to offer acceptable service and worship. We are delivered from all bondage, alike from the evil within us and from the evil without us, and we are set in the position of those who reign over all the subordinate powers alike of the material and of the spiritual worlds. He crowed us with his own crown, and made us to sit with himself on his own throne, for we are, through the whole range of our being and during the entire sweep of our existence, joint-heirs together with Christ. This truth is as sure as it is wonderful. Yet it utterly pass-eth understanding. Thought gives place to emotion and rises into adoring rapture: " Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever." " For thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth."

03.12. LECTURE 12 - THE KINGLY OFFICE OF CHRIST

LECTURE XII THE KINGLY OFFICE OF CHRIST. That the office of Mediator between God and sinful men must include the function of kingly dominion and control is self-evident. Christ's functions as Prophet and Priest would have been ineffective without it. That the promised Messiah of the Old Testament was to be a King, and that the historical incarnate God of the New Testament actually is a King in the highest sense, are witnessed to by almost every page of the whole Bible.

" There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel" (Numbers 24:17); "His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace " (Isaiah 9:6); I have "set my King upon my holy hill of Zion. . . . Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel" (Psalms 2:6-9); "One like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, aud 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 angel Gabriel, in the annunciation to the Virgin Mary, said, " Thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus.

He shall be great, and shall be called the Sou 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 1:31-33). The universality and pre-eminence and absoluteness of his kingly authority is expressed in the Revelation when it is declared that the Lamb is " King of kings and Lord of lords." The ancient Hebrews in reading substituted "Adonai" for "Jehovah." The Septuagint translates Adonai by K■ριος Lord. This latter word occurs between seven and eight hundred times in the New Testament, and in the vast majority of instances it is applied to Christ. The title which spontaneously springs to the lips of all men, even of the indifferent stranger, but with infinitely more meaning from the lips of all who have been made recipients of his love, is Lord, Jesus, Possessor, Master, Sovereign. It is universal over all, dominating the highest as well as the lowest, comprehending and bending to its own sway all lower authority and power—King of kings. It is absolute in all, knowing no limit in soul or body, in time or eternity, absolutely owning, possessing and disposing to his own uses all we are and all we possess, each thing entirely, and all things in all relations.

I. And all this is predicated of him not merely as God, but as God-man in his work as Mediator between God and man. As the second Person of the Trinity, equal in power and glory to the eternal Father, the Word of God possesses an absolute, inherent sovereign dominion as King over the whole universe. This authority is intrinsic, underived, inalienable, and is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever. During all the years of the earthly life of the God-man, alike while an unconscious babe in the manger and while hanging a dying victim on the cross, the eternal Son of

God was exercising his sovereign dominion over the entire universe. But in his office as Mediator, and in his entire Person after the incarnation as God-man, he was constituted a King by the authority of the entire Godhead as represented in the Father. His mediatorial sovereignty is derived as contradistinguished from his essential divine sovereignty as intrinsic. It is given to him by the Father as the reward of his obedience and suffering. "He 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, yea, the death of the cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on 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 2:7-11). This authority, thus bestowed upon him by the Father, is special, having particular reference to the salvation of his own people, and, to that end, to the administration of all the provisions of the covenant of grace, of which he is the gracious executive. It attaches not to his divine nature exclusively, but to his entire Person as the Godman. A max sits upon the mediatorial throne of the universe. He who stood insulted, despised, condemned at Pilate's judgment-seat, now sitting at the right hand of God, rules all worlds, as he will hereafter, seated on the great white throne, judge all men. Our blood-brother according to the flesh has " all power in heaven and in earth," that he may " make all things work together for good to them who love God." The attributes of both the divine and the human natures are together exercised in the administration of this kingly reign. All his kingly acts are infinitely wise, righteous and powerful, because he is God. But they are at the same time the acts of a man. They possess a truly human quality, for in all his administration he has a feeling for our infirmities as well as an eye for our interests.

II. Christ is already a King upon his throne in the full sweep of his kingly administration. He has, of course, as the eternal Word, been Mediator between God and sinful man ever since the fall of Adam. Otherwise, the sentence of the law must have been unconditionally executed immediately upon the apostasy. Ever since, we have been living and human history has been evolved under a system of forbearance involving an arrest of judgment. This was of course possible only as the human family has existed under the protection of a divine and competent Mediator. All the functions of the mediatorial office mutually imply one another. If he were " the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world " (Revelation 13:8), he must have been a Prophet before Moses, a Priest before Aaron, and a King before David. He was in these respects their predecessor and the ground from which they sprang, as well as their successor and antitype. A close inspection shows that the Jehovah of the Old Testament, who is also called the Angel of, or the one sent by, Jehovah, is the second Person of the Trinity, as is declared by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. (Compare Psalms 45:6-7 and Hebrews 1:8-9; Genesis 31:11; Genesis 31:13; Genesis 48:15-16, and Hosea 12:2-5, Exodus 4:14; Exodus 4:14 and Acts 7:30-35.) He reigned over all human affairs, as the biblical history relates. He gave the law from Sinai, including the entire ceremonial ritual, as well as the Ten Commandments. He brought Israel out of Egypt through the wilderness and established them in the Holy Land "with a mighty hand, and with an outstretched arm, and with great terribleness, and with signs, and with wonders " (Deuteronomy 26:8). He fought their battles with the Philistines, established his types and representatives, David and Solomon, upon their temporary symbolical thrones, and he directed the entire course of human history to the consummation of the fullness of times, in preparation for his own advent in the flesh.

But, on the other hand, in the strictest sense we must date the actual and formal assumption of his kingly office, iu the full and visible exercise thereof, from the moment of his ascension into heaven from this earth aud his session at the right hand of the Father. He could not have actually entered upon his kingly office as the God-man before he had become both God and man in the one Person through his incarnation. His function as Priest in a sense precedes his function as a King, as well as acts together with it. His atonement is the foundation of his royal right to his people and his royal administration in their behalf. When he was announced it was " declared that the kingdom of heaven was at hand." He was received by his disciples and rejected by the Jews as one claiming to be a king. Pilate wrote the title of his kingship in three languages and attached it to his cross. "This man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool" (Hebrews 10:12-13). His kingly office is essentially the royal dispensation of grace by him as a Saviour. In order that this may be universally and infallibly effectual and complete, he declares that now "all power is given to me in heaven and on earth," and he founds on this his great commission to his Church: " Go ye therefore, and disciple all nations." And Peter on the great day of Pentecost declared that when the prophet David recorded the sworn promise of God to raise up Christ to sit upon the throne, he spake of the resurrection of Christ: " This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this. 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 2:32-36).

III. The present mediatorial kingdom of the God-man is absolutely universal, embracing the whole universe and every department of it. This principle evidently involves the most momentous consequences. It has been disastrously abused by the Papal Church, and just as disastrously ignored by the Protestants. It follows logically from the Papal principles that the Church is an external visible organization of which the pope, the vicegerent of Christ, is the head—that if Christ is absolute Sovereign over the universe and all its departments, then the pope, his vicar, is supreme governor at least over all bodies and affairs of mankind. But upon Protestant principles this atrocious consequence disappears. The Church is not a corporation or visible organization. Christ has no representative exercising vicariously his royal authority on earth. There is no question as to Church authority or union between Church and State involved. Protestants should shut out for ever all these dead issues and the prejudices which they excite, and open their minds to the scriptural evidence and to the stupendous and infinitely blessed practical consequences of the great principle I have stated—that the mediatorial kingdom of the God-man is absolutely universal, embracing in its rightful sway all God’s creatures and all their actions. This truth, nevertheless, is just as plainly and as certainly taught in the New Testament as any other article of our faith. In Psalms 8:1-9, God declares his purpose to put all things under the feet of man. This purpose Paul (Ephesians 1:20-23) declares was fulfilled in Christ when he raised him from the dead and set him at his own right hand in heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world (aion); and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be Head over all things to the Church. He declared to his disciples, as the ground of the commission he gave to them, " that all power had been given to him in heaven and on earth." In Php 2:9-10, Paul says: "God 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." This absolutely and exhaustively includes

the whole universe in all its categories of heaven, earth and hell, just as the passage in Ephesians includes all duration, the a ion, or world-age, which now is and that which is to come. And this is repeated and emphasized in the most forceful language in Hebrews 2:8 : " For in that he put all things in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him and in 1 Corinthians 15:27, He only " is excepted which did put all things under him." That is, absolutely all things but God the Father. And all this is spoken, not of his authority as eternal God, but of his mediatorial authority as God-man : because (1) it is given to him by the Father;

(2) it is given to him as the reward of his obedience and sufferings;

(3) when the purpose for which it is given is fully accomplished, " when he has subdued all things unto himself," he shall deliver up this "given" kingdom over the universe " to God even the Father," and become himself, as God-man, "subject unto Him that put all things under him, that God may be all and in all" (1 Corinthians 15:24-28).

Theologians have accordingly made a distinction, designed to classify the different aspects and methods of this vast administration of royal power between Christ's kingdoms of power, of grace and of glory. These, of course, are not absolutely different realms or spheres of government, since the kingdom of power includes the kingdom of grace, and the kingdom of grace precedes and prepares the way for the kingdom of glory. They are rather different methods of working and different special systems of administration, all comprehended in his universal reign as King.

I. Christ's Kingdom of Power.—This is the providential reign of the God-man over the whole universe in the interests of his mediatorial work as Redeemer of his own people. The universe in all its provinces, material and spiritual, constitutes one system. The certain attainment of any end, the absolute control of any single department, necessarily involves the control and the co-ordinate administration of all the parts.

(1.) Hence Christ's universal kingdom of power must include, in the first instance, his providential control of the whole physical universe. The physical universe is the necessary basis of the intellectual, moral and spiritual world. The higher cannot be adequately governed unless the lower is controlled. The laws of matter and the order of the material world remain the same as before, and no change takes place that can be discovered by science. Nevertheless, the glorious fact is that the God-man, as mediatorial King, has, during the present aion or world-age, brought the whole mechanism of the material universe into requisition as means to secure the establishment of his mediatorial kingdom. He guides the marshaled hosts of heaven to that supreme result. The great currents of all the world-forces are directed to that end. The sweet influences of the Pleiades obey his voice and the bands of Orion are in his hands. It is not the God absolute, but it is our kinsman Redeemer, the man who is also God, who orders the courses of the stars, " who covereth the heaven with clouds, who prepareth rain for the earth, who maketh grass to grow upon the mountains; who giveth to the beast his food, and to the young ravens when they cry;" who " numbereth all the hairs of our heads," and " will not allow any plague to come nigh our dwelling."

(2.) Christ's mediatorial kingdom of power includes the universal moral government of God over all his intelligent creatures. The moral government of God over the human family constitutes only one province of the immeasurable empire. Angels and devils and whatever intelligent creatures may exist in other worlds must constitute one systematic moral whole with the human race. The entire

moral empire of God must be governed on the same general principles of righteousness. The will of God must be the common rule of all, his love their common motive, his glory their common end, his fellowship their common goal. Christ in this widest sense is King of kings and Lord of lords. God hath appointed his Son " heir of all things." He is placed far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named." " All in heaven and all on earth, who are to bow at the name of Jesus," include all rational creatures. And all men and angels are to be gathered to his judgment-seat. The devils " are reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day " (Jude 1:6).

He exercises this universal moral government providentially in various ways, according to the various characters and conditions of his subjects, but always upon the same principles of essential righteousness. He era-ploys angels as ministering spirits for his people at present, and he will employ them as his executive agents in the siftings of the great judgment. He restrains and controls the action of the devil and his angels, the spirits of the power of the air. He controls all events for the good of his people. Especially, he directs events to the end of effecting their complete discipline and education, and consequent preparation for the enjoyment of his glory. The end is the complete redemption of his people. But in order to secure this all the members of the human family in their successive generations and in their various family and national groups must be dealt with as subjects of the same government. During the present world-age it is not God absolute, but our kinsman Redeemer, the God-man, who is the Lord, " the Governor among the nations." He speaks with authority to every conscience. He has a supreme right to control for his own ends the service of every life. He orders every political and social event and the entire evolution of civilization and associated human activity to the accomplishment of his supreme end. And at the close every tribe and people and tongue shall stand to be judged before his throne and to have its destiny fixed by his decree.

II. Christ’s Kingdom of Grace.—This spiritual kingdom, which is the special care of Christ, for the sake of which his government of the universe is undertaken, respects first, his own spiritual people individually, and second, his professed people collectively organized in the visible Church.

(1.) Christ reigns over his own individually, both from without and from within. From without he subdues his and their enemies, restraining Satan, his angels and wicked men. He strengthens them in weakness, defends them in danger, directs and co-operates with them in action, and gives them ultimately the victory in all their contests, and causes them always to persevere to the end, that they may receive the crown of life. He also, under the inspiration of his Spirit, brings his spiritual people into sympathy with one another, and stimulates and guides the great currents of sympathy and the large interdenominational movements of the catholic Church, and all the various functions in which is manifested the " communion of saints." From within, the God-man reigns supreme in every Christian heart. It is impossible to accept Christ as our Sacrifice and Priest without at the same time cordially accepting him as our Prophet, absolutely submitting our understanding to his teaching, and accepting him as our King, submitting implicitly our hearts and wills and lives to his sovereign control. Paul delights to call himself the δο■λος, purchased servant, of Jesus Christ. Every Christian spontaneously calls him our Lord Jesus. His will is our law, his love our motive, his glory our end. To obey his will, to work in his service, to fight his battles, to triumph in his victories, is our whole life and joy.

(2.) Christ’s kingdom of grace also embraces his visible Church. Although the true Church is constituted simply by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, and although no organization is essential to its being or coextensive with its existence, nevertheless Christ wills that his true Church shall, for great practical ends, tend always spontaneously to organize itself in some form. Its forms are very various, determined in their differences by providential conditions, and they are of very different excellence, and yet they are all, whether better or worse, forms of the true Church, and therefore co-ordinate phases of the one Church. And Christ alone is the legitimate Head of this visible Church in any of its forms whatsoever. He has appointed no vicegerent. He has forbidden his servants to be called rabbi or master.

He pronounces a curse upon those who lord it over his heritage, whether national sovereigns or universal patriarchs or popes. He has in his inspired Word and through his ever-indwelling Spirit provided for the government of this Church through all ages. He has therein ordained the conditions of membership, the laws and offices, and he by his gracious providence leads to the selection of the right incumbents. There is no doctrine we are bound to believe which he has not clearly revealed in his Word, nor any duty we are bound to fulfill. The disciples of Christ are the Lord’s freemen, discharged from all human bondage, because they are bound to render absolute obedience to him alone. It is to this principle that the Church of Scotland and her long line of martyrs, under Knox, Melville and Chalmers, have borne such a noble testimony. The Covenant bound Scotland and Puritan England to live or to die by Christ’s crown and covenant.

Christ declared that his kingdom is "not of this world"—that it is not one kingdom associated with the other kingdoms, with like organizations, laws, methods of administration and ends. But it is a spiritual kingdom, embracing and interpenetrating all others, so different in method and ends from them that it cannot, when loyal to its Head, interfere with any of them or enter into organic alliance with any of them. Its Head, members, laws, officers, methods, penalties and rewards and ends are not of this world, but are spiritual —i e. they are revealed and applied by the Holy Ghost, and they bring man into relation to the great world of spiritual realities which is revealed in the Scriptures. The kingdom of Christ therefore interpenetrates all the political commonwealths of this world, and all the political commonwealths of this world embrace the kingdom of Christ. Like different gases, the kingdom of Caesar and the kingdom of Christ are vacuums to each other. They interpenetrate each other in occupying the same territory, and yet each retains its own identity and properties unchanged. They necessarily affect each other on certain sides, but when properly administered they do not interfere with one another. Having the same subjects, they nevertheless have entirely different ends, different agencies, different laws and different methods.

III.Christ’s Kingdom of Glory.—During the present age Christ is set forth principally as a conquering Captain, reigning at the head of his militant host, the Captain of our salvation (Hebrews 2:10) and the conqueror of his and our enemies and the subduer of the world (Revelation 19:11 (1G). But hereafter the Scriptures reveal a final consummation, when Christ’s kingdom shall be complete in all its members and shall be developed to its perfect state—when all the redeemed shall he gathered, the crisis of judgment passed, the glorified bodies of the saints reunited to their perfected spirits: then " shall the Son of man sit in the throne of his glory," and "there shall be no more curse; but the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him. And they shall see his face; and his name shall be in their foreheads" (Revelation 22:3-4).

IV.But if Christ's mediatorial kingdom is, as asserted, absolutely universal—especially if his direct authority embraces without exception every human being on the face of the earth during all ages, in all their relations and in all their actions—then the question necessarily arises, If Christ's kingdom embraces every human relation, how can there be any distinction between Church and State, between the things which belong unto Caesar and the things that belong unto Christ? This is a question which, however simple in itself, has continued to puzzle the minds of men from the beginning, and this confusion of thought has necessarily introduced confusion and conflict of action.

Among the Jews the State and the Church were one identical organism, discharging both secular and ecclesiastical functions, in part through the same officers and in part and at times through distinct officers. The answer given by the Papists, while admitting the distinction touching Church and State, is that as Christ is King of all men and his authority is supreme in every sphere of human interest and action, the pope his vicar reigns in his name supreme over all earthly sovereigns; that the Catholic Church, an external organized body, is in every land supreme over the State, the State being, in truth, only a subordinate and changeable organ of the Church for the purpose of executing the functions of temporal government. The answer of the Erastians, of the State-Church systems, makes the State supreme over the Church, and the Church is practically regarded only as an organ of the State for the purpose of effecting the functions of religious institution and worship. But the true principle has in this last age become generally recognized, that State and Church, considered as organized societies with laws and officers, have entirely distinct spheres, methods and objects, and hence that they have no specific organic relation to one another whatever. They indeed embrace the same territory and the same personal constituents. The same men and women who in one relation constitute the State in another relation constitute the Church. The State deals with the persons and property of Church members and with the public property of ecclesiastical societies precisely as she deals with that of all other persons and voluntary societies, and the members of the Church and ecclesiastical societies owe precisely the same obedience to the State that is owed by all other citizens and associations.

All this is perfectly clear and true, but inferences have been drawn from these principles which absolutely divorce the State from all religion and emancipate it entirely from the mediatorial authority of Jesus Christ. It is absurdly argued that if the State is absolutely free from any entangling alliances with the Church, it must be free from all religious qualities and obligations; that if it is free from the authority of the Church as an organized society, it must be free from the authority of Jesus Christ, the Head of the Church, and of the Bible, which contains his code of laws. It is argued that as no man has any right to impose his own religious convictions on others, so no body of men can possess any such right, and therefore that no majority of citizens has the right to impose by State legislation upon a recalcitrant minority obligations having a religious origin. These inferences, however unwarrantable and preposterous, are exceedingly prevalent, and are admitted, if not proclaimed, by many true Christians who are unconscious of their absurdity and utter disloyalty to the Lord that bought them and whom they profess to serve as their King.

It is very evident that it does not follow because the organized bodies we call " churches" have no organic connection with the State, nor any right to pronounce judgment upon things purely within the jurisdiction of the State, that therefore the State has nothing to do with religious laws or

obligations. There are three positions here of infinite importance to the Christian citizens of the United States:

1st. As a matter of fact, every State in the world must have, and has had, a religion of some kind. The State is an association of human beings for the purpose of promoting and protecting the interests of society within the limits of secular life. The State is the people themselves acting in their organic capacity through the machinery of law. It is self-evident, therefore, that the State or collective body must have all the qualities which belong to its constituent members. A house is a great deal more than the wood or brick or stone or iron of which it is built; nevertheless, every house has the quality of its material, whether wood or brick or stone or iron, and will necessarily act under given circumstances as determined severally by the nature of its material. So every State is vastly more than the persons of which it is composed; nevertheless, the character of the State must in every respect be determined by the character of the people which constitute it. If the people are rational the State will be rational; if moral, then moral; if rich or energetic, then it will possess those qualities; and, none the less, if the people be religious will the State they compose be religious.

It is simply absurd that a man can be thoroughly convinced that God exists and that he is a Moral Governor who will demand an account for all the deeds done in the body—that he can have his heart full of loyal affection and devotion to God as an individual while engaged in private business, and then be perfectly oblivious of the existence and of the claims of God as soon as he begins to act politically as a citizen of the State. If a man knows that God has forbidden theft, or incest, or divorce except on certain conditions, or the pursuit of worldly business on the weekly Sabbath, he cannot as a citizen do otherwise than make and execute laws in conformity to the known will of God. If a State in its public law acts atheistically, it can only be because a majority of its citizens are in heart atheists, no matter what religious professions they may make. Middle ground, a negative position, is absolutely impossible. God is either recognized or denied, he is either carefully obeyed or rebelliously disobeyed; and this impossibility of a negative position is just as true in political societies and in their conduct as in any other department of human life. Every nation has a religion or is positively, aggressively atheistic; indifference is antagonism.

2d. Every Christian must believe that the State ought to be obedient to the revealed law of Christ. This is so because—

(1) the Word of God explicitly declares that " the powers that be are ordained of God;" that "rulers are ministers of God to us for good;" that "whoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God" (Romans 13:1-4).

(2) Because Christ himself explicitly declared that to him as Mediator all power (εξουσ■α, right of dominion) in heaven and on earth had been committed (Matthew 28:18). He is thus made " Lord of lords and King of kings."

(3) Because the Christian revelation expressed in the inspired Scriptures expresses the will of Christ upon many subjects in which it can be carried out only through the agency of the State and of her laws and officers. The State must pronounce her will as to the rest of the Sabbath day, as to marriage and divorce, as to the rights of property and the relations of capital and labor, as to capital punishment and as to the education of the young. The ground covered by these subjects

the State cannot possibly avoid. And it is equally impossible for a Christian man, who knows the will of Christ as to the points in question, to ignore or disobey that will when acting in the capacity of a citizen of the State. If he does do so, he is consciously guilty of direct disloyalty to his Lord. All intelligent and honest Christians must seek to bring all the action of the political society to which they belong obedient to the revealed will of Christ the supreme King, the Ruler among the nations. The Church and the State are mutually, entirely independent. The officers and the laws of the one have no jurisdiction within the sphere of the other. Nevertheless, Christ is the common King of each, and his Bible is the common statute-book of each. The only difference is, that under the one and selfsame King, Christ, the light of nature is the primary, the word of Scripture the supplementary, law of the State; while the word of revelation is the primary and the light of nature the supplementary law of the Church. But Christ and conscience and the Bible rule equally in each sphere.

3d. These United States of North America are, and from the beginning were, of law, of right and of actual fact, a Christian nation. The original colonies were settled by bodies of men of conspicuous Christian character, who emigrated from their European homes for religious reasons. They were Puritans, Huguenots, Scotch, Scotch-Irish, Dutch and German Presbyterians, Quakers, Episcopalians and Roman Catholics, but all alike Christians. Beyond any other equally various and numerous set of men known in human history, they were earnest Christians, and they came here for the very purpose of crystallizing their faith in imperishable institutions. These men subdued the wilderness, founded the nation and laid all the foundation-stones of our constitutional law. The common law of England, the creature of Christianity, is the common law of nine-tenths of our States and Territories. Christian denominations, Episcopal or Independent, were established by law in almost all the early colonies.

Theism is recognized explicitly in almost all our State constitutions, and Christianity in many of them. Christianity has been recognized from the first by explicit action in the appointment of chaplains for Congress and for the army and navy of the United States and for the legislatures and prisons of the several States; by the appointment of fast-days and of thanksgiving-days by the supreme magistrates of the several States and of the nation ; and by the enactment of the Sabbath laws and of the laws for the suppression of blasphemy. What was true at the first has been becoming more and more true to the actual fact ever since. Nearly one-half of all the actual adult population of the country are communicants in the Christian churches. The ratio of the communicants in our evangelical churches to the whole population was in 1800 as 1 to every 14.50 of all ages; in 1850 it was as 1 to every 6.57; in 1870, as 1 to every 5.78; and in 1880, 1 to every 5 of the total inhabitants; while in the mean time between six and seven millions of our Roman Catholic fellow-Christians have come into existence. From 1800 to 1880 the whole population of the nation has increased 9.46 fold, while in the same time the communicants of our evangelical churches have increased 27.52 fold.

There are not two laws for individuals and for communities. The obligations which bind individuals necessarily bind all the communities which these individuals constitute. Every human being is bound to be Christian; therefore every community of human beings is bound to obey the law of Christ. The United States, as a matter of historic fact, have always professed to be a Christian State, and we are therefore doubly bound to this allegiance—

(1) by virtue of the common obligation which binds all men;

(2) by virtue of the special opportunities and covenants of our ancestors, which descend upon us by natural inheritance.

V. The overwhelming importance of this principle and weight of this obligation appear in the clearest light the moment the nation claims to regulate the supreme function of education. It is insisted upon that the right of self-preservation is the highest law of States as well as of individuals; that if the suffrage is universal, all holders of that suffrage must be educated in order to secure the safety of the State; that in consequence of the heterogeneous character of our population and the divisions of the Christian Church there is no agency in existence competent to educate the whole body of the holders of the universal suffrage except the State herself. The situation, therefore, stands thus:

1st. The tendency of the entire system, in which already vast progress has been made, is to centralization. Each State governs her own system of common schools by a central agency, which brings them, for the sake of greater efficiency, into uniformity of method and rules. These schools are graded and supplemented by normal schools, high schools and crowned by the State university. The tendency is to unite all these school systems of the several States in one uniform national system, providing with all the abundant resources of the nation for the entire education of its citizens in every department of human knowledge, and in doing this to establish a uniform curriculum of study. uniform standards for the selection of teachers and a uniform school literary apparatus of textbooks, etc.

2d. The tendency is to hold that this system must be altogether secular. The atheistic doctrine is gaining currency, even among professed Christians and even among some bewildered Christian ministers, that an education provided by the common government for the children of diverse religious parties should be entirely emptied of all religious character. The Protestants object to the government schools being used for the purpose of inculcating the doctrines of the Catholic Church, and Romanists object to the use of the Protestant version of the Bible and to the inculcation of the peculiar doctrines of the Protestant churches. The Jews protest against the schools being used to inculcate Christianity in any form, and the atheists and agnostics protest against any teaching that implies the existence and moral government of God. It is capable of exact demonstration that if every party in the State has the right of excluding from the public schools whatever he does not believe to be true, then he that believes most must give way to him that believes least, and then he that believes least must give way to him that believes absolutely nothing, no matter in how small a minority the atheists or the agnostics may be. It is self-evident that on this scheme, if it is consistently and persistently carried out in all parts of the country, the United States system of national popular education will be the most efficient and wide instrument for the propagation of Atheism which the world has ever seen.

3d. The claim of impartiality between positions as directly contradictory as that of Jews, Mohammedans and Christians, and especially as that of theists and of atheists, is evidently absurd. And no less is the claim absurd and impossible that a system of education can be indifferency on these fundamental subjects. There is no possible branch of human knowledge which is not purely formal, like abstract logic or mathematics, which can be known or taught in a spirit of entire indifference between Theism and Atheism. Every department which deals with

realities, either principles, objective things or substances, or with events, must be in reality one or the other; if it be not positively and confessedly theistic, it must be really and in full effect atheistic. The physical as well as the moral universe must be conceived either in a theistic or an atheistic light. It must originate in and develop through intelligent will—that is, in a person—or in atoms, force or chance.

Teleology must be acknowledged everywhere or be denied everywhere. Philosophy, ethics, jurisprudence, political and social science, can be conceived of and treated only from a theistic or from an atheistic point of view. The proposal to treat them from a neutral point of view is ignorant and absurd. English common law is unintelligible if not read in the light of that religion in which it had its genesis. The English language cannot be sympathetically understood or taught by a mind blind to the everywhere-present current of religious thought and life which expresses itself through its terms. The history of Christendom, especially the history of the English-speaking races, and the philosophy of history in general, will prove an utterly insoluble riddle to all who attempt to read it in any non-theistic, religiously-indifferent sense. It is certain that throughout the entire range of the higher education a position of entire indifferent ism is an absolute impossibility—that along the entire line the relation of man and of the universe to the ever-present God, the supreme Lord of the conscience and heart, the non-affirmation of the truth, is entirely equivalent to the affirmation at every point of its opposite. The prevalent superstition that men can be educated for good citizenship or for any other use under heaven without religion is as unscientific and unphilosophical as it is irreligious. It deliberately leaves out of view the most essential and controlling elements of human character: that man is constitutionally as religious (i, e. loyally or disloyally) as he is rational; that morals are impossible when dissociated from the religious basis out of which they grow; that, as a matter of fact, human liberty and stable republican institutions, and every practically

03.13. LECTURE 13 - THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST

LECTURE XIII THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST.

We are to examine this afternoon what is revealed in Scripture as to the nature and destiny of the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The mediatorial King must of necessity have a kingdom, and the discussion of the kingdom appropriately succeeds the discussion of the royal office of the King.

There is but one kingdom or spiritual realm in which Christ reigns for ever, and which in the end shall be eternally glorious in the perfect glory of her King; yet in Scripture there are three distinct names used to set forth the excellences and the blessedness of that realm in various aspects. Let it be remembered that while these different names are never to be confounded, since they differ from one another in flexibility and range of usage and in the aspect in which they severally set forth the one subject, yet they are related to one and the selfsame subject. Therefore, the variety of the names and their usage should never lead to any confusion as to the identity and singleness of the object to which they relate. They should, on the contrary, by their variety illustrate the many-sided perfections and relations of the one kingdom, growing more glorious and powerful through all the successions of time.

These several names used in Scripture to designate this one transcendent object on its different sides and relations are the Kingdom, the Church and the City of God.

I. The word " kingdom " is the first in the order of its use. It is the characteristic word used for this purpose almost exclusively in the Old Testament. In the New Testament the word " kingdom " appears to pass out of frequent and prominent use precisely in proportion as the word Church is advanced in these respects. " Kingdom " is used fifty times in Matthew, and one hundred and seventeen times in the four Gospels, only eight times in the Acts of the Apostles, and only twenty-four times in all the Epistles and Revelation; while, on the other hand, the word " Church " occurs only three times in all the Gospels and one hundred and five times in the Acts, Epistles and Revelation. The word " kingdom " primarily signifies dominion, control and obedience to law. The Greek word " Church " primarily signifies election, redemption out of the mass of sinful and lost men. The words "city of God" primarily emphasize the kingdom as central, as an absolute unit, as having reached the consummate light of civilization, wealth and power. Of all these terms, the word " kingdom " is the most flexible and hits the widest range in its New Testament usage. It is naturally and properly used in three special senses:

(1) In the sense of "realm " or sphere of dominion. Thus we habitually use the phrase "the kingdom of England" when we intend to signify the geographical division with its known political boundaries and its inhabitants. In this way the New Testament habitually uses the phrase "the kingdom of God" or "of Christ" or "of heaven" to signify the realm over which the government of Christ extends, the subjects of his kingdom in their relation to his government. In this sense men are said to enter the kingdom—that is, to become subjects of it and participants of the benefits which

belong to all its loyal subjects. In this sense of "realm " or subjects of Christ's dominion the word kingdom is coincident in its meaning with the word Church in its strictest sense and widest comprehension.

(2) The word kingdom is habitually used alike in the language of Scripture and of secular life in the sense of "reign" or of the exercise of royal authority. Thus when Charles I. was deposed in England and the office of king abolished, and the protectorate of Oliver Cromwell set up in its place, historians say that " the kingdom " was abolished and the Commonwealth set up. Again, when Oliver died and his son and successor was forced to abdicate, and Charles II. was brought back and set upon his inherited throne, historians say the Commonwealth was abolished and " the kingdom " was restored. Thus, in this sense of " reign," the Scriptures use the word "kingdom" when they say "the kingdom of heaven is at hand," or when we are taught to pray " thy kingdom come." And

(3) alike in the usage of Scripture and of that of daily life we use the word "kingdom" to signify the benefits or blessings which result from the beneficent exercise of royal authority. Thus, while preparing for the coup d'etat, Napoleon III. said in a public address at Lyons, "The empire is peace"—i e. universal peace will be the policy and effect of the imperial regime which I propose to introduce. In like manner, Paul uses the word when he says (Romans 14:17), " For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink "—i. e. the reign of Christ does not express itself in that kind of activity—" but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost:" these are the characters of his realm because the results of his reign.

II. The first question here is concerning the nature and extent of this " kingdom" and the method of its " coming." After that we will consider the biblical doctrine of the Church, and lastly that of the " city of God."

If Adam had not apostatized the entire course of human history would have been a normal development in fellowship with God. The central principle of loyalty to God having been preserved intact, the whole moral nature of man would have grown healthily, and all his faculties in all their exercises, and all his relations with his fellows, would have been correspondingly normal. But since sin introduced rebellion against the supreme authority of God the human character has been radically corrupted and human society disorganized. This has subjected the entire race in all spheres of its activity to the dominion of a malign spiritual empire comprehending the whole world, over which presides "the prince of the power of the air," the " prince or god of this world." And, being thus alienated from the centre of all life, the entire subsequent course of the development of man's moral character and social condition has been, in the absence of a supernatural intervention, continuously in the direction of greater and greater corruption and disorder. In consequence of this state of facts the God of heaven has set up a kingdom in antagonism to the kingdom of Satan and to all temporal kingdoms organized in Satan's interest, which kingdom shall never be destroyed, but, breaking in pieces all its antagonists, shall stand for ever. This kingdom of the God of heaven was introduced immediately after the Fall, and is to be consummated in the eternal city of God which shall descend out of heaven at the last day. It has been mediatorial from the beginning, administered at first in the hand of the unincarnate eternal Word of God, and afterward in the hands of the incarnate Word. It was symbolized in the throne of David in Jerusalem and the Jewish theocracy, and it was visibly set up in its higher spiritual form when the

long-promised Son of David, having redeemed his people on the cross, rose from the dead, ascended to the heavens and sat down at the right hand of God. This kingdom is not one among the many competing kingdoms of the earth. It is antagonistic to the kingdom of Satan only: all the natural kingdoms of men, except in so far as they are compromised with the kingdom of Satan, are penetrated and assimilated and rendered subservient to its own ends by the kingdom of God. All other kingdoms have their rise, progress, maturity and decadence, while this kingdom alone is eternal, growing broader and waxing stronger through all ages until its consummation in the city of God.

It is essentially distinguished from all the kingdoms of the world whatsoever by its origin, its nature, its end, its method of development, its eternal continuance.

(1) It necessarily rests upon a basis of redemption by blood. The atonement on Calvary is its essential prerequisite, for in its highest development " a Lamb as it had been slain " stood in the midst of the throne.

(2) It is built up and constituted not by natural forces, but by the supernatural power of the Holy Ghost, directing, using and overruling all natural forces to the accomplishment of his own ends.

(3) The sphere of this divine reign is not in the first instance external relations and conduct, but primarily the essential character, the permanent state of the heart in its ultimate springs of action as discerned by the all-seeing eye of God. And it extends to all external relations and actions whatsoever, as these are the streams which proceed from and reveal the essential state of the heart.

(4) The central principle of this kingdom, which determines all its other conditions and requirements, is the absolute loyalty of the hearts of all its subjects to the person of the King. Any service rendered from any inferior motive than this is essential rebellion. But this supreme motive is to take possession of the entire person and to absorb all his life. If any man would be a subject of this kingdom, " and hate not his father and mother and wife and children and brethren and sisters, yea and his own life also," he cannot be accepted as such. And this all-absorbing principle of absolute loyalty is to dominate all other springs of action and mould the entire life and all the relations which the individual sustains to the whole body,

(5) It is essentially a kingdom of righteousness. On the foundation of supreme loyalty to God its reign effects the establishment of all righteousness in all the relations the individual sustains to God and to his fellows. Rooted in the theological virtues of faith, hope, love, it enforces all the moral virtues known among heathen or Christian meu—true manhood in all its elements of truth, bravery, purity, generosity, magnanimity.

It embraces the man and woman as individuals, and the perfectly ordered family and community, and all ecclesiastical and political societies. It comprehends all the virtue and sets its seal of reprobation upon all moral evil; its demands in all the departments of moral character or action never fall short of absolute perfection.

(6) Its condition of citizenship is the new birth or spiritual regeneration of each subject by the recreative power of the Holy Ghost. The King himself has said, " Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." This supernatural change of nature is in each case the origin of a

supernatural life, both internal of faith and love, and external of holy obedience.

(7) This kingdom is neither a republic nor a democracy, but an absolute monarchy and an ordered aristocracy. The King possesses all perfections, human and divine, in absolute fullness. All authority and dominion, alike legislative and executive, descend upon the subject from above. The Sovereign selects his subjects, and not the subjects the Sovereign. Each subject in the economy of the kingdom will have his own peculiar grade, status and function. As in the heavens one star differeth from another star in glory, so will it be in the resurrection (1 Corinthians 15:41). The members of the one body include the hands and the feet and the head. Some shall sit with their Lord on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

(8) But the conditions of reward in this kingdom and of promotion to influence and power will be the opposite of all those which have prevailed in the kingdoms of this world. It is "not by blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." The King has said, "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant; even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Matthew 20:25-28). The baleful doctrine of human rights which is now turning all political societies into pandemoniums is never admitted in the kingdom of God. But the sublime doctrine of human duties in its stead binds all hearts and lives in beautiful harmony to the throne of the Prince and to the happiness of all his subjects.

(9) This kingdom is to endure for ever, gradually to embrace all the inhabitants of the earth, and finally the entire moral government of God in heaven and on earth. The little stone which breaks the image will become a great mountain and fill the whole earth (Daniel 2:35). This gospel of the kingdom is to be preached to all nations. Then all the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever. And in the dispensation of the fullness of times all things, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, are to be gathered together in one in Christ; who is set at the right hand of God in heavenly places, far above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and all things are put under his feet, He only being excepted that did put all things under him (Ephesians 1:10; Ephesians 1:20-21; 1 Corinthians 15:27).

III. The process by which this kingdom grows through its successive stages toward its ultimate completion can of course be very inadequately understood by us. It implies the ceaseless operation of the mighty power of God working through all the forces and laws of nature and culminating in the supernatural manifestations of grace and of miracle. The Holy Ghost is everywhere present, and he works directly alike in the ways we distinguish as natural and as supernatural—alike through appointed instruments and agencies, and immediately by his direct personal power. The special agency for the building up of this kingdom is the organized Christian Church with its regular ministry, providing for the preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments. The special work of the Holy Ghost in building up this kingdom is performed in the regeneration and sanctification of individuals through the ministry of the Church. But beyond this the omnipresent Holy Ghost works to the same end, directly and indirectly, in every sphere of

nature and of human life, causing all the historic movements of peoples and nations, of civilization and of science, of political and ecclesiastical societies, to broaden and deepen the foundations and to advance the growth and perfection of his kingdom. Thus this kingdom from the beginning and in the whole circle of human history has been always coming. Its coming has been marked by great epochs, when new revelations and new communications of divine power have been imported from without into the current of human history. The chiefest of these have been the giving of the law, the incarnation, crucifixion, resurrection, ascension and session of the King on the right baud of the Father, and the mission of the Holy Ghost.

Yet the kingdom has been always coming every moment of all the years that have passed. In all the growing of the seeds and all the blowing of the winds; in every event, even the least significant, which has advanced the interests of the human family either in respect to their bodies or their souls, and thus made their lives better or worthier; in all the breaking of fetters; in all the bringing in of light; in the noiseless triumphs of peace; in the dying out of barbarisms; and in the colonization of great continents with new populations and free states, —the kingdom is coming. Above all, in the multiplication of the myriad centres of Christian missions and of the myriad hosts of Christian workers, each in the spirit of the King seeking the very lowest and most degraded, every where lifting upward what Satan's kingdom has borne down,—the kingdom is coming. Its process is like that of the constructive power of the kingdom of nature, silent and invisible, yet omnipresent and omnipotent, like the rain and the dew and the zephyr and the sunlight. The kingdom comes intensively in each heart like the leaven, which penetrates the whole mass silently yet irresistibly until all is leavened.

It comes extensively like the growth of the mustard-seed, which from the least beginnings unfolds itself until it shoots out great branches and shelters the fowls of heaven. In this world the wheat and the tares, the good and the evil, grow together to the end. The net gathers in fish good and bad. One field brings forth thirty, another forty, and another an hundred-fold. In the end the tares shall be gathered and burned, and the pure wheat gathered without mixture in the eternal garner of the Lord. In the whole history of its coming the kingdom of God " cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, Lo, there! for behold, the kingdom of God is within you." But its consummation shall be ushered in suddenly and with overwhelming demonstrations of glory: " For 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." For the present the King is absent, gathering together in his grasp the reins of his empire: we are left to be diligently employed with the doing the utmost for his cause possible within our respective spheres against his coining. When he comes he will be revealed as a King of kings, followed by great retinues of royal princes sitting on thrones and reigning over cities in his name and through his grace.

IV. We now come to the word for this subject characteristic of the New Testament—the Church. It must be remembered that this does not present a different subject, but a different phase of the same subject. The word " kingdom " expresses chiefly the ideas of dominion and of loyal obedience. The word for " Church" expresses chiefly the ideas of sovereign election and of free and efficacious salvation. The New Testament word represented by the word " Church " is ■κκλησ■α (ecclesia), which precisely means the body of the elect—the elect, the effectually called by the power of the Holy Ghost. And phenomenally the elect are believers. Their specific mark is faith. When the Lamb shall gain his victories over his enemies and be manifested Lord of

lords and King of kings, those who accompany him will be the " called," the " elect," " believers " (Revelation 17:14). This is the sense of the word ecclesia—the body of " the elect/' "the effectually called" by the Holy Ghost, "the body, the fulluess of Christ," "the bride, the Lamb's wife." All its real members are saved. None are saved who are not really its members. It is absolutely one, no matter how its members may appear to be separated by differences of time, place, creed or outward form, for " by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free." The unity of the Church is the one absolutely essential element of its existence which is never absent, and which can never be lost. And, however much this essential unity may be disguised by the varying fortunes or by the passions of human life, it will be conspicuously exhibited in its glorified form at the last day. But the laws of human thought and language have made it inevitable that the transient forms in which parts of this great body are temporarily organized should be confounded with the essential being of that body which transcends and survives them all, and that the name which designates the whole should be applied to all its constituent parts. Accordingly, in the New Testament and in our current language the word " church " is applied to the local congregation, to the collected congregations of a city or a province, or to some special denomination distinguished by a particular creed or form of organization or ceremonial of worship. Thus we read constantly of the church in the house of Aquila and Priscilla, "the church in Corinth," "the churches of Asia," and of the Reformed, of the Presbyterian and of the Episcopal churches.

Here two points are to be distinctly borne in mind: 1st. The whole Church in its totality, the holy catholic Church in which we all profess to believe, is not made up as a general sum by adding all the particular Christian denominations together, as adding the Presbyterians to the Baptists, and these to the Methodists, and these to the Anglicans and Romanists, etc. This is self-evident, because all of these outward organizations contain many members which have no part nor lot in the essential Church of which Christ is the Head; and also because the whole body of those dying in infancy outside of the visible Church, which constitute the vast majority of the essential Church, never formed any part of these particular denominations. You might as well attempt to reach an adequate survey of the whole surface of the round earth, with its oceans and mountains, by adding together the surveyed farms of Europe and America, as to present an adequate survey of the Church which is the body of Christ and the heir of the promises by summing up in one table the statistics of our several organized denominations. The essential Church is like the all-investing atmosphere. The several phenomenal organizations which we call churches are like the visible clouds which float in various forms and variable proportions in its bosom.

2d. There are not two churches, the one visible and the other invisible. There is, and can be ever, but one single, indivisible Church of Jesus Christ. This is always visible in its exact definition and in its widest comprehension to the omniscient eye of God. It is always visible, although imperfectly, even to the eye of the human observer. It consists in its essential nature of men and women living in the flesh, and as far as they are distinguished as the possessors of a peculiar spiritual nature: by the very force of their saintship they are set apart in contrast to the mass of mankind as "the salt of the earth " and " the light of the world." Moreover, it belongs to the essential nature of this spiritual Church, as composed of intrinsically social beings who by reason of their saintship are loyal servants of their Master in a hostile world, that it always and everywhere tends to express itself in some external organized form, and so render itself the more definitely visible. When it is

finally consummated, this Church will be the most conspicuously visible of all created objects, "fair as the moon, clear as the sun and terrible as an army with banners." On the other hand, in contrast with external ecclesiastical societies called churches by us, the one holy catholic Church is relatively invisible to the eyes of men. This relative invisibility is due to two facts: First, that, because the true members of the Church in this world are inextricably mixed with false professors and unbelievers, it is impossible for human observers in this life accurately to discriminate the members of this body from its environment. And secondly, since this one Church comprehends all the centuries and members in all the communities embraced in the whole course of human history, a part being glorified in heaven, while a part is struggling with the conditions of this life, it follows that this Church is too vast to be comprehended in its unity in one human vision. As a whole, it is invisible because its proportions transcend vision. It is seen in its parts successively and imperfectly, but it will be seen completely only when the city of God descends from heaven " prepared as a bride adorned for her husband."

V. There are possible only two generically distinct theories as to the nature of the Church. The first maintains that it is essentially an outwardly organized society, like the Church of Rome or of England; its outward form as well as its informing spirit being determined by the constitution originally imposed upon it by Christ, through a succession of offices, in unbroken organic continuity from the days of the apostles until now. The second doctrine maintains that the Church is a general term for the whole body of regenerated men, whether of past, present or future generations. These are constituted one spiritual body by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, which unites them to Christ their Head, as all the various elements and members of our natural bodies are constituted one by the indwelling of a common soul. The many members of this body, being many, are one body; and it is all the more one because of the infinitely various relations which the several members sustain to our Lord and to each other, determined by their various natural faculties, historical conditions and gracious endowments. A very slight knowledge either of the Bible or of ecclesiastical history proves that the doctrine of the Church first stated is impossible. The claim is that such organizations as the Greek, Roman and Anglican churches are identical, as external corporations, with the Church of the original apostles. This is simply absurd on the face of it. It is admitted by the first scholars of the Church of England1 that " nothing like modern episcopacy existed before the close of the first century." The office of the twelve apostles was in its essence incapable of transmission, and as a matter of fact has not been transmitted. No living man can follow Paul’s example in presenting the "signs of an apostle." It has been proved hundreds of times, and never with clearer demonstration than by Bishop Lightfoot in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians, that the idea of a clerical priesthood was unknown in the early Church. Nothing like the Roman or Anglican hierarchy can be read between the lines of New Testament history without the most grotesque incongruity. Nothing like their vestments or elaborate liturgies can be conceived of as belonging to the Church of that period. Most of these are demonstrably comparatively modern, and bear marks of Jewish, of heathen and of secular origin.

Besides, the claim that the original external corporations have remained intact through all intervening generations without break in the absolutely continuous transmission of authority can in no case be proved, and in most cases is conspicuously false. The Church of Rome ridicules the claims of the Greeks and Anglicans alike. The contestant apostles of Romanism and Anglicanism

excommunicate each other, and claim exclusive authority in dioceses embracing the same territory over half the world, and utterly irrespective of any claims to priority of occupation on either side—e. g. the claims of the Romanists in New York and Virginia, and of the Anglicans in Canada, Louisiana and California. The more thoroughly, therefore, the first theory of the Church, or that which regards it as a visible corporation, is put to the test, the more inconsistent it is shown to be with all the providential facts of the case. On the other hand, it is evident that the second doctrine of the Church, or that which regards it as a collective name for the whole body of the saved in all ages, is the one which alone justifies the application to it of the common predicates of " unity," " apostolicity," "catholicity," "infallibility," "perpetuity" and "sanctity." The spiritual body is always faithful to its genuine apostolic doctrine in all its essentials; is infallibly preserved from all fatal errors of faith and practice; is set apart from the world as consecrated and morally pure; and endures through all conflicts and changes as indestructible and unchangeably one and catholic, embracing in one spiritual union all saints in all parts of the world, in all successive generations.

Nevertheless, this spiritual body, always consisting of men and women whose natures are essentially social, must ever spontaneously and universally tend to organize itself under all historical conditions. All the various forms which thence result have been comprehended in God's design, and are necessary for the spiritual development of the Church and for the accomplishment of the great tasks it has been commissioned to perform. Yet the permanent results of biblical interpretation unite with the history of Christ's providential and gracious guidance of the churches in proving that he never intended to impose upon the Church as a whole any particular form of organization. Neither he nor his apostles ever went beyond the suggestion of general principles and actual inauguration of a few rudimentary forms. The history of the churches during all subsequent ages shows that these rudimentary forms have been ever changing in correspondence with the changes in their historical conditions. And in exact proportion to the freedom and fruitfulness of the Church's activity in the service of its Master are these organic forms rapidly and flexibly adapted to the conditions of the sphere in which their especial work is appointed. These various denominational forms of the living Church are all one in their essentials, and differ only in their accidents. These accidents have been determined in each case by conditions peculiar to itself, especially by those resulting from national character and from political, social, educational and geographical circumstances. Some have sprung from transient conditions, some from the idiosyncrasies of their founders, and some even from the follies and sins of selfish partisans. Other differences are rooted in far more permanent distinctions of nations and classes, and represent persistent rival tendencies in the thoughts and tastes and habits of men. All of these, since they exist and are used as instruments of the Holy Ghost, have in that fact a providential justification. And each one, even the least significant, emphasizes some otherwise too much neglected side of the truth, and is therefore, in its day, necessary to the completeness of the whole.

It is evident, therefore, that while the Church of Christ necessarily tends to self-organization under ordinary conditions, and to different forms of organization under different conditions, nevertheless organization itself is not of its essence. The Church exists antecedently to and independently of any organization, and its far larger part, embracing all mankind of all centuries dying in infancy, extends indefinitely beyond ail organizations. All the more it is certain that no special form can be essential to the existence, or even to the integrity, of the Church. As the outward form should

express the true character of the informing spirit, of course in an ideally perfect state the essential unity of the Church, as well as all other permanent characteristics, must find expression. All radical diversities, all irreconcilable oppositions, all bigotry, jealousy, alienation and strife, must be eliminated. But all unity implies relation and all relations imply differences, and the sublime unity of the catholic Church of all peoples and of all generations implies the harmony of incalculable varieties. The principle of the union is spiritual and vital, and hence must be the result of an internal growth. The more perfect the inward life, the more perfect will be its outward expression in form. The final external form of the holy catholic Church will never be reached by adding denomination to denomination. It will come as all growth into organized form, alike in the physiological and in the social world, comes by the spontaneous action of central vital forces from within.

All living unity implies diversity, and just in proportion to the elevated type and significance of the unity will be the variety of the elements it comprehends. In the barren desert each grain of sand is of precisely the same form with every other grain, and therefore there is no organic whole. The life of the world results from the correlation of earth and sky, of land and sea, of mountains and plains. All social unity springs out of the differences between man and woman, parent and child, men of thought and men of action, the men who possess and the men who need. No number of similar stones would constitute a great cathedral. No number of repetitions of the same musical sound would generate music. Always where the most profound and perfect unity is effected it is the result of the greatest variety and complexity of parts. This law holds true through all varieties of vegetable, animal and social organisms, and is revealed equally through all the pages of the geologic records.

Certainly, God appears to be preparing to make the ultimate unity of the Church the richest and most comprehensive of created forms in the number and variety of its profound harmonies. It would have been a very simple thing at the first to form a homogeneous society out of the undifferentiated family of Adam numerically multiplied. But for thousands of years God has been breaking up that family into a multitude of varieties passing all enumeration. In arctic torrid and temperate zones; on mountains, valleys, coasts, continents and islands ; in endlessly drawn-out successions of ages; under the influence of every possible variety of inherited institution ; in every stage of civilization and under every political, social and religious constitution; through all possible complications of personal idiosyncrasy and of external environment,—God has been drawing human nature through endless modifications. All these varieties enter into and contribute to the marvelous riches of the Christian Church, for her members are " redeemed out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." And all these are further combined into all the endless varieties of ecclesiastical organizations, monarchical, aristocratical, republican and democratic, which the ingenuity of man, assisted by all complications of theological controversy and of social and political life, has been able to invent.

Who, then, shall guide all these multitudinous constituents in their recombination into the higher unity ? Shall it be accomplished by a process of absorption into some ancient society claiming to be the Church? Shall it be helped forward by the volunteered offices of some self-authorized "Church congress"? A time can never come when many of these differences so evidently designed will be obliterated. But undoubtedly a time is soon coming when the law of differentiation, so long dominant, shall be subordinated to the law of integration, when all these differences so arduously

won shall be wrought into the harmony of the perfect whole. The comprehension of so vast a variety of interacting forces must be left to God. His methods are always historical and his instruments are all second causes. He alone has been contemporaneous with the Church under ail dispensations, and omnipresent with the churches of every nation and tribe, and with him "a thousand years are as one day." The sin of schism is unquestionably very common and very heinous. In its essence it is a sin against the unity of the Church. If this unity were external and mechanical, then all organic division or variety would be schism. But since the principle of unity is the immanent Holy Ghost binding all the members in one life to Christ its source, schism must consist in some violation of the ties which bind us to the Holy Ghost or to Christ or to our fellow-members.

Hence all denial of the supreme Godhead and lordship of Christ is schism. All denial of the body of catholic doctrine common to the whole confessing Church and embraced in the great ecumenical creeds is schism.

All sin against the Holy Ghost, every breach of the law of holiness and every defect in spiritual-mindedness tend to the marring and dividing of the body of Christ. All pride, bigotry and exclusive Churchism; all claim that the true Church is essentially identical with a certain external organization or form of organization or with a definite external succession of officers; all denial of the validity of the ministry and sacraments of any bodies professing the true faith and bearing evidence of the presence of the Holy Spirit,—are schisms. All party spirit, jealousy and selfish rivalry; all unnecessary multiplication of denominational organizations; all want of the spirit of fraternal love and co-operation in the service of the common Master,—tend to the marring and dividing of the body of Christ.

If this be true, it is evident that the real union of the churches can best be cultivated by promoting the central spiritual unity of the Church which comprehends them all. For this end all who call themselves Christians must with one purpose seek to bring their whole mind and thought more and more into perfect conformity to the Word of God speaking through the sacred Scriptures, and their whole life and activity more and more into subjection to the Holy Ghost dwelling in the whole body and in all its members alike. This process must, of course, proceed entirely from within outward, never in the reverse direction. Organic unity will be the result of the co-operation through long ages of an infinite variety of forces. It cannot be brought about by any system of means working toward it directly as an end in itself. All such unionistic enterprises are prompted by many mixed motives, some of them essentially partisan, and therefore wholly divisive in their real effects. But hereafter, in God’s good time, the result will come as an incidental effect of the ripening of all churches in knowledge and love and in all the graces, and especially of a whole-souled, self-forgetful consecration of all to the service and glory of their common Lord.

VI. The "City of God." The most sublime picture presented iu the entire past history of the Christian Church since Pentecost is that presented by St, Augustine, the grandest of all uninspired Church teachers, when during the years a. d. 413 to 426, from the very midst of the conflagration of ancient Rome, the so-called " eternal city " of the pagans, he uttered in trumpet tones his argument and prophecy of the superior strength and beauty, and of the absolutely immortal life and glory, of the city of God in his De Civitate Dei. The Teutonic barbarians had already taken Borne and shaken to its foundations the ancient universal empire, upon which civilization and

order and the hopes of mankind appeared to depend. The minds of men were in a state of chaotic confusion. The future was utterly dark. Even Christians began to despair. Then Augustine made all men see the difference between the "city of the world," called eternal, which was passing away, and the pure and rainbowed " city of God," the goal of contest, but the realm of peace and love, which shall abide secure and radiant, like the incorruptible stars, for ever and ever. A city differs from a kingdom only in being its condensed essence, its central seat. What Paris is to France, what the city of Rome was to the empire of the same name, suggests the use of the title " city of God " for the consummate and glorified form of the kingdom. It is the kingdom comprised in its absolute unity, raised to its highest condition of culture, refinement, wealth and power.

Isaiah saw the " city of God " (Isaiah 60:10-22) when he said, " The sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee. . . . Therefore thy gates shall be open continually, they shall not be shut day nor night, that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought." " The Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising. Lift up thine eyes round about and see: all they gather themselves together .... the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee, the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee." The author of Hebrews saw that " city of God " when he said (Hebrews 12:22 seq.): " Ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel." And the apocalyptic prophet closes the volume of divine disclosures with the prophetic picture of the kingdom consummated in the form of this "city of God" descending from heaven: "And I John saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. 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. 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 away." For the city " has the glory of God: and her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal. . . . And I saw no temple therein : for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it And 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. . . . And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there. And they shall bring the glory and honor of the nations into it. And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever work-eth abomination, or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb’s book of life." ..." He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus."

03.14. LECTURE 14 - THE LAW OF THE KINGDOM

LECTURE XIV THE LAW OF THE KINGDOM.

We have seen that the great end in which all the providential activities of God culminate in this world is the establishment of a universal kingdom of righteousness, which is to embrace all men and angels and to endure for ever in absolute perfection and blessedness. This kingdom, viewed as a reign, must be administered by law, and, viewed as a realm, must be brought into perfect subjection to law in all its elements. This law can be nothing lower than the law of absolute and immutable moral perfection, which, having its seat in the moral nature of God, embraces the whole moral universe in its sway. This divine institution under its title of " Church" is too habitually regarded as simply the sphere of a divine redemption. The member of the Church is looked upon as a beneficiary unconditionally delivered from condemnation, whose happiness is rendered infallibly secure for ever. But the essential idea of the kingdom is a community of men in communion with God, whose whole nature and life are dominated by the law of righteousness, where every individual is holy as our Father in heaven is holy, and where all spontaneously perform to perfection all the duties which grow out of their several relations.

There are here two opposite and equally false conceptions of the nature of the kingdom of God which must be discriminated and rejected—that which makes its righteousness consist of natural morality divorced from religion, and that which makes it consist of religious sentiments and observances, morality being unemphasized.

I. It is a characteristic position of the modern rationalists, who maintain the perfectibility of human society through a process of natural evolution, that a morality which provides for all the duties which man owes to his fellows may be cultivated to perfection independent of any religious motives. It is maintained, even, that religious faith is injurious to pure morality:

(1) Because it diverts the thoughts and efforts of men from their fellow-men and from the present life, which they insist is the only sphere of moral relations and obligations, and directs them toward an invisible, spiritual world, and to a future world of which we can know nothing certainly, and to which we can, at least in our present condition, owe no duties. And

(2) they hold that the motives which religion presents in the future reward and punishment of the individual are purely selfish, and therefore can never prompt to a genuinely moral and noble character or course of conduct. They insist that the moral relations of men are necessarily confined to their fellow-men and to the present life, and that all genuine morality is prompted by the natural sense of justice which regards our fellows, and by the natural sympathies which bind us to them. And

(3) they point triumphantly to the degrading superstitions and the cruel fanaticisms which in the course of human history have been associated with all forms of religion. On the contrary, we are able to show that neither degrading superstition nor cruel fanaticism has any source or encouragement in the principles of genuine Christianity; that these evils spring, like all other vile

things, from the corrupt hearts of sinful men ; that they have existed during all periods of human history independent of all forms of religion; and that their association with any of the doctrines or institutions of Christianity has been only accidental and temporary. We maintain that the pleas for the separation of morality and religion are rational only on the supposition that Atheism is true. On the other hand, if the existence of God is admitted, then conscience instantly proclaims itself to be his voice in the soul, and speaks in his name. All morality, personal and social, must have a theistic basis to give it depth, authority and power. The morality of these boasting opponents of religion is superficial in the extreme. The noblest motives they present are those of sympathy and compassion for others. They have no eternal Moral Governor, no heavenly Father, no divine Elder Brother, no indwelling Holy Ghost; no infinite sanctions of eternal rewards or punishments. Their pale and languid lives prove that their vaunted altruistic morality is supported by no faith in its truth and no enthusiasm for its beauty. It has done nothing for the world beyond what is rationally referred to natural amiability, a passing cant of the hour, a self-admiring desire for human recognition. How miserably poor do the best showings of the ephemeral flower of non-religious morality appear when laid in the effacing radiance of the life and cross of Christ, and of that immense company of his humble disciples who through all ages and in all spheres of human life have followed his example of self-sac in the interests of humanity and of heroic devotion to the will and service of his heavenly Father! All true morality has its root and ground in, and derives its only adequate motives from, the doctrines of Christianity and from the fellowship of God with man which Christ secures. A rebel against supreme and fundamental obligation cannot possibly be righteous in any relation, however subordinate. And the only motives which render any action completely righteous are supreme love to God and love to man for God’s sake, " for whether we eat or drink or whatever we do," if we would claim the meed of the righteous, we must " do all for the glory of God."

II. The clanger most easily besetting many apparently zealous Christians lies in the opposite direction of holding to the validity of a religious experience, the immediate effect of which is anything short of the love and practice of all righteousness. The gratuitous justification of a sinner on the ground of another’s righteousness, imputed to him freely without respect to his personal past character or record, is legitimately the root and necessary precondition of the most perfect morality. Nevertheless, this doctrine in the hands of ignorant and impure men is capable of the most serious abuse. And even among orthodox Christians, who are theoretically all right in their acknowledgment of all moral obligations, the least lapse of watchfulness will bring us in danger of a comfortable resting in the security of our position in Christ, while we neglect the full performance of all the moral obligations which spring out of our relations as Christians alike to God and man. The very end for which the stupendous enginery of redemption was devised and executed, including the incarnation, crucifixion, resurrection of the Son of God and the mission of the Holy Ghost, is to establish a community of regenerated and sanctified men, absolutely perfect in righteousness. The very conception of an immoral Christian is monstrous. And, however, imperfect the Christian may be at any stage of his spiritual growth, he can make no compromise with any sin; he must put forth all his powers in ceaseless efforts after absolute moral perfection in all directions. He must include all the duties which spring out of our relations to God, and all those which spring out of all our relations to our fellow-men of every kind. There can be nothing overlooked, much less willingly neglected. He must include not only the theological graces and the cardinal moral virtues, but the bloom and symmetry of moral excellence which result from the

perfect harmony of all the virtues.

He must be pure in thought as well as in life, magnanimous and generous in feeling and impulse, as well as just in his transactions. A narrow-minded, conceited and selfish Christian is an incongruity as real, though not quite so shocking, as an immoral Christian. Whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are of good report, whatsoever things are edifying, whatsoever things are spiritually beautiful, whatsoever things are Christ-like,—all these things are involved in the righteousness of all saints. To be a gentleman or a lady in the essential, not the conventional sense, is the very least demanded in the moral character and conduct of any Christian. Anything beneath that is out of the question. But beyond that the Christian hero and heroine must ever aspire to the heights of moral and spiritual excellence and beauty, such as will be realized perfectly only in the spirits of just men made perfect in the holy city.

III. The sublime source of this law is the uncreated, absolute and immutable moral perfections of the divine nature. This nature is presupposed in the divine volition, the self-existent nature being immanent in the will. This perfection is absolute; it admits of no qualifications or degrees. Every, even the least, element of duty is imperative. Every, even the least, shortcoming in that which is right is of the essential nature of sin and guilt. This law, having its seat in the nature of the supreme Moral Governor, must be at the same time original, supreme, absolute, universal, and immutable. It must have been one in all ages and in all realms, over all orders of creatures of all degrees of knowledge and power, over the heights of heaven and over the pit of hell. The specific duties may vary indefinitely, but the principle of duty—the absolute obligation to all that is right and to the rejection of all that is not right—is universal and immutable. The absolute obligation of all moral excellence is universal and immutable, but specific duties grow out of relations immediately when those relations are constituted.

(1) The obligation of universal love? and of absolute truth binds all God’s moral creatures equally everywhere, because these are absolutely demanded by the unchangeable nature of God, and because they are results under the universal law of moral perfection, from the essential relations which all moral agents sustain to God and to each other.

(2) There is another very large class of duties which immediately spring out of the permanent relations which God has sovereignly established in the constitution of human society in this world. These are expressed by the commandments, " Thou shalt not steal," " Thou shalt not kill," " Thou shalt not commit adultery." These would have no meaning in a state of relations in which there was no property, no mortal life and no sexual constitution. But as soon as these relations exist, the moral obligations necessarily exist.

(3) A third large class of duties spring for a time from certain temporary relations which God has constituted among a particular people and during a particular dispensation or constitutional period: as, for instance, the judicial laws of the Jews, many of which appear to us so peculiar, grew necessarily from the application of the eternal principles of right to the very peculiar social, governmental and ecclesiastical conditions which God, for wise purposes, had at that time established among them. The specific laws last as long as the special reasons for them continue, and pass into desuetude as soon as these reasons cease to exist.

(4) A fourth class of duties spring from the simple sovereign volition of God. He is of course always rational and righteous in all his decrees. But the reasons which determine him may be utterly unknown to us, and whether we see or appreciate the reason or not, the sovereign volition of God binds us by a perfect moral obligation to obey, because he is our Owner and Lord. Thus, the command to observe as holy the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath has two parts—the one invariable, because it rests upon the general nature of man, physical and spiritual, which needs a day of rest; and the other variable, because it is positive purely, resting only on the volition of God, who has set apart one day in seven, and a particular one of the seven, to be that day of rest; which otherwise would have been a matter of indifference.

Hence the moral law of the kingdom is absolute and perfect and universal, descending from above, never ascending from below. It is immutably one, yet always comprehending new conditions, and generating an indefinite variety of new special obligations out of the changing relations constantly developed under the sovereign guidance of the great King. We never elected God. The united power of all his creatures can never limit or condition his will. No rebellious barons will ever coerce from him a charter which will limit the absolute autocracy of his reign. There is in all the ages and in all the provinces of his kingdom no such thing as human rights to disturb his government or to distract righteousness. No creature, from the very nature of the case, can possess any rights over against Him who causes him to exist and to be what he is. Nor can any creature possess any rights over against any other creature, except such as are given by God.

If I possess a right relative to my brother, my brother owes it to God to render it to me, and my possession of it creates a new obligation on me to God. Thus, all so-called human rights are divine appointments for our benefit, creating special duties on all sides, which all the parties concerned owe directly to God. The universe is an absolute monarchy in which absolute moral perfection, interpreted by infinite wisdom and executed by infinite power, sits upon the throne. In this realm there are no rights but universal honor and blessedness secured by the mutual discharge of all duties, all which spring ultimately from the will of God, and hence are all duties owed to him. The King of the kingdom is the incarnate God, who has redeemed us by his blood, as well as created us by his power. The only ultimate right is his right to us, and the only source of law is the moral perfection of the divine nature expressed in his will. All service is worship; all righteousness is service to him rendered out of love and gratitude for his redemption. The obligation which descends upon us from his absolute right and sovereign will is loyally accepted by us, and rendered back in our loving service as the spontaneous tribute of our hearts. "To the only wise God, our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, now and for ever."

IV. This divine law is made known to the subjects of the kingdom through many different channels. All these mutually supplement and corroborate the testimony of one another. The fundamental fact upon which all others of this order depend is that man in his moral nature as in his intellectual was created in "the likeness of God." Our nature is essentially finite and contingent, and our knowledge imperfect and variable; whereas God’s knowledge is infinite, and his nature essentially perfect and absolute. Nevertheless, the immanent spontaneous moral law of our intrinsic nature corresponds, as · an imperfect reflection, to the transcendent moral perfection of God’s nature, and answers obediently to every indication of his will. Sin has perverted and deteriorated this law, but the voice of God can always arouse it to intense action; and the regenerating and sanctifying power of the Holy Ghost restores it to its original purity and vigor; and as our whole nature is developed into

perfect manhood, into the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ, " the moral law within us" will be more and more assimilated to the divine standard. The light of nature, as reflected even in the outward physical and lower animal world, and pre-eminently as witnessed in the providential course of human history, testifies to the same eternal principles of righteousness. " 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." For even the Gentiles, who are without the supernaturally revealed law, and " do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law are a law unto themselves; which show 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." But such has been the deteriorating influence of sin that " the law written on the heart" and " the light of nature," although these remain, no longer suffice as the organ of signifying God's will to man. A supernatural revelation has been necessary to reveal the law of duty, as well as to reveal the method of salvation through redemption. For this purpose God has at sundry times and in divers manners spoken unto the fathers by the ' prophets, and afterward by his Son whom he hath appointed heir of all things, who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sin, sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high. The entire mass of this prophetical testimony, and, above all, this personal self-revelation of God in Christ, as represented by the pen of inspiration in the sacred Scriptures, constitute the volume of the supernaturally revealed will of God. This is the divinely authoritative and infallible rule of all duty as well as of all faith. All the principles of duty binding us are herein contained. Nothing not in principle commanded in the Bible can be held to be obligatory on any Christian, and all that is thus enjoined is obligatory upon every Christian. The will of God, as indicated in the current leadings of providence and in the dealings of his Holy Spirit with our hearts, never imposes new principles of duty, but only applies the general principles already revealed in the Bible to the changing conditions of our providentially guided lives. The Bible, the Holy Ghost dwelling in us, and providence, the two latter always read in the light of the former, constitute the Christian's complete organ of knowing the will of his Lord. A summary of this moral law, including, in general principle, all the duties which grow out of our relations to God and to our fellow-men, is presented in the ten commandments, engraved by the finger of God on two tablets of stone on Mount Sinai. And all the members of the kingdom of God are under equal obligations to obey this law absolutely. There are no classes of subjects, no allowed degrees of saintship. We are all alike redeemed by one price, and under the same moral obligations and sanctions. The ordained minister is no more bound to consecrate his powers to the Lord than the most secular layman. The missionary and the martyr owe no higher measure of duty than the most self-indulgent professor. If a man does not open his conscience to every indication of the divine will, and if he is not prompt to obey, he is an alien and not a subject; and if he is found masquerading under false colors, he is in danger of being arrested as a spy. This law, moreover, demands instant and absolute obedience, not only from all classes of Christians, but also in every sphere of human life equally. A Christian is just as much under obligation to obey God's will in the most secular of his daily businesses as he is in his closet or at the communion table. He has no right to separate his life into two realms, and acknowledge different moral codes in each respectively—to say the Bible is a good rule for Sunday, but this is a weekday question, or the Scriptures are the right rule in matters of religion, but this is a question of business or of politics. God reigns over all everywhere. His will is the supreme law in all relations

and actions. His inspired Word, loyally read, will inform us of his will in every relation and act of life, secular as well as religious, and the man is a traitor who refuses to walk therein with scrupulous care. The kingdom of God includes all sides of human life, and it is a kingdom of absolute righteousness. You are either a loyal subject or a traitor. When the King comes how will he find you doing ?

V. If we are asking for the conditions of salvation alone, the law and the gospel mutually exclude each other. For, what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God has accomplished in the flesh of his own Son, whom he sent for that purpose in the likeness of sinful flesh. And yet in this work both the law and the gospel co-operate in different ways to one end. What, then, are the uses of the moral law under the gospel dispensation? If man had never fallen, his obedience would have been wholly spontaneous, and his knowledge of the will of God for the most part intuitive. But after man sinned it was necessary that God should reveal his will supernaturally by his inspired spokesmen, and vindicate it by terrible demonstrations of power and judgment. So, when Jehovah proceeded to introduce his kingdom in a visible form under the old economy through the ministry of Moses, he prefaced the institution of the ceremonial system, which is a shadow of the gospel, by a most striking repromulgation of his moral law amidst the awful thunders and lightnings and earthquakes of Sinai. Never are the exalted holiness and inexorable justice of that law so emphasized as when the law is shown in connection with human redemption, as that which extorts expiation at such a dreadful cost as on Calvary, and as that which demands that the whole of human life must be raised to the height of such an inexorable standard of righteousness as on Sinai. That the moral law still binds the unregenerate, and must be enforced upon them rigorously, has always been clearly admitted by Christians. But there grew up a controversy in the second generation of the Lutheran theologians, chiefly resulting from misunderstanding of the terms employed relating to what was called among them the " Third Use of the Law." This all resulted in a very luminous answer being given to the question in the " Formula of Concord," which has since been accepted as true and wise by the whole Church. This statement recognizes these three uses of the law under the gospel dispensation:

1st. Its primary use by its commands and its terrible penalties is to restrain wicked men, and thus make human society possible in this state of probation.

2d. Its second use is to convince men of sin by revealing to their eyes the awful whiteness of the divine holiness. In this light they see their own moral vileness and the true measure of their guilt. This is the instrument the Holy Spirit uses in bringing us to genuine repentance and to the humble, sincere embracing of Christ as our Saviour. It is thus that the moral law even more efficiently than the ceremonial law becomes our " schoolmaster (tutor or disciplinarian) to bring us to Christ."

3d. The third use of the law, which is as essential as either of the others, is that it should ever continue in this life to the regenerated and progressively sanctified Christian the transcendent measure and test of right, the standard of character and the stimulus to effort. To live up to this standard of excellence is the goal to which the Christian runs, the prize for which he fights. The all-perfect law, embodying the righteousness of God, continually reveals our shortcomings, condemns our corruptions, evokes our repentance and drives us to endeavor. In the case of the Christian the law remains, although the motives to obedience are changed. Our obedience is spontaneous, our motive is love; yet all the while the law towers above like the white glistening

peaks of the Alps, forbidding us to loiter, summoning us to the skies. Our obedience is possible because the Holy Ghost of Christ has been sent to dwell in our hearts for this very end. The obediences we render are the "fruits of the Spirit." We are not discouraged. We press onward to the absolute fulfillment of all righteousness, for all things are possible to him in whom the Spirit of Him dwells who in our stead and in our behalf has " fulfilled the law in the flesh."

VI. Since the kingdom of God on earth is not confined to the mere ecclesiastical sphere, but aims at absolute universality and extends its supreme reign over every department of human life, it follows that it is the duty of every loyal subject to endeavor to bring all human society, social and political, as well as ecclesiastical, into obedience to its law of righteousness. It is our duty, as far as lies in our power, immediately to organize human society and all its institutions and organs upon a distinctively Christian basis. Indifference or impartiality here between the law of the kingdom and the law of the world, or of its prince the devil, is utter treason to the King of righteousness. The Bible, the great statute-book of the kingdom, explicitly lays down principles which when candidly applied will regulate the action of every human being in all relations. There can be no compromise. The King said with regard to all descriptions of moral agents in all spheres of activity, " He that is not with me is against me." If the national life in general is organized upon non-Christian principles, the churches which are embraced within the universal assimilating power of that nation will not long l)e able to preserve their integrity.

Population increases geometrically, and food only arithmetically. Capital seeks aggregation in masses; labor becomes more plentiful and cheaper. The weaker goes to the wall and the stronger survives. The masses crowd into vast cities, forced by the irresistible pressure up into garrets and under ground into cellars. Capital is massed as never dreamed of before into hundreds of millions. Vast corporations aggregate and perpetuate the wealth of kingdoms through succeeding generations. Machinery takes the place of human labor in cultivating the earth and in the manufacture and distribution of all commodities. The terrible struggle of competition, directed by science and whipped into intensity by steam and electricity, is assuming proportions never conceived of before by the wildest dreamer. The pressure of the advancing column is overwhelming; the weakling has no possibility of maintaining his ground. Combinations are increasing and assuming a more threatening aspect every year. In the old monarchical nations of Europe the ships of state labor terribly in the storm. The experienced navigators propose to lighten their ships and relieve their strain by throwing overboard obnoxious institutions. They would grant the principles of " nationalities," of " home rule," of land distributed among the multitude of small proprietors; they would abolish class distinctions, aristocracy and monarchy. And all this may relieve the stress of the contest in Europe for a generation. But, alas! all this has already been long done in our America, and yet the war has not slackened. There remain no more lumbering abuses for us to sacrifice in the forms of our institutions. For a free republic like ours there is no salvation except in obedience to the principles of the kingdom of God. That kingdom rests ultimately upon the Fatherhood of God, the Elder Brotherhood and the redeeming blood of Christ, and the universal brotherhood of men. Its principle is love. Its law is duty. It appeals not to the right of the weak, but to the love and duty of the strong. Brothers are never all equal; but true brothers respect, sympathize with and love one another. The interest of one is the interest of all, and the anguish or the joy of one is experienced alike by all. This human brotherhood is essential, it is eternal. The earthly conditions which separate us are accidental and transient. There is no gulf of

ignorance or poverty or vice which should cut off or modify our expressions of tender love and sympathy. Even the very least of these humble ones Christ calls brethren. We must not keep them at arm's length, we must not neglect their interests, we must not in the competitions of trade push them to the wall. We must love them and make them know we love them, and help them in their struggles with poverty and sin. The kingdom of God embraces all classes, but it recognizes no class distinctions. We know neither capitalists nor laborers, neither rich nor poor, as such, but only men as men, men as brothers in Christ Jesus. If the rich operator under the pressure of competition, obeying the so-called "laws of trade," pays starvation wages, we warn him not as a rich man, but as a brother, that he is sinning against the law of the kingdom. Our brothers should, in spite of all the laws and competitions of trade, be enabled to live as becomes our brethren while they do our work. Charity degrades the lazy receiver. So the withholding a full share in the profit of the common business degrades the man hastening to get rich. If the poor brother joins the association to fight capital, we warn him, not as a poor man, but as a brother, of the duty which he owes to his employer, and of their mutual responsibilities in the common enterprise. If capitalists combine to fight labor, laborers will combine to fight capital, and one is as right as the other, and, whatever may be hoped for from a mutual recognition of their rights, more is imperatively necessary. But if all will open their hearts to the love of Christ, and submit their wills absolutely to the reign of righteousness, and devote themselves to the performance of duty instead of the vindication of rights, then the strong will bear the burden of the weak, and we will all together enjoy a common prosperity, in which the sympathy of all multiplies the happiness of each. It is said that Socialism is opposed to religion and the inviolable sacredness of the family tie. If so, then religion and the holiness of the marriage bond are the great weapons with which to fight Socialism. Carry the cross and the love of Christ into every home. Practically recognize the brotherhood in Christ of every man. Prohibit divorce, hold sacred the marriage tie. Consecrate your personal service and all your wealth to the Master's cause. And the dark clouds of threatened anarchy will melt away into the clear sky. It is too late to go back. In this free republic repression of the monster of social chaos by sheer force is impossible. In the grant of universal suffrage we have burnt our ships behind us. There lie before us now only the two alternatives—either a war between the forces, which will shatter the social fabric and end in anarchy, or the supremacy of the reign of the kingdom of God.

VII. And to us and to our fellow-countrymen of this generation God has committed this tremendous trust of forwarding or of retarding by centuries the coming of the kingdom of heaven in all the world. He has placed us in the centre of the field and at the crisis of the battle on which the fate of the kingdom for ages turns. When human society was reconstructed after the destruction by the Flood, the laws of differentiation and dispersion prevailed for millenniums. At the Tower of Babel the languages were confused and multiplied, and the children of men driven in all directions over the face of the earth. The different divisions were isolated from one another by physical barriers, pre-eminently by the Souliman Mountains in Asia and the great Desert of Sahara in Africa. Thus, after the lapse of ages, through the influence of climate and other providential conditions, different permanent varieties of the human family were generated, which may be grouped under three great types—the Mongolian of Eastern Asia and Oceanica; the African; and the Caucasian of Western Asia and Europe. The Caucasian race, itself divided by mountain-chains and seas and distributed on peninsulas, generated innumerable races and national varieties, as the Celt, the Teuton, the Sclav, the Russian, the French, the Anglo-Saxon. Under the Old Dispensation every

epoch-making movement was divisive. The children of Eber were chosen and the rest of mankind rejected. Out of the Hebrews were selected the Israelites, and out of the Israelites the Jews. But when Christ assumed the reins of his kingdom at the right hand of the Majesty on high, the tendency was instantly reversed. His commission was, "Go, disciple all nations, baptizing them, teaching them, and lo, I am with you to the end of the ages." The banner of the kingdom was set up in Jerusalem and carried throughout the Roman empire, then throughout Europe, thence throughout the world. Always the standards of the kingdom have followed the course of empire westward. But beyond the shores of our Pacific there is no more west. There the Occident and the Orient stand face to face. The whole continent is ours, and it stands with all ite mountain-chains running north and south, its immense plains, including all zones from the tropics to the poles, open to the free access of all nations and races, facing the western migration of all the inhabitants of Europe and Africa on our eastern side, and the eastern migration of the multitudinous Mongolians on our western side. Celts, Teutons, Sclavs, Russians, Germans, Frenchmen, Anglo-Saxons, are all incorporated in our population. Africans, Mongolians, Caucasians, Africa, Asia, Europe, all pour their tides of superfluous population into our wide areas. Here the kingdom is to be consummated in the reunion of all the varieties of the long-rent family of man. Here, where the multitudinous hosts rally, is the very eye of the battlefield. To-day is the day of fate, the crisis of the world's history. At the beginning God sifted the foremost nations of Christendom and sowed our soil with the finest of the wheat. The Puritans, Huguenots, Dutch, Scotch-Irish, Episcopalians, German Reformed of the old Palatine stock, and the best of the Roman Catholics laid the foundations of our empire. During the first ages religion controlled the development of the State. It was established at first in nearly all the colonies in some definite form of church government. It was recognized in the colonial charters and in the constitutions of the first States. For nearly two hundred years every college and almost every academy was founded and administered by Calvinists.

During the first two centuries our growth was slow, the elements brought in by immigration were homogeneous, and the process of assimilation to the original type was rapid and complete. In the first one hundred and sixty years, from the colonization of Plymouth Bay to the Revolutionary War, the population only grew to be three millions. It required nearly fifty years more to raise it to ten millions, while in the last fifty years it has increased thirty-seven millions, and at present it advances at the rate of considerably more than a million a year. It is estimated that during the fifty years preceding 1847 the number of immigrants did not amount to one million, while in the forty years since that time more than ten millions have been received. In the single year 1882 nearly eight hundred thousand were received. At present Dr. Strong, in his wonderful book entitled Our Country, estimates the foreign population, consisting of the foreign-born and of their children, as fifteen millions.

He calculates that at the present rates of progression the foreign population will in 1900 amount to not far from forty millions. During the first one hundred and sixty years only thirteen colonies were organized. These multiplied to sixteen in 1800, to twenty-six in 1840 and to thirty-eight in 1880. Others of immense size are demanding recognition, and many of the new States are much larger than all the New England States together. There is no question that the moral and spiritual destiny of the world depends upon the moral and religious character ultimately assumed by the population of the United States. There is no more room to question the obvious fact that the moral and

religious character of the populations filling the States and Territories of the great West, which must soon control the whole nation, is rapidly forming now, and must take its permanent stamp for ages within the next thirty or forty years.

Men of this generation, from the pyramid top of opportunity on which God has set us we look down on forty centuries! We stretch our hand into the future with power to mould the destinies of unborn millions. We of this generation occupy the Gibraltar of the ages which commands the world's future.

" We are living, we are dwelling, In a grand and awful time, In an age on ages telling— To be living is sublime!"

Chapter 101

03.15. LECTURE 15 - SANCTIFICATION AND GOOD WORKS-HIGHER LIFE

LECTURE XV SANCTIFICATION AND GOOD WORKS.—HIGHER LIFE.

It is a great blessing to be able to recognize the fact that all the great historical branches of the Christian Church are very much united in their faith as to the essentials of the gospel. As to who Christ was, as to what Christ did, as to his Person and as to his offices, as to his supreme lordship over the whole Church and over the whole universe as mediatorial King, Catholics and Protestants of every name agree. The differences chiefly relate to the application of Christ's redemption, to the method of its application and to the order in which the great benefits of salvation are communicated to us and realized in the experience and life of the believer. In the first place, I would say that rationalists generally—and by this term I include all of a rationalizing tendency, all who would be comprehended generally in theological language as of a Pelagianizing or Semi-Pe-lagianizing tendency—maintain the principle that God's favor depends directly and immediately upon man's moral character; that as long as man is good God is favorable to him; that as soon as man sins God comes into opposition to him; and that the only condition required for restoration to the divine favor is genuine repentance and reformation. thinkers is that becoming good is the necessary prerequisite of being received again into favor with God.

Romanists in general, of course, are free from this Pelagianizing and rationalistic spirit. The tendency of Romanism is to make everything supernatural. The tendency of Rationalism is to make everything natural. The Romanists' doctrine in the first place differs from Pelagiauizing and rationalistic notions by maintaining that salvation wrought by Jesus Christ our Lord is applied only by a supernatural operation of the Holy Ghost working through certain sacraments which he has appointed as means and instrumentalities. Their doctrine is, that without the sacrament there is no grace, and that all grace can be obtained through the sacrament without the knowledge of the truth, and very much without the co-operation of the subject. The Society of Friends, as you know, go to the extreme, as we think it, of holding that grace may be adequately experienced without the use of this class of appointed means. The position taken by the great historical churches since the Reformation is one intermediate between these two extremes.

We believe thoroughly that the grace may be given through the sovereign pleasure of God, and by an exercise of divine power experienced without the sacrament; but we believe the sacraments are also divine institutions of his appointment, and that they are therefore universally obligatory and necessary because of the obligation of precept, and that beyond this they are in their adaptation to our constitution and our condition very admirably fitted to be efficient means of grace when intelligently received in connection with the truth and accompanied with the gracious power of the Holy Ghost. On the other side, the Romanist agrees in certain respects with the rationalist. This comes out in the historical fact that they confound the ideas which we emphasize by the words justification and sanctification. The Romanist word justificatio, which has come down in the literature of the Roman Catholic Church, combines in its meaning all these ideas—to wit, the

forgiveness of sins, the establishment of a state of favor, the removal of indwelling sin and the communication of indwelling grace; that is, all that is embraced in our terms justification, regeneration and sanctification. In the nomenclature of the Roman Catholic Church all these are embraced under one word, justification; and this opinion coincides with that which I have stated to-be the common opinion of rationalists in general, though they differ from rationalists so much on the other side in regard to the position that the making of a man good must precede as a condition his reception into divine favor.

There are two principles, then, in which the Roman Catholic doctrine as to the application of redemption stands in direct contrast and opposition to what we call the doctrine of the Reformers—what we now call the evangelical doctrine. The Romanist holds that every individual must be first united to the Church, and through the Church to Christ. The evangelical believer holds that every individual must be spiritually united to Christ, and through union with Christ united to the Church. The Romanist holds that through the grace of God we are to be made good, and then, being made good, we are to seek divine favor. Whereas the Protestant evangelical position is, that we must first be received into the divine favor, and in consequence of that reception be made good. The Romanist doctrine of justification is that its final cause is the glory of God; its efficient cause is the powerful operation of the Holy Spirit; its formal cause, that in which it consists, the remission of sins and infusion of grace; its meritorious cause, the passion, death and merits of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that its instrumental cause is baptism. The sacrament acts as an opus operatum—i. e. by the simple grace inherent in the sacramental act itself. In every case in which the subject does not consciously and intelligently oppose an obstacle to the grace-effecting power of the sacrament, all sin is removed and saving grace is infused. Only concupiscence remains, which they deny to be true sin, properly so called, and regard only as the ashes or cinders, the result of past sin and the cause of future sin. But in every instance and under all ordinary conditions they admit that men do sin after baptism, and then they provide for them what they call their second justification, which is accomplished always through the instrumentality of the sacrament of penance.

If any of you want intelligently to form an opinion in regard to the Roman Catholic theology, you must remember the very first necessity is to recognize the fact that words are used in a different sense in the two systems. You would do them great injustice and bring to yourself great confusion if you should take, for instance, justification and give the Protestant definition of it, and then the Roman Catholic definition of it, and put those in opposition one to the other. The analogue of our doctrine of justification is the Roman Catholic doctrine of penance. Romanists hold that when a man has sinned after baptism the condition of his being forgiven is that he shall experience and perform repentance.

Now, repentance, as an experience, may be defined as a virtue. That is, it is just what we call repentance, a grace wrought by the power of the Holy Spirit. But penance as a sacrament consists of three parts. It is confession made to the party having jurisdiction. It is an undergoing of satisfaction as defined and appointed by him. It is then, finally, receiving absolution. Romanists hold that upon a perfect confession and repentance, and upon due and adequate and legally appointed satisfaction, the absolution, which, as pronounced, is not declarative simply, but is efficient, really removes liability to the punishment of sin. They hold that God awards to all human sins two distinct penalties, one eternal and one temporal. Their doctrine of the eternal penalty of

sin is that it has already been suffered and paid by Jesus Christ our Lord, and therefore removed absolutely and for ever from all these members; but the temporal penalty is retained, which must be endured proportionately by each sinner for himself. And thus God is represented as keeping a debit-and-credit account with all Christians, wherein their sins in their various degrees of turpitude shall be debit, and wherein their acts of benevolence of various degrees, cither in this life or in purgatory, represent the credit, and a balance is struck between these; and in every case it must be finally adjusted on the side of credit to the individual before the final day of judgment.

We come now to the Protestant or evangelical position. The first principle that we hold is that all spiritual life in the creature is conditioned upon his intimate relation to and fellowship with God. If God is angry with us, we are cut off from him and spiritual life is impossible. If spiritual life is to be restored, it must be upon the condition that God shall be first reconciled to us, and then we shall be restored to his love. The doctrine of the evangelical Church is that a man must first become reconciled to God, and be brought back into the sphere of divine favor, before he can receive the Holy Spirit and be brought into union with God and made spiritually good. That is, the favor of God is the essential precondition of grace and holiness.

Now, this is expressed by saying that justification must precede regeneration, and that regeneration must precede sanctification. All these graces are defined with wonderful precision and fullness in our Catechism, which is familiar to you all. Justification is there declared to be an act of God, accomplished by one single divine volition, completed by one single act in each instance. It is declared also to be au act—a forensic act; that is, an act of a Judge, not an act of God as Sovereign. It is not performed in the exercise of prerogative or of right as a Sovereign, but in the exercise of his infinite wisdom and justice in judging of objective facts. It is an act of God pronouncing that with respect to this person the law has no penal demands—that all its demands in the covenant of salvation have been satisfied. And this act of God proceeds upon his previous act of accrediting to the believer, as the ground of his acceptance, the righteousness—that is, all the result of the penal suffering and all the merit of the vicarious obedience—wrought out by our Lord Jesus Christ.

It consequently changes the relation of the justified .person to the law, not only with regard to the past, not (only with regard to the present, but with regard to the whole future. So that obedience to the law is no longer the condition of our acceptance. We are received into the favor of God for ever, and on the condition of righteousness, which has already been achieved and which has already been made ours, not simply in the purposes and covenants, but in the actual act of God in putting it to our account and making it actually ours.

Now, regeneration follows immediately upon this. It is also an act of God, wherein he exercises his mighty power in one single volition; but it is not the act of God as Judge. It is an act of divine creative power, analogous to that which he put forth when he created man originally, when he said, " Let there be light, and there was light," or when our Lord Jesus Christ called Lazarus out of the grave. It is an act in which he communicates to us in the centre of our soul a new spiritual life, which, acting from within, involves the whole nature, communicates a new principle of activity and a new mode of action to all the faculties in all their functions and in all their relations.

Sanctification necessarily begins with, and indefinitely continues as a consequent of regeneration. It is not an act, but a work of God’s grace, wherein he sustains and develops, perfects and

continues, the work which he has commenced. He himself teaches us the relation of these graces, one to the other, by metaphors and analogies between the natural and the spiritual life. Regeneration is begetting, or, on the other hand, it is the new birth, and therein we are born babes in Christ. Sanctification is a growth under the sustaining and supporting influences of the Holy Spirit dwelling within us. It proceeds in a twofold process, in the mortification of the old man and in the vivification of the new man. All that remains of the old corruption is subdued, and the principle of life which has been implanted in us is gradually developed in us in every faculty and in every function. It involves the intellect, because sin is blindness. The new birth involves spiritual relations, and the process of sanctification is a process of illumination whereby we come more and more to understand the revelations of God as they illuminate both hemispheres—both the earthly and the spiritual horizon.

Hence it involves the affections. These new affections go forth to new objects, and gradually these affections, in their entirety and in all their exercise and in all their functions, are made pure and spiritual. It involves also the voluntary faculties, the desires, the affections, all the faculties of connation which go out to their object and issue in volition, in choice and purpose. A man is thus enabled to choose the highest end and to resist the evil, so that he gradually becomes, not only more illuminated with it, but more and more in love with it in his affections, and he becomes stronger and stronger in the habitual understanding, detection and rejection of all evil, and in the choice and in the achievement of all good.

Now, every Christian who really has experienced the grace of Christ must, unless very greatly prejudiced, recognize the fact that this work of sanctification is the end and the crown of the whole process of salvation.

We insist upon and put forward distinctly the great doctrine of justification as a means to an end. It is absolutely necessary as the condition of that faith which is the necessary source of regeneration and sanctification, and even* person who is a Christian must recognize the fact that not only will it issue in sanctification, but it must begin in sanctification. This element must be recognized as characteristic of the Christian experience from the first to the last. And any man who thinks that he is a Christian, and that he has accepted Christ for justification, when he did not at the same time accept Christ for sanctification, is miserably deluded in that very experience. He is in danger of falling under that judgment of which Paul admonishes when he speaks of the wrath of God coming down from heaven upon all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, and with special reference to those who " hold the truth in unrighteousness."

Now, this process, however, from its very nature must be a gradual process. Of course, I would not deny that just as God might take a pebble and make a man out of it, so he might take the greatest sinner in the world and by the exercise of his mighty power make him in an instant the greatest saint in the world. But I do say, from all we do know of God, either in the works of creation or in the works of providence or in the Bible, that any such conception is utterly incongruous and outside of all analogy and all probability. All God’s working, so far as we know anything about it, is historico-genctic. He works by means. He works according to the lines and sequences of natural law.

Now, that justification should be an act, that it should be begun and accomplished by one divine volition, is very natural because it is unavoidable. There can be no degree between condemnation

as a sinner and acceptance as a justified man through the righteousness of Christ. If I stand before God in my own right, I am utterly , condemned. If I stand represented in the vicarious righteousness of Jesus Christ, then in one instant I stand divinely justified, and far beyond what I would have been if Adam had kept his first estate and sin had never invaded this world.

If Adam had not fallen we would have been justified by Adamic righteousness. Angels and archangels now stand before God justified by angelic righteousness. But Jehovah Tsidkenu, Jehovah is our righteousness. It is not what you or I have done or will do, it is not our services in the past or promises for the future, but it is what the eternal Son of God, in the likeness of sinful flesh, did suffer and accomplish in the flesh, which is the ground of our justification and of our acceptance before God. And therefore it is that the instant the sinner believes and trusts in the pardoning Lord Aw righteousness becomes his, and it is by one instant act which cannot be divided, in a moment which cannot be analyzed into degrees, that the condemned sinner becomes a justified saint. The same must be true, from its very nature, of regeneration. There must be an absolute commencement somewhere when God was moved to come forth out of the solitude and isolation of his infinitude to lay the foundations of the heavens and the earth. There must have been an absolute beginning; there must have been one instant when the energy of God went forth from without and acted in the objective world and brought something into existence that was not there before. So regeneration must be an instant act. There must be a time, an instant, when the soul is dead. There must be another instant when the soul is living. You know how it is expressed in the divine Word. It is creation—that is, an instant act. It is a begetting—that is, an instant act. It is a new birth. It is a quickening of the dead —that is, an instantaneous act. But when this new life is implanted in us, is it not evident to all men that unless God shall work, nothing of this kind can take place? This, then, is a simple act of his power, and from the very nature of the case must be instantaneous. But after it is implanted in us there must be a gradual process by which that grace that is implanted in us, exhibiting itself as an energy in every one of the faculties, takes possession of the whole being, shows its gradual and repeated action in all the habits of the life, and at last comes forth in its spontaneity as a complete and finished result. The same is clear from the precepts of God wherein he commands us to work out our own salvation with fear and trembling; in which he commands us to avail ourselves of all the means of grace which he has especially appointed as the great means of sanctification. The truth of God acts upon us, of course, in every way according to the nature of the truth which acts. The commands act upon us in one way, the threatenings act upon us in another way, and the promises act upon us in another way, and the glimpses of divine glory act upon us in another way. Retrospects of the past and the prospects of the future all act upon the regenerated Christian and stimulate his activity in various ways. And so it is with the providences of God. The Lord leads us, you know, by devious ways through our pilgrimage, and he appoints for us all our changes.

Now, under all these conditions God is carrying on the process of sanctification. We are gradually growing up and adding grace to grace, going from one degree of knowledge to another, from the acquisition of one increment of strength to another, from the development of one faculty to another, just as a child grows, just as Jesus grew himself, in wisdom and stature. First we are babes in Christ, and come at last to the measure of the stature of perfect manhood in Christ. But every one can see that a Christian, while he recognizes that this work must be a growth, recognizes that we cannot compromise with any evil. It is perfectly evident that the standard of

sanctification in the Christian life, which is at once placed before him when he first receives Christ, is the standard of infinite and of absolute perfection. There can be from the very nature of the case no compromise here, and it must be recognized as such from the first. This results from the nature of moral principle and moral obligation. It is very plain that all that is moral is obligatory. That is what the word means. If a thing is right, it ought to be; and if it is right in its entirety, then it ought to be in its entirety.

St. Augustine said fourteen hundred years ago—and the language has never been improved—" Every lesser good has an essential element of sin." Now, for instance, suppose that you love God. Suppose that there is nothing in your heart but love to God. It does not follow that you do not sin. You say, "I love God, and there is nothing in my heart but love to God. Is not love right?" Yes, if you love God with all your heart, with all your mind, and with all your strength and with all your manhood. But if there be in this love any defect; if it come short in quality; if it come short in quantity,—then it partakes of the nature of sin, for every lesser good, as well as every degree of good short of perfection, is of the essential nature of sin itself. Therefore if any Christian should say, " Why, we cannot be perfect—that is impossible. Nobody is perfect. I will not succeed if I try, and therefore I will sit down with a qualified obedience; I will mix water with my milk; I will mix half-heartedness with my endeavor; I will compromise the standard, because the perfect standard is absolutely impossible,"—why, that man is selling his soul to the devil in doing this; he is making a compact with sin in the very nature of it. Any permitted sin, any sitting down willingly to imperfectness, is of the nature of sin, and unallowable.

I am not lowering the standard. Now, the Perfectionist people lower the standard to themselves. I remember that I had a Perfectionist a member of my church when I was a very young man, and in conversation she said to me, " Mr. Hodge, you must keep up the standard."—" Oh yes," said I, " you must keep up the standard. You say Mr. Smith is perfect—that is your standard. J say that only Jesus Christ is perfect—that is my standard. Which of us, then, keeps up the standard?" The Perfectionists, all of them, confound justification and sanctification miserably, just as Roman Catholics do; only they do it in an informal, illogical way; but they do it.

They hold that the Lord Jesus Christ, or that God, for the sake of the Lord Jesus Christ, has graciously lowered the demands of the law. They admit that we cannot fulfill the Adamic law under which God created man; but they say that we can fulfill the gospel law, that we can render a perfect love, and the evangelical standard is lowered to conform to our standard. This is an act of substitution of a new thing. That is a miserable lowering of the standard. It is putting a new and lower standard in the place of the old and higher standard.

Now, the truth is that this law has never been lowered, the principle of the law by which moral character is to be measured having its norm in the absolutely perfect moral constitution of God himself. God’s law is an utterance, it is an expression of God himself in the forms of human thought and language; it reveals to man the infinitely perfect moral nature of God himself. And when God’s law is altered, and so altered and modified that God is compromised, that moral character has been modified and has been compromised in the very throne of the universe itself. It is true that the law has been satisfied for us for our justification, that the Lord Jesus Christ has been substituted in our place. But the law was not lowered—it was magnified, it was made honorable ; so that what a man could not do in that he was weak through the flesh, God has done

by giving his Son in the flesh. But it was by perfect obedience and by the vicarious sufferings of Jesus Christ that this debt was paid, and fully paid by the terms of the law. But this refers to the law as a covenant of salvation; it does not refer to the law as a moral standard of character. St, Paul said, in his Epistle to the Romans (Romans 6:14), "Sin shall not have dominion over you, because you are not under the law, but under grace." He is referring to justification; he is not referring to sanctification. He does not say that the Lord Jesus Christ satisfied the law in your behalf, and that therefore the law has no more demands upon you; but he says the Lord Jesus Christ satisfied the law as a covenant in your behalf. But the law, as a standard of character, remains the same infinite, perfect law, having its ground and norm in the infinite and perfect, in the absolutely unchangeable, nature of God himself. The same thing is proved by the fact that the Bible tells us that God himself is the standard. How can anybody claim to be perfect when God is the standard, or claim that the law is to be lowered ? We are to \yo holy as our Father in heaven is holy. We are told to lay aside every weight and the sin that doth most easily beset us, and run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus as our standard and our aim and glory. Then, as Christ's perfection was an absolute perfection, why of course the perfection of the Christian can be nothing less than absolute perfection. As Christians, therefore, we cannot compromise with sin. No man can serve God and Mammon. No service is admitted from the first, not even in the recruits, from those who come with a divided heart. We are to leave the things which are behind, and to reach forward always to the things which are More, in order that we may apprehend and realize that whereunto we have been apprehended in the purposes and in the design of Christ.

Especially is it our privilege and duty to go forward to the attainment of perfect assurance, making our calling and election sure.

There are two different positions occupied in Christendom on this subject of faith and assurance. Some have held that assurance is of the essence of faith, and that a man, if he is a Christian at all, will know that he is a Christian. This was a form of thinking very prevalent at the time of the Reformation. It grew out of the fact that they were more earnest, spontaneous men than they were reflective Christian divines. It is a matter of fact that at that period of Church history there were men in whom this grace of assurance of salvation was very prominent. They did have it, and God gave it to them, because he gave them an herculean work to do which demanded heroes for its performance. In direct opposition to this the Romanists take the position that assurance of personal salvation is impossible, and they take it on this ground : assurance means absolute certitude, grounded upon divine revelation. The Romanists point out the fact that there is no text in the Bible where it is said that John Smith is a Christian. The fact that any man is a Christian is not a matter of divine revelation.

Now, our Confession of Faith takes the middle ground, and I think the right ground, that assurance is not of the essence of faith. And this is very plain, because the Bible makes the distinction between the assurance of faith and the assurance of hope. Assurance of faith is strong, full faith; assurance of hope is an inference from that. Faith terminates on the ground of assurance; hope terminates upon the object desired. Faith is the foundation of hope, but faith and hope are not the same tiling; they do not go out in parallel lines with one another and take hold of the same object. Assurance of faith is assured faith, but assurance of hope is the conviction that we are Christians and that we are objects of divine love and heirs of divine glory. It can be put, like any other point of

reasoning, in the form of a syllogism. It is a matter of absolute revelation that he that believes in Christ is saved. This is the major proposition of the syllogism. The minor proposition is, "I believe." That has no need of revelation ; it belongs to the inner consciousness. Am I not just as sure that I believe as I am sure that my pulses beat? You put the minor under the major proposition, and the infallible conclusion is, " Therefore I am saved." Our Confession says that this infallible assurance springs up in the heart in consequence of three elements meeting together. The first is strong faith in the Word of God; second, the consciousness of the possession of those graces to which the promises are annexed. It is not simply faith; the Bible is full of promises, and they arc addressed, not to persons named, but to characters. Whosoever loveth, whosoever believeth, whosoever obeyeth, whosoever trusteth, whosoever hopeth. Well, if I hope and trust and obey and love, the consciousness of possessing these graces gives me the assurance of the promises which God has annexed to the graces. Then, in the third place, there is that mysterious and royal gift, the witness together with our spirit of the Holy Spirit.

Like all similar truths, this may be abused fanatically and claimed ignorantly by very stupid persons to whom it does not apply. But it is in the Word of God; it does belong to some person, and there must be a way of finding out and testing this. It is the witnessing together of our spirit with the Spirit of God. You cannot confound these two personalities; my spirit and Jehovah's Spirit—we are two. But if the Spirit of God as a Person comes to my spirit as a person, and bears witness together with my spirit that I am a child of God, I have the utmost certitude. Of course we must guard against misconception; there is no point in which it is more necessary for us to apply critical tests. There is no state of mind which is more to be desired, which more immediately tends to sanctification, which develops more power, and is in a wider sense the precondition of great usefulness, than that which is characterized by the words assurance of hope, and which results from the witnessing with our spirit of the Spirit of God. Per contra, there is no state of mind so dangerous and profane, and which leads more to sin, than that wicked, conceited assumption which we meet sometimes in unholy and godless persons, when they claim to know that they are the favorites of Heaven, because they have conceived they had the witness of the Spirit. We are all liable to this abuse; we are moved to it by the natural operation of self-love. We all want to be " the sons of God and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ." We all want to have the question settled.

Then, again, it is not only the tendency of an innocent self-love, but also of pride, and it may be the seduction of Satan; because when he wants to take a person into his grasp entirely, what better thing can he do than to render him morally callous and fill him with presumptuous self-assurance?

How are you and I to know ? I think the first essential mark of the difference between true and false assurance is to be found in the fact that the true works humility. There is nothing in the world that works such satanic, profound, God-defiant pride as false assurance; nothing works such utter humility or brings to such utter self-emptiness as the child-like spirit of true assurance. Surely this can be known. If a person is self-confident, there is self-assurance; if there is any evidence of pride in connection with his claim, it is a most deadly mark; it is the plague-spot which marks death and corruption. But if there is utter humility you have the sign of the true spirit. This will manifest itself in connection with another mark. If one is really united to Christ in a union sa established that Christ is indeed in possession of the soul, the whole consciousness will be taken up with what I would call Christ-consciousness, and there will be no self-consciousness. Little children are very prompt to show their character. There is a great difference in them. Bring a child into the room.

She comes thinking about nothing in particular, looking at her mother, then looking at the guests or anything that objectively strikes her, not thinking of herself. That is pure, sweet and lovely. She grows older, and she comes to think of herself and what people think of her, and her manner has lost its unconsciousness. A great deal of what you call bashful-ness is rottenness at the heart; it is self-consciousness. Nothing in the world so tends to defile the imagination, to pervert the affections and to corrupt the morals as self-consciousness. You know it is connected with every diseased and morbid action of the body. A young woman told me that she wanted the witness of the Spirit, and she talked about it everlastingly; she wanted to tell her own experience and feelings always. I told her she must forget herself, not think of her own feelings. The man who is talking about his love unceasingly has no love; the man who is talking about his faith unceasingly has no faith; the two things cannot go together. When you love, what are you thinking about? Are you not thinking about the object of your love? And when you believe, what are you thinking about? Why, the object that you believe. Suppose you ask yourself, "Am I believing ?" Why, of course you are not believing when you are thinking of believing. No human being believes except when he thinks about Christ. Am I loving ? Of course I am not loving when I am thinking about loving; no human being loves except when he is thinking about Christ as the object of his love. In Virginia I once saw one human being in whom there was the perfect work of grace, as far as I could see as her pastor, and I was intimate with her six years. Even on earth she was one of those who had made their garments white in the blood of the Lamb, and she seemed always to walk upon the verge of heaven. I never heard her speak of any one particular of her character or of her own graces. I have come out of the pulpit when the congregation had gone, and have found her upon her knees in her pew, absolutely unconscious of all external objects, so far was she absorbed in worship. When I roused her from her trance, she cried instantly, " Is he not holy? is he not glorious? is he not beautiful? is he not infinite ?" She did not speak of her own love or of her feelings. A great deal of Perfectionism is rotten to the core. All self-consciousness is of the very essence and nature of sin. Then, again, true confidence leads necessarily to strong desires for more knowledge and more holiness, for unceasing advances of grace.

I was told once, in a congregation where I preached, that I need not tell a certain young man anything about religion ; he. had finished it—that is, that, having finished it, he found nothing else to do. That is what the word " perfect" means. Now, when a man has finished eternal life, when he has finished learning all the revelation of God, when he has experienced all the infinite benefits of Christ’s redemption, when he has finished all the mysterious work of the Holy Ghost in his heart, he ought to be annihilated. There is no place in heaven or on earth for such a man. But a man who really has the love of God in his heart is always reaching forward to the things which are before. The more he loves, the more he wants to love; the more he is consecrated, the more consecration he longs for. He has grand ideas and grand aims, but they lie beyond him in heaven.

I want to speak now about Antinomianism. There are two forms of Antinomianism, but they are the same thing. One has been called Neo-nomianism and the other Antinomianism.

Antinomianism is the doctrine that Christ has so satisfied the law for us that it is abolished; that having gone to Christ we are washed and cleansed, and we may do as we please, because Christ has in every sense so fulfilled the law that it has no more dominion over us. That is called Antinomianism.

It has been very common for Arminians to charge upon Calvinism the doctrine of Antinomianism. We repudiate it. We say with Paul of the man who says, " Let us continue in sin that grace may abound," his damnation is sure.

Neo-nomiauism is a substitution of a new and lower law for the infinite law of God. The law is the absolute perfection which God has put before us, and they lower the standard when they teach a lower doctrine with regard to sin. The other view is that God has, for Christ's sake, not abolished the law, but he has substituted a new law, and that in place of the law of absolute perfection things are adjusted to the nature of man in his present state. This is the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, and the doctrine also of many pretenders to perfection; it is the precise doctrine of the "higher life" under a different name. Of course, there can be no controversy if you mean really higher life. We all believe in that; we all preach it. " Go on unto perfection;" " Leave the things which are behind;" strive after holiness in every direction. But if you say you have attained to it, and that higher life is just what I see embodied in the lives of A, B and C, I say that is the very opposite. It is not a higher life; it is a lower life.

It is wrong, because it substitutes a lower standard. It is wrong, because it gives you a false idea of sin, for sin means "any want of conformity" to the absolute standard of God. Every one is a sinner. John Wesley admits that; everybody admits that. If you use the word " sin " in the sense of a real, deliberate choice of evil, then perhaps some men may not be sinners in that sense. But even Dr. George Peck, whose book is a standard with regard to the doctrine of Perfectionism among Arminians, says: " In the life of the most perfect Christian there is every day renewed occasion for self-abhorrence, for repentance, for renewed application to the blood of Christ, for application of the rekindling of the Holy Spirit." What is the use of calling that perfection? We do go on unto perfection, and we grow better and better every day; but every day we come so far short that there is renewed occasion for having recourse to the standard of perfection. We require the renewed application of the blood of Christ and the grace of the Spirit. We do not call this perfection. But you say, Why make a point of telling people they cannot be perfect? I say we do not make a point of telling people they cannot be perfect. I open the Bible and it says, Move on; " forgetting the things which are behind," go forward. When a man can show that he is doing this, he is going on to perfection. I would not preach that you cannot be perfect, but I would preach to you, Have no standard of perfection but Almighty God and Jesus Christ his Son. That is the doctrine. Perfectionism is pernicious and evil, because it is false. It is not true, and every lie does harm. A lie that touches the very quick and centre of religious experience is of the very nature of death itself. A man recently died in London who held this doctrine. He was once my guest in America. I loved him. I was his guest in London. But I thought he knew no more of theology than a babe; yet he was trying to teach others when he ought to have been taught himself. He said that we all receive Christ twice. We receive him for our justification, and afterward we receive him for our sanctification; and he tried to illustrate it in a great many instances. He spoke of D'Aubigno, Thomas Chalmers and Mrs. Jonathan Edwards.

Now, it is very remarkable that nearly all the most perfect saints never themselves knew their own perfection. Mrs. Edwards was all the time aspiring for perfection which was beyond her, and never thought for an instant that she was perfect. D'Aubigno never heard of the grace of justification without sanctification. And if you could have talked to Dr. Chalmers, with his great heart and glowing tongue, on such a theme as this, he would have struck it down into the dust. It is not true.

You cannot take Christ for justification unless you take him for sanctification. Think of the sinner coming to Christ and saying, " I do not want to be holy" I do not want to be saved from sin" I would like to be saved in my sins;" " Do not sanctify me now;" " But justify me now." What would be the answer? Could he be accepted by God? You can no more separate justification from sanctification than you can separate the circulation of the blood from the inhalation of the air. Breathing and circulation are two different things, but you cannot have one without the other; they go together and they constitute one life. So you have justification and sanctification; they go together and they constitute one life. If there was ever one who attempted to receive Christ with justification and not with sanctification, he missed it, thank God! He was no more justified than he was sanctified. The whole process is the reverse of sanctification in its very essence; for the more a man grows in sanctification, the more delicate is his sensibility, the more exquisite his sense of sin. A man who has been in a swoon, utterly dead to sensation, recovers his sensations gradually. As he becomes more and more conscious, he gradually perceives everything that is wrong with him. So the more a man is sanctified, the more is there a change in his judgment; it becomes more discriminating, and the more humble will be his estimate of himself. Things which did not appear to be sin at first will be realized as sin afterward more and more.

Those who say, " We have already attained and are already perfect," lower the standard; instead of sanctification, it is pollution; instead of a higher life, it is a lower life. Again, it necessarily generates increasing self-consciousness and spiritual pride; these things run together, and will go out at last in utter darkness.

You can all understand the ripening of the pear. There is a ripening which goes on in the autumn of the year which is perfect, and perfectly ripe fruit is one of the most perfect and beautiful things in nature. It is a gradual process from the blossom through all the different stages. You could not hasten it. It is growing on in the sunshine and when the dews of heaven descend upon it. The ripening is perfect; and when you take it from the limb you say, " Thank God, this is perfect; it has run through all the stages; it has omitted none, it has come to the end, it is finished." But you go sometimes and you find pears early ripe, and they have a sweet and luscious self-consciousness of it, and they fall down flat on the earth and are soft, because there is a worm at the core. My good grandmother used to say, and I think now it is worth repeating, " I do hate the early-ripes."

03.16. LECTURE 16 - THE SACRAMENTS

LECTURE XVI THE SACRAMENTS.

Baptism. As we have seen before, in Lecture IX., that the Church and kingdom of God rest upon a covenant, it is evidently appropriate that Christ should provide visible seals by which that covenant should be ratified and its benefits symbolized to all who accept its terms. We have seen also, under Lecture XIV., that the true Church is designed by God to organize itself under his law, under varying historical conditions, in outward visible communities: it is evident, therefore, that it is to be expected that Christ should give to his Church certain divinely-appointed and universally-recognized badges of membership by which they are to be distinguished from others. The word " sacrament" is not in the Bible, and therefore the meaning of that term, and of the other terms by which the class comprising baptism and the Lord’s Supper have been designated, must be. determined from the general usage of the Church.

I. They have been called " mysteries " by a very natural association. The mysteries were the secrets of Grecian religious rites, which could not possibly be discovered by the uninitiated, but which were, while jealously guarded from the outsider, gradually revealed to the initiated in proportion to his grade of membership. The early pastors of the primitive Church were surrounded by heathen communities. On the Sabbath days their congregations at first consisted of three distinct classes—the heathen inquirers, the catechumens and the communicants. After the sermon had been preached, with singing and prayer, the general audience of the uninitiated heathen were dismissed, with the formula Ite, missa est!—" Go, it is dismissed." Then the catechumens, or candidates for baptism, the first degree of Christian profession, were instructed, and afterward dismissed with the same formula, Ite missa est! Then only the communicants of the second or highest grade of Christian profession remained, and they together celebrated the most sacred rite of the Lord’s Supper, at which none of the uninitiated were allowed to remain even as witnesses. Hence the sacraments came by analogy to be regarded as the Christian mysteries, or innermost secrets unveiled only to the initiated, and hence, likewise, the Lord’s Supper itself came to be called the "Mass," from its being introduced by two repetitions, and followed by a third repetition of the dismission formula, Ite, missa est!

These rites have more generally and permanently been called " sacraments," which has mistakenly been taken as the Latin equivalent of the Greek mystery. The scramentum was anything that renders sacred or binds, as a bail or a soldier’s oath. These sacred rites seal and publicly consummate a Christian’s profession of faith and allegiance. They bind him to a service, like a citizen’s oath of loyalty, which was obligatory upon him antecedently in consequence of his birth. In the same general sense these special rites have been called, especially among Scotch Presbyterians, " sealing ordinances." By engagement therein the professing Christian openly signifies and seals his profession of faith and promise of service. At the same time, by the admission of the individual to the privilege of participating in them the Church, through its officers, signifies and seals its recognition of the covenanting believer as an accepted member of the

Church. It is for this reason that the right of admitting to or of excluding from these "sealing ordinances" is called "the power of the keys," the power of admission or of exclusion, " of binding or of loosing," of which our Lord speaks in his address to Peter (Matthew 16:19). And for this reason also the right of administering these "sealing ordinances," which are the keys that open or shut the doors of the visible Church, has always been rigidly confined to the ordained ministry or highest class of church-officers, thus qualified to act in this matter—not as individuals, but as representatives of the whole body of believers and the executors according to law of their corporate will.

II. It is a more important question to ask what are the real nature and design of these sacraments in the economy of the Christian Church.

Sacraments are symbols, symbolical actions, wherein outward physical signs represent inward invisible grace. The signs consist of the elements and of the sacramental actions of the minister and of the recipient in relation to these elements. They are symbolical transactions, in which Christ and the benefits of his salvation are represented, sealed and applied to believers. The grace symbolized is purchased by Christ, is conveyed and applied by the Holy Ghost and is received by faith. That grace, therefore, as inward and invisible, belongs to the spiritual Church as such, whether organized into visible societies or not. But the sacraments, wherein this inward invisible grace is represented by outward physical signs, belong obviously to those visible societies or organized churches into which the spiritual children of God are gathered. They can have no other sphere. They are signs and seals to men in the flesh of things which relate to the spiritual world. But the outward sign has no pertinency except in relation to the condition of men in the flesh and sustaining the relations of members of visible organized societies. Their need and use grow out of the two facts—

(1) that as long as we are in the flesh the most profound impressions are made upon our souls through our bodily senses; and

(2) that as long as we are associated together in these outward visible organizations we need visible, easily recognizable badges of fellowship and seals of a common loyalty.

These symbols are, in the first place, natural. Circumcision and the washing the body with water in baptism are obviously natural signs, significant of the need of a second birth—a new birth, which will be like life from the dead; a life distinguished from the natural life by spirituality. The sacrifice of the paschal lamb, and the sprinkling of his blood on the doorposts, and the eating of his flesh at a sacrificial feast as people in fellowship with God, and the breaking and eating of the bread and the pouring out and drinking of the wine in the Lord’s Supper, are obviously natural signs, significant of our participation in all the sacrificial benefits of Christ’s redemption. In the second place, being selected by God as natural symbols of the spiritual graces represented, they are ordained by him to be so regarded and treated on his authority by his Church for ever. Their suggestive and edifying power is due to both of these facts—the natural likeness and the divine appointment The design of these sacraments is obvious from their nature and uses, and is moreover clearly taught in Scripture.

1st. They are effective objective exhibitions of the central truths of the Gospels. Like pictures they impressively set forth to the eye and the imagination the same great truths which the Word of God

read or preached sets forth to the ear. Their use has proved the wisdom of their appointment. The rationale lies in the constitution of human nature as embracing rational spirits incarnate in animal bodies.

2d. They are badges of church-membership, and hence at the same time of our relation to Christ as our Teacher, Redeemer and King, and of our relation to one another as beneficiaries of the same redemption, learners in the same school, brethren in the same family, subjects of the same kingdom and heirs of the same inheritance. They discharge the same offices as do the pass-signs of the secret societies, the uniform of the army, the standards of the battle, the flag of the nation. They give definite visibility to the professing organized Church of Jesus Christ on earth, at once in the eyes of its own members and of all outsiders.

3d. They were also designed by Christ to be the seals of his covenant with men. Every covenant implies two parties, who mutually give and receive pledges. A seal is an outward visible thing or action attached by appointment of government, which recognizes and consummates a contract, rendering the contract even more sacred by the governmental recognition. In these sacraments Christ seals his mediatorial undertaking for us, and pledges by an objective declaration, in every case audible and visible, our salvation on the condition of our really and spiritually doing what we in appearance do in receiving the sacrament. We at the same time swear a sacred oath, enacted by word and act, to put ourselves absolutely into Christ's hands to receive his full salvation and to be consecrated to his service.

4th. They were also ordained by Christ to be means of grace—not the only means, in the absence of which grace is not given, but real, divinely-appointed means, the use of which is obligatory and most useful to all Christians, the appointed instruments in the hands of the Holy Spirit of effecting and distributing grace to men severally as he wills. " The outward and ordinary means, whereby Christ communicates to his Church the benefits of his mediation, are all his ordinances; especially the Word, sacraments, and prayer " (Larger Cat., Ques. 154). Christ uses these sacraments not only to represent and seal, but also actually to apply, the benefits of his redemption to believers (Shorter Cat., Ques. 92). This efficiency as means of grace does not, of course, inhere in the sacramental elements or actions themselves, nor in the merit or intention of the administrator, but always in the present gracious volition of the Holy Ghost, whose instruments they are, just as the efficiency of the axe or hammer or sword is due to the will and power of the man who wields it. The axe cuts down the tree because it is adapted to cut wood, and because it is energetically and skillfully wielded by a strong man. The sacrament acts as means of conveying grace because its signs and actions are adapted to affect the mind and the heart and the will of men in the right way at the same time, and because the Holy Ghost, who works in us to will and to do of his good pleasure, uses it as he wills and to effect his own purpose.

III. It is well known that the Romanists hold that there are under the new law or covenant seven sacraments—viz. baptism, confirmation, the Lord's Supper, penance, marriage, orders, extreme unction, although they have always acknowledged that baptism and the Lord's Supper constitute a pre-eminently sacred class by themselves—as Thomas Aquinas calls them, potissima sacramenta. All these, with the exception of penance and extreme unction, are admitted by Protestants to be important divine ordinances. The only question between Protestants and Catholics at this point relates to the proper extension of the word " sacrament," which is not found

in the Bible. The true way of putting the question on the Protestant side is not to raise a controversy as to the meaning of a non-biblical word, but to ask, "Are there any other divine ordinances of the same class, possessing the same qualities and sustaining the same relations as baptism and the Lord's Supper?" We Protestants answer, emphatically, " No !" That these special ordinances were designed to be perpetual is as plain as language and reason can make it. In the first place, this is antecedently probable, because the reason for their original institution still continues. In the second place, this continued use in the case of each sacrament is specifically commanded: " Go ye into all the world, discipling all nations, baptizing them," etc., and, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of this world-age " (Matthew 28:19-20; Mark 16:15); " Do this in remembrance of meand the inspired comment of the apostle, " For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come" (1 Corinthians 11:26). These are, therefore, to continue until the second coming of Christ. In the third place, the apostles practiced the use of both sacraments as long as they lived. And in the fourth place, the entire Christian Church, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, has continued their observance in unbroken continuity unto the present time. IV. Baptism.

All the wwld knows the vast volume of controversy and of controversial literature which has been generated in the Church around this immense subject. We have, on the one hand, the great body of the historical Christian churches, and, on the other hand, the Protestants of Protestants, our Baptist brethren. In this point of view the advantage appears to be on our side. But this advantage is very greatly abated when we come to estimate the average quality of the two great contestant bodies in mass, and recognize the fact that these Baptist brethren stand among those occupying the very foremost rank in intelligence, learning, piety, effective usefulness and universal and strict fidelity to the Word of God. The questions in debate relate to fundamental points: 1st. What is baptism ? What, precisely, are we commanded to do when we are commanded to baptize ? 2d. What classes of persons are we to baptize ? These Lectures have nothing to do with controversy. "We propose, therefore, in the most friendly spirit toward all those who differ from us, to state with perfect simplicity our own belief as to what is the truth on both these subjects.

[I.] We believe that the command to baptize is precisely and only a command to wash with water as a symbol of spiritual regeneration and cleansing into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. The essential parts of the external sacrament are, consequently, (1) the formula;

(2) the element;

(3) the action;

(4) the sense in which the symbol is interpreted.

(1)It is essential to the validity of this ordinance that it should be administered " in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." This is certain—

(a) because of the words of the great commission in Matthew 28:19;

(b) from the essential significancy of the rite.

Besides being a symbol of spiritual purification, it is essentially, as the rite of initiation into the Christian Church, a covenanting ordinance, whereby the recipient recognizes and pledges his

allegiance to God in that character and in those relations in which he has revealed himself to us in the plan of salvation. The formula of baptism, therefore, is a summary of the whole Scripture doctrine of the Triune Jehovah as he has chosen to reveal himself to us in all those relations which the several Persons of the Trinity graciously sustain to the believer in the scheme of redemption.

(2)The element, as is universally acknowledged, is water. Water is to the physical system of this earth and to the life upon its surface what the blood is in the animal organism. When water is withheld the whole earth becomes first clouded with dust, and then parched to death, and finally becomes a barren desert. When the water is copiously restored the face of nature is purified, and the desert is transformed into the garden of the Lord. Water as the universal bearer of life and solvent is the natural type of spiritual regeneration and sanctification. If water, therefore, is absent, there 19 no baptism, because the command to baptize is the command to wash with water.

(3) The element and the action by which it is used and applied constitute what is technically called the " matter of baptism"—i. e. the thing done by the person who performs the rite. This we believe to be simply a washing with water. The whole rite is a symbol of spiritual cleansing. The thing to be done, therefore, is to wash. The manner of doing it is, therefore, necessarily accidental and outside of the command. This we fully believe—

(a) Because the Greek words used to express the command βαπτ■ζω and β■πτω, although their root-meaning is to immerse in any liquid, have come to mean generally the producing of the effect for the sake of which the liquid is applied; e. g. to wash or to tinge or to dye, no matter in what manner the liquid is applied to the subject operated upon. The word ν■πτω, to wash, and the word βαπτ■ζω, are used interchangeably in the New Testament (Matthew 15:2; Mark 7:1-15; Luke 11:37-39. See also 2 Kings 5:13-14 and Titus 3:5).

(6) These words are unquestionably used in the New Testament in a great variety of connections in which they cannot emphasize any one mode of applying the water, as the " washing of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and of tables " (Mark 7:4), and the baptizing of Moses "in the cloud and in the sea" (1 Corinthians 10:1-2). The "divers washings" of the first tabernacle (Hebrews 9:10) we know to have been effected chiefly by sprinkling and pouring (Hebrews 9:13-21; Exodus 30:17-21).

(c)In all probability, the original manner of applying the water in Christian baptism was by pouring the water out of the hollow of the hand or out of a shell or small vessel, without any emphasis or special signification attached to the manner in which the water was applied. This we regard as probable, because the prevailing modes of purification among the Jews were the pouring of water and the sprinkling of blood or ashes (Leviticus 8:30; Leviticus 14:7; Leviticus 14:51; Hebrews 9:13-22). The personal ablutions of the priests were performed at the brazen laver, from which the water poured forth through spouts or cocks (1 Kings 7:38-39; 2 Chronicles 4:6). Pouring water out of a vessel upon the hands, feet or head of the person has been the method of applying water for purposes of purification from the earliest age to the present time in all the Oriental world from the Ganges to the Bosphorus. The earliest rude remains of Christian art in the Catacombs represent John as baptizing on the side of a stream of water by affusion.

(d)The outstanding essential fact, about which there can be no controversy, is that baptism with water is a symbol of baptism by the Holy Ghost. The one signifies what the other effects—i. c. the

cleansing the soul from the guilt and pollution of sin (John 3:5; Titus 3:5; Acts 2:38; Acts 22:16; 1 Corinthians 6:11; Ephesians 5:2 f). It is the washing of the body corresponding to the "washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost" John and the apostles baptized, and the modera minister baptizes, with water, but Christ baptizes us with the Holy Ghost (Luke 3:16; Acts 1:5; Acts 11:16; Acts 22:16; 1 Corinthians 12:13). The one is the shadow, the other is the substance.

(e) Everywhere in the New Testament the connection in which the baptism with water is spoken of indicates the fact that it symbolizes the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and implies spiritual purification. In John 3:22-30 the question debated between some of John's disciples and the Jews as to baptism is expressly defined to be a question concerning purification. Men were exhorted to be baptized in order to wash away their sins. It is declared that men must be born of water and of the Spirit, and that baptism as well as faith is an essential condition of salvation. The effect of baptism is declared to be purification (2 Kings 5:13-14; Jdt 12:7; Luke 11:37-39).

(J) The metaphorical representation given in Scripture of the Spirit's influence, of which baptism is the outward sign, never implies that the mode of the application is essential. The gift of the Holy Ghost was the grace signified (Acts 2:1-4; Acts 2:32-33; Acts 10:44-48; Acts 11:15-16). The fire which did not immerse them, but appeared as cloven tongues and " sat upon each one of them," was the symbol of that grace. Jesus was himself the baptizer, who now fulfilled the prediction of John the Baptist that he should baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire. The gift of the Holy Ghost is set forth alike in the Old and New Testaments in such terms as "came from heaven," "poured out," "shed forth," "fell on them" (Isaiah 44:3; Isaiah 52:15; Ezekiel 36:25-27; Joel 2:28-29).

(g) The metaphorical illustrations of the effects and benefits of baptism given in the New Testament do not lay any emphasis upon nor suggest any importance as attaching to the mode of applying the water in baptism. We are said "to be born of water and of the Spirit;" to " have put on Christ" as a garment in baptism; to be " planted together or generated together;" "to be buried with him by baptism into death " (John 3:5; Galatians 3:27 ; Romans 6:3-5). These, none of them, represent baptism itself, but all alike refer to the spiritual effects of that grace which water baptism symbolizes. In baptism we symbolically and professedly receive the Holy Ghost. The indwelling of the Holy Ghost unites us vitally to Christ. Union with Christ involves our being "generated or grafted together with him into one vital organism;" our putting on Christ as our righteousness; our being united with him federally, so that his death is our death and his rising to newness of life ours also; as he is a Priest, we are priests; as he is a Prophet, we are prophets; as he is a King, we are kings. All this and much more is true, but none of it even suggests the manner in which the water shall be applied in baptism.

(Λ) The Christian Church as a great historic body has always felt itself free in regard to this question. In the Eastern churches pouring has prevailed from immemorial times. The Greek Church has always insisted on immersion. The Roman Catholic and Protestant historic churches admit both forms. During all the more modern freer and more evangelical ages the tendency toward baptizing by sprinkling has increased and become more general. The general body of Christians have always felt that as the mode of the application of the water in baptism was not of the essence of the commandment, they were free to do in the matter as convenience as local custom suggested.

(i) It is in the highest degree incongruous with the genius of the Christian religion and with the general analogy of its institutions that the mere manner of applying water as symbolical of purification should be considered of any importance. This religion is pre-eminently spiritual and reasonable, and not external nor formal. It is designed for all men of all climates, ages and conditions, and to be applied to individuals and communities under all conceivable circumstances. The external mode of performing a rite is insisted upon in no other instance. Christ and his apostles have left no prescriptions as to the form of church government nor as to the manner of induction into church offices. No hints even as to a liturgy or form of prayer or order of general service of the sanctuary are given in their writings. Neither posture in prayer nor form of psalmody is prescribed. The questions as to the use of instrumental music, robes and written or extemporaneous prayers are left absolutely indeterminate. In the case of the sister sacrament of the Lord's Supper the manner of celebrating it, by absolutely universal consent of all Christians, has been left to the free selection of each ecclesiastical community, some receiving it lying on couches, as the apostles did who received it from the hands of Christ, and some kneeling, and some standing, and some sitting; some using unleavened bread after the original example, and others insisting upon the bread of every-day life.

(j) The case standing thus, as we think, as above stated, it is evident that the only point in connection with the mode of baptism is to insist upon it that the mode is an accident of no importance at all. The only serious mistake that possibly can be made in the premises is that of insisting upon some one of the many possible modes as absolutely essential to the integrity of the rite. The essence of the tiling is to wash with water as a symbol "of the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Everything other than this or more than this necessarily confuses the doctrine and obscures the impression of the truth. The simple command stands and embraces all Christians: " Go, wash with water into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost;" and "He who baptizes with the Holy Ghost and with fire will be with you alway, even to the end of the world."

[II.] Who are to be Baptized?

There are two principles applying to the solution of this problem which appear to us to be very clear and unquestionable. The first of these principles is that baptism is a sacramental action representing an inward invisible grace. Consequently, the outward action ought never consciously and intentionally to be applied where the inward invisible grace is absent. There could be no farce more profane, no empty show more ghastly, than that of sealing the form of a covenant where there was no real promise, of applying an outward symbol of spiritual life and grace where all spiritual life and grace are absent. Such mockery would transform the sacred pledges of God's truth into a lie. The second principle, which we affirm to be no less obvious and certain, is, that the baptism with water is itself an outward visible sign, to be applied by human agents who are incapable of reading the hearts of men, and who have no power of conveying and no authority of absolutely pledging the spiritual gifts which God retains in his own hand. It follows, consequently, that in practice, while the sign should never intentionally be applied where the grace is absent, there cannot, however, be any infallible connection between the sign and the grace. God alone reads the hearts of men and dispenses the invisible grace, and men who cannot read the heart alone dispense the outward visible signs of the sacrament. It follows that these human ministers of God's will must administer these rites upon certain presumptions—i. e. they must follow certain

divinely-appointed signs or indications which raise in each case the presumption that the parties concerned are either now or to be hereafter the parties to whom the invisible spiritual grace signified belongs. It is perfectly plain that every human society, whether social, political or religious, must necessarily be organized and administered on the same principles. Men can judge character only by external indications, and these external indications must be assumed to be presumptive evidence of the reality and genuineness of the character they indicate. And the individual officers of the society, whatever it may be, cannot be allowed to follow unrestrictedly the indications of their own variable judgments in each particular case. The society itself must, through its supreme authority, establish general rules and tests of presumptive evidence upon which its officers must act alike in the admission and in the exclusion of members.

1st. In the case of adults, or persons arrived at the condition of independent responsible agency, the presumptive ground of fitness for admission to the sealing ordinances of the Church is a competent knowledge of the plan of salvation, a credible profession of personal faith, and a walk and conversation consistent therewith. The amount of knowledge requisite must vary with the general intelligence of the subject. But it is evident that no person can be a Christian by profession who is absolutely ignorant of his own guilt and pollution and of Christ's meritorious work in our behalf. And, on the other hand, it is no less evident that multitudes of Christ's children are saved who have attained only to the vaguest and most elementary knowledge of the essentials of the gospel. A " credible profession " does not mean a profession of faith which compels credence or which convinces the observer that it is genuine, but it is simply the opposite of the incredible; it is a confession that can be believed. Neither ministers of the gospel nor elders are able to read the secrets of the human heart or to judge of character. Therefore, the great Head of the Church has not laid upon us the responsibility. The responsibility of professing Christ rests upon the individual professor. Every man who has the competent knowledge, and who makes a profession not incredible, and whose life is in conformity therewith, has a presumptive right to come to the sacraments. He does not need to prove his way in. If the Session or pastor exclude him, they or he must show sufficient positive evidence of his not being a Christian to keep him out. This plain principle is one of great importance, the violation of which has brought great evil upon the Church. As the minister and church Session have no power of reading the heart of the applicant, so it must be a great evil if they officially form and express any judgment in the case. If they do pretend to listen to and judge of the value of the experience recited, they profanely assume to possess the prerogatives which belong to God alone, and they lead deluded souls to put an unwarrantable confidence in the worthless endorsement of the church authorities. It is by reason of this that so many are asleep in Zion. Each man ought to be thrown back upon his own unshared responsibility, and made " to examine himself, that so he may eat of this bread." On the other hand, it is the great duty of those church-officers to whom Christ has committed the keys of the visible kingdom of heaven on earth to proclaim the truths of the gospel, to impress the resulting duties upon the consciences of men, and to set forth the high conditions of Christian communion which God exacts. The Romanists baptize all children indiscriminately. All adults who render an outward adherence to the Church are baptized. The State-Church systems of Protestant Europe recognize every reputable citizen of the State as a legitimate member of the Church. The true doctrine is, that no man, whatever his external relations may be, has a right to come to the holy sacraments unless he is duly qualified, and he cannot be duly qualified unless he is a living member of Christ's mystical body, a temple of the Holy Ghost. Unless he possesses this character, his approach to

the sacraments is in vain and a sin. But of this fact the man himself is always and only the one responsible judge. The officers and members of the church have no right to go behind his not incredible profession on the presumptive evidence of which the Master requires all others to receive him and to treat him in all things as a Christian brother.

2d. The children of all such persons as on the ground of their own credible profession of faith are received as members of the visible Church are to be baptized as members of the visible Church, because, presumptively, heirs of the blessings of the covenant of grace. The divinely-appointed and guaranteed presumption is, if the parents, then the children. This is not an invariable law binding (rod, but it is a prevailingly probable law, basing the authorized and rational recognition and treatment of such children by the Church as heirs of the promises. The reasons for our thinking so must be condensed into the fewest words:

(1) This presumption is rendered exceedingly probable by the fundamental constitution of humanity as a self-propagative race. A moral government pure and simple presupposes only individuals, and addresses itself to the control of individuals through their reasons, consciences and wills. But the fact which differentiates the human subjects of the divine government from an ideal realm —as that of the angels, for instance—is that we are a race in which the nature, character and status of the parent determine those of the child by a universal and inevitable hereditary law. Thus, the apostasy of Adam gave an entirely new direction to the history of his entire race, and thus the character and destiny of families, races and nations have been always predetermined by the deeds and experiences of their ancestors. The law of heredity is the fundamental law of animal nature, including man; and since the God of nature is identical with the God of grace, it was to be anticipated that his remedial scheme of redemption should conserve and operate through all the laws of nature, while it antagonizes only that false nature which is sin. Hugh Miller, the Christian geologist, says: " Whatever we may think of the scriptural doctrine on this special head, it is a fact broad and palpable in the economy of nature that parents do occupy a federal position, and that the lapsed progenitors, when cut off from civilization and all external civilization of a missionary character, become the founders of a lapsed race. The iniquities of the parents are visited upon the children. In all such instances it is man left to the freedom of his own will that is the deteriorator of man. The doctrine of the Fall in its purely theological aspect is a doctrine which must be apprehended by faith; but it is at least something to find that the analogies of science, instead of running counter to it, run in exactly the same line. It is one of the inevitable consequences of that nature of man which the Creator ’bound fast in fate’ while he left free his will, that the free will of the parent should become the destiny of the child."

(2) This presumption is borne out by the analogies of the entire history of God’s providential revelations of the scheme of redemption recorded in Scripture. If the parents by an inevitable law bore their children away from God in their apostasy, it is surely to be expected that they shall bring back their children with them God-ward in their regeneration. The sin of the parents immediately involved the condemnation and guilt of the family. So when God began graciously to open to men a way of escape, and set up his kingdom in the world, the family was made the first form of the Church. In the entire patriarchal age every family, the heads of which professed the true religion, was a visible Church. The father was the prophet, priest and king. By him the morning and evening sacrifices were offered. Wherever Abraham and the other patriarchs went they erected the altar and called upon the name of the Lord. The whole family, including especially the little children,

constituted the Church, and were trained in the knowledge and service of God. In all his covenants God explicitly included the children with their parents. The faith of the parents turned the favor of God upon their children, and the promises of the parents bound their children under inalienable obligations. The curse denounced upon Adam and Eve has been in all its specifications inflicted on their seed throughout all generations. So when covenanting with Noah, the second father of the race, God said, " I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in all their generations ;" and when making his national covenant with the Israelites, Jehovah declared this principle: "For I, Jehovah thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments." And in the first great sermon of the New Dispensation, on the day of Pentecost, Peter, when preaching to the people that they must repent and be baptized, gives this remarkable reason for it: "For the promise [the gospel covenant] is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

(3) Baptism under the New Dispensation of the covenant of grace in all respects takes the place of circumcision under the Old. It is "the circumcision of Christ" (Colossians 2:11-12). The one was a mark that was a sign of the necessity of regeneration and a pledge of its gift. In the other, water, the universal element of cosmical life and the universal instrument of cleansing, is applied to the person with the same significance and design. Each in its own age was the authoritatively appointed door of entrance into the fold of salvation and the badge of citizenship in the kingdom of God. Viewed as a mere outward rite, neither circumcision nor baptism nor their absence avail anything, but the new creature, which both alike signify. Baptism takes the place of circumcision, the seal of the covenant which God made with Abraham: " For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise " (Galatians 3:27; Galatians 3:29). Baptism represents the washing away of sin; circumcision did precisely the same. For God said, " I will circumcise thy heart and the heart of thy seed to love the Lord with all thy soul," etc.

Circumcision, like baptism, represents an inward spiritual grace: "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God" (Romans 2:28-29). Circumcision as well as baptism unites us to Christ. For Paul says (Colossians 2:10-11): "In whom" (i. e, Christ, Head of all principality and power) " 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." Water baptism is the precise equivalent of " the circumcision of the flesh;" and the baptism of the Holy Ghost is the precise equivalent of "the circumcision of the heart." The apostle Paul says everything of circumcision that an evangelical pastor would now say of baptism. The condition of the circumcision of an adult under the Mosaic law was precisely the same credible profession of faith which is now demanded as a precondition of adult baptism. But all the children of believers were circumcised; therefore there is every presumption that the children of believers should be baptized.

(4) The Church under the Old Dispensation is precisely the same Church with the Christian Church under the New. They bore the same name: the "Kahal Jehovah " and the ■κκλησ■α κορ■ου alike mean the Church of the Lord. Thus, Stephen called the " congregation of the Lord "

before Sinai " the Church in the wilderness." (Compare Acts 7:38 with Exodus 32:1-35.) Their foundation in the Person and work of Christ was the same. The conditions of adult membership in each were the same profession of faith and promise of obedience. Every true Israelite was a true believer (Galatians 3:7). All Israelites were at least credible professors of the true religion. The sacraments of this Church under its successive dispensations were of the same significance and binding force. Baptism is the "circumcision of Christ" (Colossians 2:11-12). The Passover, like the Last Supper, represented the sacrifice of Christ (1 Corinthians 5:7). The Christian converts from Judaism were not gathered into a new Church, but were daily added to the already existing Church. The Gentile branches did not constitute a new olive tree, but were grafted into the old Israelitish olive tree (Romans 11:17-24). The apostles, who entered the Church by circumcision, and who acknowledged Christ as the Messiah before the excision of the Jews in mass because of unbelief, were never baptized, while Paul and others, who belonged to the exscinded mass, were grafted back to their own olive tree through baptism. But the infant children of all the members of the Church under the Old Testament were regarded and treated as members of the Church themselves, and their membership was sealed on the eighth day by circumcision.

(5) Christ and his apostles, members of a Church which had always included infants, and themselves circumcised in infancy, in all respects spoke and acted as Psedobaptist ministers would in their place. Christ blessed " little children," and declared of such is " the kingdom of heaven," or the visible Church under the New Dispensation (Matthew 19:14; Matthew 13:47). He commissioned Peter to feed his lambs (John 21:15-17), and all the apostles to " disciple all nations" by baptizing, then teaching them (Matthew 28:19-20). The apostles were not settled pastors in an established Christian community, but itinerant missionaries in an unbelieving world, sent not to baptize, but to preach the gospel (1 Corinthians 1:17). Hence we have in Acts and the Epistles the record of only ten separate instances of baptism. In every case, without a single recorded exception where there was a family, the family was baptized as soon as the head of the family presented a credible profession of his faith (Acts 16:15; Acts 16:32-33; Acts 18:8; 1 Corinthians 1:16). And in their Epistles they always addressed children as members of the Church (Ephesians 5:1; Ephesians 6:1-3; Colossians 3:20; 1 Corinthians 7:12-14). In the most natural manner, without the slightest hint of change, and with every incidental indication possible of the uninterrupted continuance of the historical church-membership of infants, the narratives of the New Testament church-life grow from those of the Old. The preaching of the New Testament opens with the explicit declaration, abundantly significant as coming from an apostle to a representative national audience, all of whom knew of no Church which had not always embraced children in its sacramentally-sealed membership: " The promise"—i. e. the gospel covenant, of which circumcision and baptism were successively the seals—"is unto you and to your children " (Acts 2:39).

(6) The universal consent of Christians in historical continuity with the apostles bears unbroken testimony to the immemorial right of the children of Christian professors to be recognized as members of the Church with their parents. It is noticed in the earliest records as a universal custom and as an apostolical tradition. Justin Martyr, writing a. d. 138, says that "there were among Christians of his time many persons of both sexes, some sixty and some seventy years old, who had been made disciples of Christ from their infancy." Irenaeus, who died about a. d. 202, says: " He came to save all by himself—all, I say, who by him are born again unto God, infants and

little children and youths." The practice of infant baptism is acknowledged by Tertulliau, born in Carthage a. d. 160. Origen, born of Christian parents in Egypt a. d. 185, says that it was " the usage of the Church to baptize infants," and that " the Church had received the tradition from the apostles." Cyprian, bishop of Carthage from a. d. 248 to a. d. 258, together with his entire synod, decided that baptism should be administered to infants before the eighth day. St. Augustine, born a. d. 358, declared that " this doctrine is held by the whole Church, not instituted by councils, but always retained." This Pelagius himself was forced to admit, although he had visited all parts of the Church from Britain to Syria, and the point made by Augustine was fatal to the position which Pelagius occupied (Wall's History of Infant Baptism and Bingham's Christian Antiquities, bk. xi. ch. iv.). The Church split into several fragments, Roman, Greek, Arminian, Nestorian and Abyssinian, all differing in much, but all agreeing in support of the custom of recognizing and sealing infants as church-members. At the time of the Reformation learned and holy men were raised up by God in the midst of every European nation. There were perfectly independent movements in each national centre of reform. Zwingle, the Reformer of the Swiss; Luther, the Reformer of the Germans ; Calvin, the Reformer of the French; Cranmer, of the English Church, and Knox, of the Scotch, were all independent, and in some things diverse, yet they all agreed spontaneously in the recognition of the church-membership of the infant children of believers. And the great historic churches of the Reformation—the Anglican, the Lutheran, the Reformed or Presbyterian in all its varieties, the original branch of the Independents, the world-conquering Methodists—all unite with the older churches, Eastern and Western, in maintaining this grand historic constitution of infant church-membership. Those who protest against this ancient and ecumenical consensus, however eminently respectable as we affectionately recognize them to be, are certainly a recent growth, and thus far, as compared with the mighty host, but a small minority.

[III.] What is the Use of Infant Baptism?

We freely admit that our good Baptist brethren, who refuse to recognize and treat their children as members of the Church of Christ from birth, nevertheless enjoy with us the very benefits which infant baptism asserts and seals. The mistakes of God's true children will never make him unfaithful to them nor defeat the blessings he intends for them. Precisely the same is true of the truly Christian Quakers. They enjoy all the blessings signified and sealed by the outward sacraments, although they neglect all of them entirely. Nevertheless, our Baptist brethren being judges, the obedient use of the sacraments is the more excellent way. The use of " infant baptism " is precisely the use of any sacrament; that is, the incomparable benefit of externally signifying and sealing the benefits represented.

1st. In the baptism of every infant there are four parties present and concerned in the transaction: God, the Church, the parents and the child. The first three are conscious and active, the fourth is for the time unconscious and passive.

2d. In the act of baptism the use is found at the time in the benefit resulting from binding the parents and the Church to the performance of all their duties relating to the child, and from binding upon the child those special obligations and sealing to the child those special benefits which spring from the gospel covenant as it includes the children with the believing parent. The faith involved is that of the parent and of the Church, while the unconscious and passive beneficiary is the child himself.

3d. Subsequently, when the child is taught and trained under the regimen of his baptism—taught from the first to recognize himself as a child of God, with all its privileges and duties; trained to think, feel and act as a child of God, to exercise filial love, to render filial obedience —the benefit to the child directly is obvious and immeasurable. He has invaluable birth-right privileges, and corresponding obligations and responsibilities.

4th. It is evident that this should be supplemented by a rite of confirmation. Of course I do not here refer to the unauthorized Romish and prelatical sacrament of the laying on of the hands of one of the changed successors of the apostles. I refer simply to the historical, universally-practiced Christian ordinance observed in bringing the Christianly instructed and trained children before the Church " when they come to years of discretion, if they be free from scandal, appear sober and steady, and to have sufficient knowledge to discern the Lord's body, they ought to be informed it is their duty and their privilege to come to the Lord's supper " (Directory for Worship, ch. χ., § 1). Then they who have been members of the Church from their birth are admitted to full communion, and are confirmed in their church standing upon their voluntarily taking upon themselves the vows originally imposed upon them by their parents in baptism. This is the confirmation, separated from the abortive mask of the so-called sacrament, that John Calvin declared was an ancient and beneficial custom, which he earnestly wished might be continued in the Church (Institutes, bk. iv. ch. xix. 12, 13), and which Dr. Charles Hodge declared to be " retained in some form or other in all Protestant churches" (Princeton Review, 1855, p. 445). As far as we misunderstand or ignore this beautiful ordinance of confirmation we abandon to the mercies of our Baptist brethren the whole rational ground and reason of infant baptism.

[IV.] Mar Johanan, the Nestorian bishop, when solicited by High-Churchmen to separate himself from non-prelatical Christians, exclaimed, "All who love the Lord Jesus Christ are my brethren." Above all the narrow, meagre patriotism on earth is the large, free ecumenical patriotism of those who embrace in their love and fealty the whole body of the baptized. All who are baptized into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, recognizing the Trinity of Persons in the Godhead, the incarnation of the Son and his priestly sacrifice, whether they be Greeks or Arminians or Romanists or Lutherans or Calvinists, or the simple souls who do not know what to call themselves, are our brethren. Baptism is our common countersign. It is the common rallying standard at the head of our several columns. It is our common battle-flag, which we carry forward across the enemy's line and nail aloft in the heights crowned with victory. We will be confined in our love and allegiance by no party lines. We follow and serve one common Lord. Hence there can be only " one Lord, one faith, one baptism," and hence only one indivisible, inalienable " sacramental host of God's elect."

03.17. LECTURE 17 - THE LORD'S SUPPER

LECTURE XVII THE LORD’S SUPPER

We now enter the innermost Most Holy Place of the Christian temple. We approach the sacred altar on which lies quivering before our eyes the bleeding heart of Christ. We come to the most private and personal meeting-place, appointed rendezvous, between our Lord and his beloved. We are here to have discovered to us the Christian mysteries which have been carefully reserved for hundreds of generations for the initiated alone. To all else the wide world is invited without limit and without condition, but to this sacred rite the covenanted brethren alone. It marks the central, vital epochs in the believers life and intercourse with heaven. It marks hence the successive stages of his pilgrimage along the King’s highway toward the New Jerusalem and the banqueting-halls of our Father’s house. It is consequently the central ordinance in the whole circle of church-life, around which all the other ministries of the Church revolve, and through which we have exhibited to the outward senses the indwelling of God with men, the real presence and objective reality of " the holy catholic Church," and the reality and power of " the communion of saints." It will be our place to rehearse succinctly its biblical and ecclesiastical names, its genesis, its matter (including its elements and sacramental actions\ its design and significance and effect, ami its future promts

I. (1st) It is called by the apostle (1 Corinthians 11:20), and after him by the Christian Church in all ages, by the familiar and touching title, the " Lord’s Supper.** The Greek word dttmw, here translated "Supper,** properly designated what we would now call the dinner or the principal meal of the Jews, taken by them mid by all Eastern nations generally late in the afternoon or in the evening of the day. The sacrament inherited this name by uatural descent, because our Saviour instituted it while he and his disciples were partaking of this meal. It is called the Lord?β Supj>cr because it was instituted at his last supper with his disciples to commemorate his death and to signify and to convey and seal his grace.

(2d) It is also called by the apostle (1 Corinthians 10:21), and after him by all Christians, " the Lord’s Table.’1 The word "Table’Micro of course stands for the gracious provisions spread upon it and for the entire scrvicw connected with it. It is the " table" to which tin* precious Lord invites his guests and at which he himself graciously presides.

(3d) It is called also by the apostle the " Cup of Ill<»ss-ing" (1 Corinthians 10:16), the cup blessed by Christ, and so consecrated to be the vehicle of sujxTnaturul blessings graciously conveyed to men worthily partaking. In Christ’s name and in virtue of his commission the ordained minister now " blesses e. invoke** the divine blessing upon—these elements that they may Ixi made tins instruments of conveying this blessing to the worthy partakers of them.

(4th) This service is also called "the Communion" (1 Corinthians 10:16). This and " the Sacrament" are the titles most commonly given by the way of eminence to this sacred rite. The act of partaking of these holy symbols, if intelligent and sincere, involves the most real and intimate communion—i.

e. a mutual giving and receiving— between Christ, the Head and the Heart of the Church, and his living members, and consequently a vital interchange of influences between all the living members of that spiritual body of which he is the Head.

(5th) The evangelist Luke also calls this sacrament on one occasion (Acts 2:42) " the Breaking of Bread/' because the symbolical action of the officiating minister in breaking the bread signifies the precious truths that the flesh of Christ, torn for us sacrificially, purchased our redemption, and that, as we all partake of one bread as we receive one Christ, so we shall all be one in the most vital and spiritual sense in time and eternally.

(6th) This holy ordiuance is also called by our Lutheran brethren, in their symbolical books," sacramentum altaris" the sacrament of the altar, because they have accepted so far the Romish tradition, retained also in the Anglican Church, which has transformed the " communion table " of Christ and his apostles into an altar. This of course the Lutherans, who are strict Protestauts, use only in a figurative, commemorative sense, because this sacrament is in no sense an atoning sacrifice, except in so far as it is the commemoration of the one all-perfect, all-satisfying sacrifice which our Lord offered in his own body on the cross eighteen hundred years ago.

(7th) In the ancient Church, as among some of the modems, agapte or " love feasts" were held, at which all the Christians of a community assembled and feasted in common. At these the consecrated elements of the Holy Supper were distributed and received. The name of the feast thus came to be applied to the sacrament which was the crown of the whole.

(8th) It was called in the ancient Church often " a sacrifice, an offering." But it was never understood to be a real sin-expiating sacrifice in itself. It was given this name, since so sadly perverted in the Roman Church, only because it represents commemoratively the one finished sacrifice of Christ, and because it is connected with the spiritual sacrifices of the worshiper's heart and life (Hebrews 13:15), and with an accompanying collection and oblation of alms for the poor of the church.

(9th) One of the most beautiful of all the designations this sacred service has borne is that of " Eucharist," from the Greek word ε■χαριστ■ω, to give thanks. To " ask a blessing " upon our food and " to give thanks " for it have always been intimately associated in Christian practice. According to Matthew 26:26-27, our Lord is represented as " having blessed " the bread, and then as having given thanks when presenting the cup. It is both " the cup of blessing99 upon which we have invoked the divine blessing (1 Corinthians 10:16), the cup of thanksgiving, "the cup of salvation," which we take in the house of the Lord, calling upon his name and giving thanks for his salvation (Psalms 116:13).

II. Its Genesis.—This is essentially and immediately the j>ersonal sacrament of Jesus Christ. It was immediately instituted by him in person while partaking of the last supper with his disciples. It immediately commemorates his death. It is always administered by his direct authority. The worthy communicant immediately communicates with the present Christ. The reality of the sacrament depends entirely upon his being really, immediately present in the act. Take away either its original institution by Christ or the immediate preseuce of Christ in every repeated celebration of it, and it is no sacrament at all. Nevertheless, like every other scriptural, ordinance, it was not suddenly thrust into existence without any foregoing preparation. All things, divine sacraments as well as others,

obey the law of continuity, and grow under the special providence of God out of long-prepared roots or seeds. The divinely-prepared historic root of the Lord's Supper was, as is well known, the Passover. The nation of Israel was the type of the Christian Church. The deliverance of that nation from the bondage of Egypt, and the redemption of her sons from the slaughter which overtook the first-born of every Egyptian household, were types of our redemption from sin. The paschal lamb was a type of Christ. The paschal supper with its attendant rites represented, under the Old Economy, the external redemption already accomplished, and no less the future perfect redemption to be afterward accomplished when Christ the true paschal lamb was sacrificed. The Lord's Supper commemorates the same redemption, looking backward to the already accomplished fact. The Christian Sunday is an historical continuation of the Jewish Sabbath, only the day of the week changes, and runs back in absolutely unbroken continuity through the ages—through the ages before the Flood, through the years before the Fall—it and matrimony being the only monuments of the golden age of innocency. Each recurrent holy day stands to us first as a monument of the sovereignty of Jehovah as Creator, and secondly, as a monument of our redemption consummated in the resurrection of our Lord. Every Lord's Day when we celebrate the Holy Supper we repeat in a chain of unbroken continuity the memorial of his sacrificial death. And in the beautiful circle of the Christian year, Holy Week, Good Friday, Easter, we repeat in a far longer chain of unbroken continuity the Christian sacrament of the Supper, looking back over a vista of nearly eighteen centuries and three quarters to its institution, and also over a vista nearly twice as long, of nearly three thousand five hundred years, to the institution of the first Passover and the redemption of Israel from the bondage of Egypt. When God delivered the children of Israel from their bondage in Egypt he sent forth his angel commissioned to destroy the first-born in each Egyptian household. He oommauded the Israelites by families or small groups of families to select a male lamb of the first year without blemish, and slay it at the setting of the sun, and with a sprig of hyssop sprinkle the lintels and sideposts of the doors of their houses. The blood was to them as a token upon the houses where they were, for when the Lord saw the blood he passed over them, so that the plague which destroyed the Egyptians did not come upon them. They were also commanded to roast the flesh of the lamb that night, and to eat it entirely before the morning with unleavened bread and bitter herbs: with their loins girded, and their feet shod and their staves in their hands they were to eat it in haste, ready to depart (Exodus 12:1-51; Exodus 13:1-22).

Hence the Lord appointed the Passover, or Feast of Unleavened Bread, as a sacramental memorial in their generations, as an ordinance for ever. On the 14th of Nisan the house and all the utensils were diligently searched and purged of leaven, which, as incipient putrefaction, was the symbol of moral corruption. At evening, the beginning of the 15th of Nisan, the paschal lamb was sacrificed and his blood sprinkled on the altar and the fat burned (2 Chronicles 30:16; 2 Chronicles 35:11). The lamb was roasted whole and eaten entirely by the assembled household, with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. Four cups of wine, the Mishna tells us, were always drunk.

Two of these are distinctly mentioned in Luke 22:17-20. Our Lord, Luke says, took one cup and gave thanks, and said, " Take this, and divide it among yourselves." " Likewise also he took the " second "cup after supper, saying/' etc. They also always sang the Hal lei, or praise-psalms, consisting of all the Psalms in our Bible from Psalms 113:1-9, Psalms 114:1-8, Psalms 115:1-18 Psalms 116:1-29, Psalms 117:1-2, Psalms 118:1-29 inclusive. The first part, including Psalms 113:1-9 and Psalms 114:1-8, was sung early in the meal, and Psalms 115:1-18 Psalms 116:1-29,

Psalms 117:1-2 and Psalms 118:1-29 at the close, after the fourth or last cup of wine had been drunk. This is the " hymn " alluded to (Matthew 26:30; Mark 14:26) when it is said, "And when they had sung a hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives."

After the filling of the secoud cup of wine, and just before the eating of the paschal lamb began, the son or eome other member of the family asked the father, who presided as the prophet and priest of his household, what was the meaning of the peculiar arrangements of this feast (Exodus 12:26). Then the father rehearsed the history of their great national redemption, and expounded the symbolical and commemorative and the moral and religious significance of the traditional observance. The whole service was at the same time a pious memorial of the redemption of the lives of the first-born of Israel, and of the nation itself from the bondage of Egypt, and a type or prophetical symbol of the redemption of men by the sacrifice on the cross of the body of Jesus Christ.

Therefore Christ came up to the feast of the Passover on purpose to be offered up a Sacrifice for the sins of the world. When many came up out of the country to be purified before the Passover, "they sought for Jesus, and spake among themselves, as they stood in the temple, What think ye, that he will not come to the feast?" They little knew the significance of their own question. Of course he would come. If he did not, the entire historical development of the Jewish people for nearly two millenniums would have been a failure. The meaning and fruition of the entire line of prophets and of priests, of sacrificial offerings and of periodical feasts, depended upon his coming up to this particular feast, fulfilling the promise, giving reality to the symbolical representation of all that had gone before. Therefore he at once fulfilled all the prophecy of the past and inaugurated the future of realized redemption. He ate with the disciples the flesh and bread of the typical Passover, and while doing so he gave to the elements a new and higher significance, and thus developed out of the paschal supper of the past the Lord’s Supper of the incomparably more glorious future. So he took the bread—the same unleavened bread which had been eaten from the beginning for sixteen hundred years—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." As if he had said, You will no more need to kill and eat the paschal lamb, for I, Christ, am your true Passover, sacrificed for you (1 Corinthians 5:7). But this bread I appoint to be the symbol of my sacrificed body; take and eat it until I come again, in remembrance of me. Likewise also he took the last, or fourth cup, after supper—the same cup which had been drunk for ages uncounted at the close of the paschal supper. This ancient cup, with all its historical associations, he took up, and instantly glorified it with new meaning. This cup hereafter you are to continue to drink until the end. It is henceforth the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you ; drink ye all of it (Matthew 26:26; Matthew 26:28; Luke 22:20). And from that awful night until to-day, for upward of eighteen hundred and fifty years, the disciples of Christ of every nation and rite have endeavored, with more or less success, to keep this feast of the Christian Passover with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth (1 Corinthians 5:8).

III. The matter of the Lord’s Supper consists (1) of the elements used, and (2) of the sacramental actions which are performed in their use. The elements consist, as all Christians are agreed, of bread and wine.

1st. The bread used in the original sacrament was the unleavened bread which had been used by divine command in the paschal feast from the time of Moses to that of Christ. But Christ speaks of it, in instituting the sacrament, not as " unleavened," but as " bread." The point of the symbolism is that as bread, our daily bread, is the staff of life and nourishes the body, so Christ in his divi-ne-human Person and mediatorial offices nourishes our souls when apprehended by faith. It is evident, from the allusions to its observance throughout the Acts and the Epistles, that the apostles commemorated the communion in connection with ordinary social meals and in the use of whatever bread happened to be present, which on such occasions we know to have been the common leavened bread. Although it is obviously a matter of indifference what particular form of bread should be used, a controversy sprang up between the Greek and Roman churches as to the kind of bread it is proper to use in the Eucharist. The Greek Church insisted that the bread used should be leavened, and maintained that the contiuued use of unleavened bread was a remnant of Judaism. The Roman Church insisted upon the use of unleavened bread. The Lutheran branch of the Protestant Church adheres to the practice of Rome in this particular. The great body of the Reformed churches, including the Anglican Church, on the contrary, maintain that the kind of bread is not essential, but that the wafer used by the Romanists is not properly bread, which is the staff of life, the ordinary food of mau. We therefore, by an eminently proper tradition, use ordinary leavened loaf bread, so prepared that the unity of the " one bread " of which all partake is visibly set forth, and this is broken before the people into parts, so that they, being many, all partake of one bread.

2d. The contents of the cup were wine. This is known to have been "the juice of the grape," not in its original state as freshly expressed, but as prepared in the form of wine for permanent use among the Jews. " Wine," according to the absolutely unanimous, unexceptional testimony of every scholar and missionary, is in its essence " fermented grape-juice." Nothing else is wine. The use of " wine " is precisely what is commanded by Christ in his example and his authoritative institution of this holy ordinance. Whosoever puts away true and real wine, or fermented grape-juice, on moral grounds, from the Lord’s Supper, sets himself up as more moral than the Son of God who reigns over his conscience, and than the Saviour of souls who redeemed him. There has been absolutely universal consent on this subject in the Christian Church until modern tim&, when the practice has been opposed, not upon change of evidence, but solely on prudential considerations. Many Christians have, however, mingled water with the wine, because it was an ancient custom probably practiced by Christ himself, and also by some because water mingled with the blood flowed from his broken heart (John 19:34). But the Lord’s Supper is not a material object, something, like the " Host" in the Roman Catholic worship, that can be enclosed in a box, carried about, lifted up and worshiped. It is in its essence a transaction, something performed in time, having a commencement, a progress and a conclusion. Hence we Presbyterians hold that the consecrated elements cannot be carried from the church after the celebration of the communion by the minister to sick and absent communicants. If a person is not present at the communion he does not commune, no matter how much he partakes of the bread or wine which remains. The only proper way to meet the cases of sick communicants is for the minister to take representatively the Church with him to the sick-room, and there go through the service in all its parts.

Since, then, the communion is a transaction, the sacramental actions involved are as essential parte of it as the elements of bread and wine. These are—

1st. The "blessing," or cousecrating prayer, in which we ask God to set apart as much of the elements as we shall consume to their sacramental use, to bless them to us, aud us in their use; in which, moreover, we invoke the presence of Christ, the great Master of assemblies, as one of us in our midst, and of the Holy Ghost in our hearts.

2d. The " breaking of bread," symbolical of the sacrificial breaking of the body of Christ upon the cross, and also of the oneness of believers, who, being many, all partake of one Bread. This is so prominent that the entire service is once designated from this one feature (Acts 2:42).

3d. The distribution and reception. In these acts the whole communion culminates and concludes. The sacred character of the elements does not consist in themselves, but in their use. As soon as this use is completed tlie bread and wine, whether in the body of the recipient or remaining in the vessels of the service, are no more holy than any other specimen of their kind in the world. In the Roman, Anglican, and Lutheran churches the minister in person conveys the bread and wine carefully to the mouth of each communicant. In the Reformed churches, on the contrary, the elements are distributed by elders, or " representatives of the people," who carry the elements and set them before the communicants, each one of whom is expected to receive and appropriate them with his own hands. The Lord says to each of us, " Take, eat." The communion always implies an active attitude upon the part of each recipient. Each communicant for himself transacts with his present Lord. Each one receives and appropriates to himself by faith Christ and all the sacrificial benefits of his redemption. It is, therefore, a cruel and an injurious perversion of this ordinance when the minister, not satisfied with all his other opportunities of preaching, throws his fellow-oom-municants into a passive attitude at the Lord’s Table by his ceaseless addresses, fencing of tables and charges and preachments of whatever kind. Christ is present. Every believer at the table should be left alone with his Lord. All that one fellow-communicant, minister or other, can do for his fellow in such a case is to stimulate and direct his activities Christ-ward. This can be done ouly by leading in direct acts of worship, in appropriate hymns and prayers, or in the simple, quiet recitation of the words of Christ himself. Who besides Christ should dare to discourse at the communion? All that the minister can possibly have any true call to say, in the way of instruction, exhortation or warning, can surely be delivered previously in the " preparatory services" or in the "action sermon."

IV. Tlie Design or Meaning of (he Sacrament.—This, of course, is the heart of the whole ordinance. The one necessity for us is to have clear and comprehensive views as to what meanings the sacrament bears, and as to the uses it is designed to serve for us. Comprehension here is as much to be sought as clearness, because this consummate means of grace has many sides, like a diamond cut with many facets, and sustains many relations and accomplishes blessings for us in many different ways. The real truth here, as elsewhere, is to be found only in the view which takes in the whole on all sides.

Let us begin, therefore, with the surface meanings and lower uses, and rise gradually toward the heart and inner mystery of the whole.

1st. This sacrament is, in the first place, avowedly and self-evidently a commemorative rite. The Master said when he instituted it, " This do in remembrance of Me." And ever since that awful night endless successions of disciples have gathered to perforin these sacred rites with the intention of " showing forth his death till he come." The great mass of men pass away in indistinguishable throngs, falling like the leaves of the forest in mass, their individuality lost to human recollection in this world for ever. The memory of some few men out of the thousands linger long and fade slowly into the night of oblivion. A very few epoch-making men, as Moses, Paul, Augustine, Luther, change the course of human history and live for ever in the new world they inaugurate. But it is only Christ the incarnate God, Christ the perfect Man, Christ the bleeding Price of man's redemption, Christ the resurgent Victor over death and hell, whose ever-present memory is the condition of all progressive thought and life. The memory of Christ as the great character of all history has become omnipresent in all literature, philosophy, ethics, politics and life. All experience, all existence, witness to him. The whole universe repeats his story and keeps him eternally in mind. Monuments (monere) exist to keep persons and events in mind. They are of many kinds, as of earth or stone or brass or changes wrought in the forms of human speech or action, or other observances to be repeated for ever at intervals. This latter kind are incomparably more effective and imperishable as memorials than the others. The Tower of Babel, the Pyramids of Egypt, the most stupendous material monuments, the world has ever seen, have either perished or are far gone in decay, while the history they were erected to commemorate is lost beyond the rational guess of critics. And yet the Sabbath-Day monument of creation, thousands of years older than the Pyramids, and the Lord's Supper, which in its historic roots in the Passover was brought into being at the very feet of the then young Pyramids themselves, remain as fresh and as articulate with their original significance as at their birth. These observational monuments are likewise omnipresent the world over, as well as imperishable. The Sabbath Day and the Lord's Supper, preserved and disseminated with absolutely unbroken continuity down the ages and throughout the nations, keep the memory of Christ alive just as it was at the first, because their very existence and their constant repetition are the unfaded testimony of Christ's contemporaries, the accumulated testimony of all the ages that Jesus Christ was in very fact delivered sacrificially for our offences and raised again for our justification (Romans 4:25).

2d. It is no less obvious that the sacrament is an object-lesson addressed to the eye, a picture of the essential central verities of the gospel to be seen accompanying and enforcing the preached or read Word addressed to the ear. God has so constituted us as composed of soul and body that all impressions made on the senses naturally compel the attention and excite the corresponding emotions more powerfully than abstract ideas expressed in words. This is the source of the power of all music and poetry and art which appeal to the senses, the imagination and the feelings. Experience has proved that when men invent improved methods of exhibiting the gospel beyond the narrow limits of illustration explicitly authorized by the Master, infinite corruption is the swift result. But certainly we are safe as long as our liturgical scheme keeps accurately within the limits prescribed by the positive commands of Christ and the example of his apostles. The excess of the Papists and Ritualists, on the one hand, is not more dishonoring to Christ and injurious to the spiritual interests of his Church than the unauthorized restrictions of the Quakers on the other. This pictorial exhibition of the central truths of the gospel presented in the elements and sacramental actions of the Lord's Supper is of course reinforced and rendered many times more effective by the fact that all the worshipers take part personally, each one for himself, in those sacramental

actions. Not only is the mind exercised with divine truth, not only are the senses appealed to, and the emotions through the senses, but the will is immediately called into action, and the outward acts of taking and of eating and drinking correspond in the consciousness immediately with the inward acts of receiving and appropriating Christ and the benefits of his redemption. It is for this reason that the Reformed insist so emphatically upon the communicant actively taking and appropriating the elements with his own hands, and that we so urgently exhort the minister not to throw the worshipers at the communion into a passive attitude by his instructions and exhortations, but to confine himself to the legitimate office of stimulating and guiding their spiritual activities by leading them in direct acts of worship and covenanting with the Lord.

3d. It is also obvious, and universally recognized, that this holy communion service is a visible mark or badge of Christian discipleship; an appointed form whereby repentant rebels are to lay down their rebellion and take up and profess their new allegiance to their Lord ; and a conspicuous sign whereby the Church and her members are to be distinguished from the world. Every human society finds such a visible, easily-recognized sign or badge indispensable, and this especially when the members of the society in question are commingled in hostile relations with foreign elements. And it is obvious that every such badge of membership and pledge of loyalty to be effective must, like the flag of the nation, be authoritatively imposed by the central sovereignty.

True living faith in the Lord Jesus Christ is the only absolutely necessary condition of salvation, because if a man exercises true faith in the very article of death, as did the thief upon the cross, he shall be certainly saved. Nevertheless, it is evident that in the social state true faith, if it exists, must express itself in full and open acknowledgment of the Lord, and that salvation must be conditioned upon open loyal confession and upon open loyal obedience, as much as upon an internal principle of faith. The faith is the root. It comes first, and the true profession and obedience depend upon it, and cannot exist without it. Nevertheless, in the advanced stage the fruit is just as essential as the root, and the tree that finally fails to bear fruit will be cut down and cast into the fire. The judgment asserted by Christ is unavoidable : "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before ray Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven " (Matthew 10:32-33). Hence the conditions of salvation as proclaimed by the Master himself include public confession as well as faith : " Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16:15-16). This principle is explicitly emphasized by the apostle Paul: " The word of faith, which we preach : that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation " (Romans 10:8-10).

It is true that a true believer, who for any reason is prevented from confessing Christ by wearing publicly his sacramental badge, may just as efficiently confess him by other significant words and deeds. And it is further true that if a communicant is indeed a true believer at heart, he will constantly confess Christ in other ways— indeed, in all conceivable ways—in all his life. Nevertheless, a loyal citizen cannot choose his own flag. The public and official signification of loyalty cannot be left to the accidental choice of individuals. Above all, in a state of active war no loyal soldier can for one moment fail to hold aloft the one battle-flag which his leader has entrusted to his care. He covers it with his body, he shields it with his life, he carries it aloft with streaming

eyes and heaving breast at the head of the host. So do we with solemn joy, with reverent love and passion, carry in sacred pomp this sacramental flag of confession and of challenge high in the face of the world which crucified our Lord. But before we can go any farther we must answer this question: Is Christ really, truly, personally present with us in the sacrament ? Do we therein covenant and commune with him in person, touch to touch, immediately and really, or is this only a show, a symbol of something absent and different from what it seems ? The gross perversions of the Romanists and Ritualists, who have made it altogether a question of the local presence of Christ's flesh and blood, have occasioned much confusion of thought and many prejudices on the subject. Nevertheless, as a matter of fact, every believer knows that Christ is present in the sacrament—that he has, as a matter of fact, experienced his presence. If he is not present really and truly, then the sacrament can have no interest or real value to us. It does not do to say that this presence is only spiritual, because that phrase is ambiguous. If it means that the presence of Christ is not something objective to us, but simply a mental apprehension or idea of him subjectively present to our consciousness, then the phrase is false. Christ as an objective fact is as really present and active in the sacrament as are the bread and wine or the minister or our fellow-communicants by our side. If it means that Christ is present only as he is represented by the Holy Ghost, it is not wholly true, because Christ is one Person and the Holy Ghost another, and it is Christ who is personally present. The Holy Ghost doubtless is coactive in that presence and in all Christ's mediatorial work, but this leads into depths beyond our possible understanding. It does not do to say that the divinity of Christ is present while his humanity is absent, because it is the entire indivisible divine-human Person of Christ which is present. When Christ promises to his disciples, " Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world-age," and, " Where two or three are met together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," he means of course that he, the God-man Mediator they loved, trusted and obeyed, would be with them. His humanity is just as essential as bis divinity, otherwise his incarnation would not have been a necessity. His sympathy, his love, his special helpful tenderness, are human. He is able to be our perfect High Priest, "being touched with the feeling of our infirmities," because he "was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin " (Hebrews 4:15). But what do we mean by "presence"? It is a great mistake to confuse the idea of " presence " with that of nearness in space. This may be a condition of presence or it may not, but it is never " presence " itself. If you walk abroad at noonday in the tropio6, the most overwhelmingly present thing to you in the universe is the intolerable sun, although it is ninety-three millions of miles distant. If another person is only one foot distant, but separated from you by a wall which cuts off all light and sound, he is as absent as if in the centre of a distant star. But if the same person, a hundred feet from you in an audience-room, sees you face to face and hears every vibration of your voice, he is as truly present as if he touched you at every point. When Whitefield's preaching was fully heard and its power felt across the Delaware River, he was present really and truly wherever his voice was heard and his matchless eloquence felt " Presence," therefore, is not a question of space: it is a relation.

Personal presence is such a relation of persons that they are conscious of each other as immediate objects of perception and sources of influence. We know nothing as to the ultimate nature of the union of our souls and bodies, yet we no less are certain of the fact. We know nothing as to the ultimate nature of either sight or hearing, whereby we make our mutual presence felt in social intercourse, yet we are absolutely certain of the facts. So we need not speculate how it is that Christ, the whole God-man, body, soul and divinity, is present in the sacrament, but we

are absolutely certain of the fact. He has promised it. We have hundreds of times experienced it. We can neither see his face nor hear his voice with our bodily senses; nevertheless, when we exercise faith, he, the whole Christ, speaks to us, and we hear him; we speak to him, and he hears us; he takes all we give him, he gives us and we receive all of himself. This is real, because he is present. And this is not confined to the sacrament. He makes manifest to our faith the reality of his presence with us, and communicates the same grace to us on many other occasions. But here and now and thus is his appointed rendezvous. Whatever may be our fortune under other conditions and at other times, here and now and in this breaking of bread we have a personal appointment to meet our Lord. And he never disappoints those who thus seek him with faith and love. The Romanists and Lutherans and Ritualists have confused this question and greatly lowered its tone by insisting that the real presence in this sacrament is the literal flesh and blood of Christ, and that the object we really eat and drink when we partake of it is the same literal flesh and blood. This view, as far as it has any scriptural foundation at all, rests on two assertions of Christ.

(1) In the Gospel of John (John 6:53-54) he says, " Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life." Two great mistakes have been made: (a) This language has been interpreted literally instead of spiritually; (6) it has been held to refer to the Lord’s Supper. Now, neither of these interpretations is true. In John 6:63 Christ explains the sense of the entire passage when he says; " It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." The literal interpretation is senseless, useless and revolting. No eating of any flesh can give spiritual life or holiness to man. The spiritual sense is full of light and sweetness. What is present in the sacrament is not literal flesh and blood to be eaten and drunk, but the whole divine-human person of our Lord to be loved, worshiped, communed with, covenanted with, and enjoyed in every form of use and fellowship.

Eating and drinking is not by the mouth and digestive organs of our bodies, but it is the believing reception and self-appropriation to our souls of the spiritual grace offered. What we do thus eat and drink is not literal flesh and blood, but all the sacrificial benefits of Christ’s redemption, all the blessings of every kind he purchased for us by his sacrifice—justification, adoption, sanctifica-tion, life, peace, joy, victory, himself and the fullness of his love and grace. Besides, this language does not refer to the Lord’ Supper. The words were spoken before the Lord’s Supper was instituted, and no allusion is made to that Supper in the entire passage. Besides, " the eating of the flesh " and " the drinking of the blood " spoken of in that passage are declared to be absolutely necessary to salvation, which no Christian, whether Papist or Protestant, ever believed to be true of the Lord’s Supper.

(2) The second assertion of Christ upon which this revolting doctrine is made to rest is his word of institution : " Jesus took the bread, . . . and gave to his disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body." Now, remember that Christ was sitting in the actual flesh at the table, eating and drinking the bread and wine with the rest. According to all the laws of language and common sense, he could only have meant, " This bread represents, signifies, my body." Thus, in Genesis 41:26-27 it is said, " The seven good kine are seven years: and the seven good ears are seven years." Thus it is said in the symbolical language of Daniel (Daniel 7:24), "And the ten horns are ten kings;" and in Revelation 1:20, " The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches, and the seven

candlesticks are the seven churches." And so we now say, when tracing on a map the progress of an historic battle, " These are the British forces, and these are the Americans," or " Here are the Federal forces, and here those of the Confederates." On such an unsubstantial basis as this has grown up the Romish doctrine of trausubstantiation, that when the priest pronounces the words of consecration the whole substance of the bread is changed into the very body of Christ, and the whole substance of the wine is changed into his blood, so that only the sensible qualities (appearance, taste, smell, etc.) of the bread and wine remain, and the very substance of flesh and blood remain without their appropriate qualities. This conversion of substance is permanent, so that the flesh and blood in the form of the wafer and wine, as long as they are visible, are to be kept and adored as the very flesh and blood of Christ. And, the blood being inseparable from the flesh, and the human spirit inseparable from the blood, and the divine Spirit from the human, whosoever either eats the bread or any portion of it, and he who drinks the wine or any portion of it, eats or drinks the entire person of the God-man.

Hence when the Romanists withhold the cup from the communicant he suffers nothing, because, eating the bread, he receives the whole Christ. Hence the minister is a priest, and when he, turning toward the altar, elevates and waves the Host toward God, he offers a real expiatory sacrifice, expiating the sins and purchasing gracious favors for the living and the dead. Thus Romanists make the Mass a sacrifice as well as a sacrament. On the same unsubstantial ground even the Lutherans insist that while the bread and wine remain just what they appear to our senses to be, nevertheless the literal flesh and blood of Christ, though invisible, are really in, with and under the bread and wine, and are really eaten and drunk together with them. And even Calvin tried to mediate between the two extremes by maintaining that though the flesh and blood of Christ are as to their essence absent in the distant heavens, nevertheless they are dynamically present (as, e. g.f the sun throughout the sphere of its radiance) to the body and soul of the believing communicant.

Discarding all such materialistic and mechanical con ceptions, we maintain our unshaken faith, not in abstract, material flesh and blood, but in the actual objective, effective presence with the believing communicant of the whole divine-human Person of Christ. We are unable, and we do not care, to explain the nature of the fact scientifically; but we do know that he is as fully and as really with us in the sacrament as the minister or the fellow-communicant sitting by our side. Face to face and heart to heart and hand to hand, he recognizes and speaks to us, and we recognize and speak to him; and when we speak he hears, and when he hears his whole divine-human heart responds.

4th. Since, then, Christ is personally and immediately and literally present, our communion with him is direct and real. The Greek words xoevwvta, the act or state -of copartnership, the having all things in common, and μετοχ■, participation, are in the New Testament indiscriminately translated " communion " and " fellowship." In the one body all the vital organs have communion. The brain and the heart and the lungs and the stomach reciprocally live in and through each other. Communion between is copartnership and fellowship. The most entire, unlimited and intimate of all human communions is between husband and wrife in a true marriage. The most absolute and intimate of all communions in the universe is between Father, Son and Holy Ghost in the one Godhead. The most absolute and intimate communion between God and the creation is that established through the divine-human Person of Christ with his believing people. This is both

symbolized and actually effected in the Lord’s Supper—symbolized in our eating bread and drinking wine, actually effected by our immediately receiving into our souls, through faith, the actually-present Christ, his whole Person and all the benefits his blood purchases, and by our unreservedly giving to him and his taking our whole selves as consecrate to him. There is no figure in the world which expresses more adequately this absolute entire reception, appropriation and assimilation of another than that of eating and drinking. We incorporate the whole Christ entire and all his offices and work into our personal characters and lives. We freely give, and Christ takes, immediate possession of our whole selves, all our potentialities and activities, for ever. Throughout every octave of our spiritual nature every chord is attuned and brought into exquisite harmony in response to the transcendent mind and spirit of Christ. Hence the Lord’s Supper is characteristically called the iS Communion," " for the cup of blessing which Ave bless, is it not the communion (κοινωνι■α, copartnership) of the blood of Christ ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ ?" And if we have communion with Christ, the common Heart and Head of all, we must have communion one with another. All at the same table, all in the same ecclesiastical fellowship, all of every name and rite now living on the face of the earth and eating of one bread and drinking of one cup, all of all ages and dispensations, through these sacred elements receive the universal Christ, both theirs and ours, and experience that eternal life, that undying joy, which from the Head flows to and through all his members. Herein, on every Communion Sabbath, we visibly proclaim our faith and fellowship with the one everywhere-present Christ, and in him with "the holy catholic Church, the communion of saints."

5th. And, finally, this holy Supper is, in conformity with its inner nature, called by way of eminence " the sacrament." The sacramentum, in classical Latin, came to mean specially the soldier’s oath. The army, halting under the shadows of the great primeval forests, gathered in its new recruits, and by the terrible ceremonial of the soldier’s oath they were bound to an unconditional loyalty to their imperial leader, who reigned from his seat at the head of the host. A victim having been offered in sacrifice, his blood was poured into the hollow of their convex shields. The new soldier, plunging his right hand into this sacrificial blood and raising it to Heaven, swore by all most sacred to be faithful, heart and act, to his master through life and through death. This, of course, implied a reciprocal pledge of protection and benefit from the lord to his loyal follower. So Jesus went in person to the feast, and taking the broken bread and poured wine, the symbols of his crucified body and shed blood, he swears to each of us to fulfill for us and in us his whole mediatorial work—to secure for us, body and soul, his complete salvation culminating in the bosom of God, And we with streaming eyes, taking in our hands and mouths the same tremendous symbols, swear, looking straight into the face of our present Lord, to keep back no part of the price, but to place on the altar of his service all we are and all we possess, without reserve or change for ever. Take the shoes from off your feet and step lightly, for the place is most holy on the inner side of the veil. And when you go down and out into world again, remember that the binding sanotion of this great sacrament rests on you every moment of your lives.

V. Our blessed Saviour told us when he instituted this holy Supper just before his death, " I will not any more eat thereof [of this Passover] until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God" (Luke 22:16); and again, " I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in ray Father’s kingdom " (Matthew 26:29).

[The MS. shows that the conclusion of this Lecture was left unwritten.]

Chapter 104

03.18. LECTURE 18 - THE STATE OF MAN AFTER DEATH AND THE RESURRECTION.

LECTURE XVIII THE STATE OF MAN AFTER DEATH AND THE RESURRECTION.

We come now to the fourth and last department of systematic theology, usually designated by the common term Eschatology, or the science of last things. The great departments of Anthropology and of Soteriology relate to events and matters of personal experience which have come to pass. The topics embraced in the department of Eschatology relate to events and experiences yet future to us. This fact, of course, accounts for the comparative vagueness and absence of uniformity which characterize the faith of the great historic churches upon the several points involved in this department. The whole region lies entirely beyond our experience. We can know anything on these points only as it is definitely revealed in the Word of God. And it must ever be remembered that this revealed Word was not given us to satisfy our curiosity or to afford us the material for speculation, but simply to afford us a practical ground of faith and hope and a guide to the performance of duty. Beyond this information thus afforded the Scriptures will not carry us. One of the wisest reflections ever made on the matter of biblical prophecies was that by the great Sir Isaac Newton—viz. " That prophecy was not given in order to make men prophets." And it is just as profoundly true that no amount of study, no brilliancy of interpretation, will ever make the future hemisphere of Eschatology as clear to us in this life as we have already found to be the departments of the Person and work of Christ, of the Spirit’s application of the same, and of our practical duties on the Hue of our earthly pilgrimage. The main essential points, such as the fact that human probation is closed at death, the second coming of Christ, the resurrection of all men, the general judgment, and the final award of endless happiness or misery, all are clearly taught in Scripture, and all are firmly held with unvarying consent in all the creeds of the great, historical churches. Dissentient opinions on these points are in the strict sense of the word heresies, and have been continued to individuals or small and transient Church parties. On the other hand, as to all other points involved, its to the time in which some of the events will occur, or as to the order in which they will come to paws, and an to the intermediate state, Christians, otherwise orthodox. differ from one another and hold various views. Within these limits we must tolerate difference and respect the mental independence of our brethren. In a few matters of detail, not settled in any way in our Confession of Faith, I shall be forced to differ from brethren whom I hold in great respect and affection. I do with reluctance and with sincere deference to their opinion, and only because I am convinced that the view. I shall present are more consistent with the statements and language of the Bible, and that they offer a far stronger polemic position from which to defend our common faith than that occupied by the brethren who will most emphatically dissent from me.

I. The first point explicitly and emphatically stated in Scripture is that human probation ends with death—that the relation then established between a man and God remains unchanged for all eternity. Everything the Scriptures say on the subject plainly implies this fundamental fact, and there is nothing in the sacred Book which, in its plain interpretation, carries an opposite meaning. "

Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, that they may rest from their labors, and their works do follow them" (Revelation 14:13). It is the earthly life, "the things done in the body," which are finally to determine character and destiny at the judgment-seat of Christ (2 Corinthians 5:10). Our blessed Saviour, in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, declares explicitly two capital facts: 1, that immediately upon death the good man goes to a state of holiness and happiness, and the bad man to a place of torment; and 2, that these states and the characters they imply are permanent and irreversible. Abraham evidently voices the divine judgment when he says to the importunate subject of instant perdition, " And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed, so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot, neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence" (Luke 16:19-31). Christ's commission to his original apostles, which defines the only and the entire ground of authorized hope, reads thus, " Go ye into all the cosmos and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned;" "And lo! I am with you alway, even to the consummation of the age "—to the end of this world, period, or dispensation (Mark 16:15-17; Matthew 28:20).

Thus the commission and the offer of the gospel it carries extend only to the present age of the gospel on the earth. They who do not believe here and now in this life shall be damned. Paul beseeches the Corinthians that they " receive not the grace of God in vain," because " now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation " (2 Corinthians 6:1-2). The same lesson is enforced by all our Lord's various parables of the kingdom of heaven, as, for instance, the parables of the Ten Virgins and of the Talents. The Lord comes to each of us at death. His coming is always sudden, and the person who is found without oil in his lamp is excluded from the marriage supper.

II. The teaching of Scripture upon the other points included in the immediate destiny of every soul after death is admirably summed up and clearly stated in the answers to the thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth questions of our Shorter Catechism : " The souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory-; and their bodies, being still united to Christ, do rest in their graves till the resurrection;" "At the resurrection, believers, being raised up in glory, shall be openly acknowledged and acquitted in the day of judgment, and made perfectly blessed in the full enjoying of God to all eternity." The wicked Dives was immediately upon death cast into Hades, and " lifted up his eyes being in torment," doubtless in the same prison-house wherein, according to Jude (sixth verse), " the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he (God) hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day."

III. All these points are settled. Concerning these there ought to be no longer any debate. But it is abundantly evident, although constantly overlooked by Christians, that the Scriptures settle nothing as to the place or location in space of either heaven or hell. Unquestionably, these terms must designate place or definite location in space, because all created spirits, good or bad, can exist only under the limitations of space. But the particular places are defined neither absolutely nor relatively. Whether these places are far apart or contiguous in space; whether they each always continue to occupy the same portions of space, or are occasionally or frequently moved from one portion of space to another; whether each of them occupies fixed regions or is carried about on revolving spheres like the suns and their planets; whether relatively to us they are up or down,—all these questions are unanswered in Scripture, and with regard to them all opinion is absurd and speculation vain.

It is true that the Scriptures characteristically represent the destination of the good as upward and that of the bad as downward, and in the Old Testament the latter is spoken of as under the surface of the earth. But it is unquestionable that this language is purely metaphorical—that it refers not to relation or direction in space, but to moral differences of honor, happiness and the reverse. In this sense the language is perfectly natural and consistent with the general manner of thought and language characteristic of Oriental people, and especially of the biblical writers. But it is plain that when used from the point of view of the inhabitants of a revolving and rotating globe like this earth, the literal interpretation of this language is absurd. To say, moreover, that heaven is where the infinite and omnipresent God is, is evidently to contribute no definite information with regard to its locality, since essentially he is just as much in hell as in heaven. The New Testament beautifully settles this question to the perfect satisfaction of every Christian heart: " To be absent from the body is to be at home with the Lord " (2 Corinthians 5:8, Revised Version). Heaven, as a place, is defined to be where the incarnate God-man is.

IV. But this at once demonstrates the fact that the condition of Old Testament saints before Christ's death was in some essential respects different from that which all the redeemed dead share together since his death and ascension. To us and to all the redeemed the essence of heaven is to be with Christ, to be where he is. The vision of God in the incarnate Word, the intimate fellowship with the risen and glorified God-man, our merciful High Priest, is the very essence of the blessedness we seek. Now, whatever else may have been true of the place, the state or the blessedness of the redeemed dead in Old Testament times, they could not have enjoyed this crowning grace. As the Old Testament believer, in the use of the ceremonial system of symbolic worship, looked forward trustingly and longingly to a Christ to come hereafter as the goal of his desire, as we New Testament believers look forward with trust and joy, and longingly hasten unto the second coming of our Lord, so must the happy, holy redeemed dead in the Old Testament age have looked forward trustingly, longingly to the fulfillment of all their desires, the goal of all their hopes, to the coming and dwelling among them for ever of their incarnate Lord in his sacrificed body, beautified and glorified.

Therefore, it follows that when on the evening of Friday the soul of the then dead Christ, personally united for ever to his divinity, entered paradise, he must have irradiated it with a sudden light never seen there nor in all the universe of God before. That one moment consummated heaven and revolutionized the condition of the redeemed for ever. How much more then, when some forty days afterward, in his completed person, his risen and glorified body united to his glorious soul and Godhead, he ascended and sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high, must the seats of bliss have been transformed and glorified for ever, and made the central temple and cosmopolitan eye and crown of the universe! " For the Lamb is " now henceforth "the light thereof."

V. It is also very plainly the teaching of the Word of God in both Testaments that the condition into which the souls of men, either good or bad, depart immediately after death, although fixed and irreversible in its general character, is nevertheless intermediate and not ultimate in the character or degree either of the misery on the one hand or of the blessedness on the other.

1. In the first place: although the souls of believers immediately after death are made perfect in holiness and pass into a state properly called glorious, nevertheless the intermediate state is a condition of death. The spirits of men, while their bodies remain in the graves, are ghosts or

disembodied souls. The condition of even the redeemed dead, although completely delivered from sin and at home with the Lord, is one in which they are not yet completely delivered from all the consequences of sin. They look forward to the resurrection of their bodies and to the consummation of their salvation consequent upon the second advent of Christ on earth and its immediate consequents, just as the Church on earth does. Christ, although his soul was in paradise, continued " until the third day under the power of death." The same is true of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and of all the dead until the morning of the resurrection. The Bible always speaks of the " resurrection of the dead therefore they are called " dead," although their souls are in heaven before the resurrection. The Scriptures characteristically point the faith and hope of believers forward not to the hour of death, but to that of the resurrection, as the crisis of our complete redemption. The day of resurrection is called " the day of redemption " (Ephesians 4:30). Paul (Php 3:11) declares it to be his great object of desire and of effort " if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection of the dead." The hope of the gospel, as Paul and all the apostles preached it, was the hope of the resurrection of the dead. When the hour comes, it is the dead in Christ, still dead, who are to rise first (Acts 23:6; 1 Thessalonians 4:16).

2. Spiritual death is not here in question. As far as unbelievers are concerned, they continue spiritually dead from their birth through all eternity. As far as the believer is concerned, he is spiritually alive from the moment of his regeneration (John 6:54). But death, in its common sense, is precisely defined as the suspension of the personal union of soul and body. It continues precisely as long as this union is suspended. It ends the instant this union is re-established by the resurrection. The human soul is essentially constituted for this personal union with a material body. This union conditions all its sensibilities and all its activities. When absent from the body the personality is incomplete; the ghost-life, however happy, must be intermediate and provisional. It is only in the reconstructed personality consequent upon the resurrection of the body, and its glorification in the likeness of Christ, that the person is ready for final judgment or for the consummation of salvation. This view certainly does not depreciate the state of the disembodied dead with Christ in heaven during the present age. It is perfectly true that the believer at death " is made perfect in holiness, and does immediately pass into glory." But that is not final. There is something incomparably higher and more complete to look forward to—when all the redeemed shall pass for ever from under the power of death, and each entire person, instinct with life and glorified, shall be completely conformed to the likeness of his Lord and adjusted to his environment in the new heavens and the new earth.

VI. In connection with this we are brought to the question as to the true meaning of the Hebrew and Greek words Sheol and Hades, in the Old and New Testaments. This question is rather of exegesis and of biblical theology than of positive doctrine. We hold, as has been shown, precisely what our Catechism and Confession of Faith teach as to what becomes of the souls and bodies of men immediately after death. Nevertheless, the revelation of truth, communicated by God to the fathers and recorded in the Scriptures, has been a gradual one, and it is of importance for us to know not only what the truth finally revealed is, but also to trace the history of its gradual communication through past dispensations. It is only in this way that we can rightly interpret the Scriptures in their true historic sense. And, above all, it is only in this way that we can maintain the true historic ground of our faith in controversy against all who deny its truth.

It is true that the Scriptures must be interpreted according to the analogy of the faith, and that the general design and fixed principles of the whole must guide us in the interpretation of the parts. Nevertheless, the dogmatic method of interpretation, whereby it is insisted that the fullest development of doctrine gathered in the apostolic writings shall be found in the earliest writings of the Old Testament, may be carried very much too far, and be a great occasion of weakness when assaulted by the enemies of truth. The question is not how we do now conceive of heaven and hell, but what did the sacred writers mean by Sheol and Hades. The English word " hell" is of Saxon origin, and originally meant " a concealed place," and hence either the " grave," where the body goes at death, or the " invisible world," " the spirit-world," where the soul goes. But it has come now to have the fixed sense of " the place of perdition," where the devil, his angels and the lost souls of men are in torment. This last sense is so general and so firmly established that no attempt should be made to alter or confuse it. We use, therefore, the term " hell" for the place of the punishment of lost souls. Many scholars have held that the words Sheol and Hades, in the original Scriptures, sometimes mean "hell" and sometimes "the grave." I believe that modern Hebrew and Greek scholars, free from mere traditional trammels, unite with almost absolute unanimity in maintaining that these words never on a single occasion in the Bible mean either " hell" or " the grave," but always and only the invisible spirit-world, in which the disembodied souls of men, whether good or bad, abide after death and before the resurrection, while they remain under the power of death for a season. This view is certainly consistent and uniform. It permits a simple and natural exegesis of all the passages in which the words in question occur, and it does not in the least modify or weaken the dogmatic positions assumed in our Confession. The word " heaven " often occurs in the Old Testament, but is never used to express the place or condition into which believers are introduced at death. The single exception (2 Kings 2:1) proves the rule, because Elijah, of whom alone it was said that he went to heaven, was translated in his body, and did not die at all. The word " heaven" always designates in the Old Testament the dwelling-place of God. Heaven is his throne, while the earth is his footstool. He is always represented as reigning, looking, hearing, answering, acting, coming from heaven. But on the contrary, all men, good and bad alike, go when they die to Sheol (Dr. C. Hodge’s Systematic Theol., Part 4, chap. i. section 1).

Sheol occurs sixty-five times in the Old Testament, and, with two or three exceptions, is represented in the Septuagint by the Greek equivalent Hadts. Hades occurs also eleven times in the New Testament, and throughout both Testaments the two words have one single, plain, uniform meaning. They mean the spirit-or ghost-world, in which the disembodied spirits of all men are gathered before the resurrection while they remain under the power of death. It is part of the realm of death. Residence in it, like death, is part of the consequence of sin. Irrespective of the atonement of Christ, its condition would be purely penal and hopeless. But in view of that atonement Sheol or Hades was to all true believers the vestibule of heaven. The fact that all men, good and bad were represented as going to Hades or Sheol of course did not imply that they all went to the same place or to the same or to a like condition, any more than it does now when it is said that all men go down to the grave or to death, or than it is when it is affirmed of different emigrants from Europe that they are going to America. All went to Sheol or Hades—that is, all, good and bad alike, went out as disembodied spirits into the ghost-world, precisely as all, good and bad alike, died, though death is the penalty of sin. And all alike continued under the power of death in the disembodied state until the resurrection. But the good were rendered perfect in holiness, and taken to seats of bliss called " paradise" or "Abraham’s bosom," while the wicked,

abandoned by the spirit of grace and sealed until the day of perdition, went to Gehenna, a place of torment. And between these two there was a great and utterly impassable gulf fixed.

It naturally follows that Sheol, Hades and death are generally spoken of in the Old Testament as dark and dread-inspiring, as the consequence of sin. The fullness and completion of salvation had not then been brought fully to light. Even believers, while anticipating salvation with calm faith, yet shrank from death and their continuance in Sheol or Hades, and looked forward with longing to the completion of salvation in the resurrection, which was the ultimate goal of their hope. The Psalmist exultantly affirms, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades" (Psalms 16:10). Thus Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, declares that the patriarch David spoke of the resurrection of Christ, God having promised that he would " not leave his soul in Hades." Thus Martha, the weeping sister of Lazarus, confessed at his grave the common faith and hope of a believing Jew: " I know that he shall rise again at the resurrection of the last day." And thus in the resurrection, when the salvation of the redeemed and the condemnation of the lost are finally consummated, it is foretold in Revelation 20:13-15, "The sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and Hades delivered up the dead which were in them. . . . And death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire." Then the lost will suffer the second death. Then the redeemed, complete in soul and body, and in both bearing the glorious image of Christ, shall be delivered from all the power and influence of death for evermore.

VII. This explains perfectly the much-disputed phrase in the most ancient and universal creed of the Christian Church, wherein it is asserted of Christ, "He was crucified, dead and buried ; he descended into hell." In the original it stands, " He descended into Hades;" and since the changed sense acquired by the English word " hell," the original and accurately-correct and biblical word " Hades " should be restored. This creed, as it stands, is a part of the binding standards of our Church, to which every minister and elder solemnly subscribes, and it is, after the Scriptures, the most ancient, venerable and generally recognized of all the historic literary monuments of the Christian Church. It seems to me a dreadful violation of the bonds which connect us with the history of Christian faith and life, and of the common ties which still connect the divided segments of " the body of Christ," for any one branch of that Church to agitate for the mutilation of the venerable creed which belongs to the whole brotherhood and to all the sacred past as well. This is rendered the more clear and forcible by the obvious fact that the natural and most generally accredited meaning of the clause objected to is perfectly true, and that it can have no objectionable doctrinal implications. The true meaning is that given it in our Confession of Faith—i. e. " continuing in the state of the dead, and under the power of death, until the third day." That is precisely what going into Hades, the world of the disembodied spirits of dead men awaiting their resurrection, means. The soul of Christ, personally united to his divinity, went, the moment he gave up the ghost, to the very same place and condition as that to which the souls of all redeemed men from the beginning had gone. But on the first day of the week Christ arose, and thus became the first-fruits of them that slept, and afterward ascended, carrying captivity captive (1 Corinthians 15:20; Ephesians 4:8).

VIII. Man consists of soul and body. The entire person, reintegrated by resurrection after death, is the only possible subject of complete and final judgment— the only possible subject upon which complete and final punishment can be inflicted, or to which complete and final rewards can be granted. Unless man is judged, acquitted and acknowledged in the body, and in the body made perfectly blessed in the full enjoying of Christ to all eternity, the whole and complete historical

person is not justified or saved. Unless the sinful man is judged, condemned and damned in the body, the whole and complete historical person of the sinner is not dealt with according to law and justice, and the supreme holiness, truth and justice of God are not fully shown forth. Resurrection is equally necessary in the case of the finally saved and of the finally lost, and for the same reason; that is, in order to complete the full personality, as a subject of judgment, and hence of reward or of punishment.

It hence follows that the resurrection of the redeemed is (1) the consummation of their personal salvation ;

(2) therefore, in their case, gracious, for Christ's sake, a consequence of Christ's resurrection. On the other hand, the resurrection of the reprobate is (1) the necessary antecedent to their final judgment and endless perdition;

(2) and hence, in their case, judicial and punitive.

It seems very clear that it is not logical to reason from the fact that Christ's true people are everywhere encouraged to look forward to the "resurrection of life" as the crowning of their redemption, that therefore the " resurrection of damnation " must be redemptive also (John 5:29). The latter is to lead " to everlasting punishment," but the other "to life eternal" (Matthew 25:46).

IX. The ground of the resurrection of the reprobate will be judgment—the demands of the perfect law which they have broken. As to the nature of their resurrection bodies we have no revelation. The ground of the resurrection of the saints is the already accomplished resurrection of Christ, the " first* fruits of them that slept." We are to rise because he rose. We are to rise as certainly as he rose. And we arc to be like him when we awake, because " he will change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself" (Php 3:21).

1.The same bodies are to rise again which are deposited in the grave. This is expressly asserted in every way: " It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption." We are to rise in the same sense that Christ rose. But his identical body rose again and was identified. Our " vile bodies are to be made like unto Christ's glorious body." We know not what the essential principles of bodily identity are, but we know, certainly, that we have identically the same bodies from the cradle to the grave, although the material constituents of these bodies are continually changing. It is enough for us to be absolutely sure that the bodies we shall rise with at the resurrection will be in the same sense identical with the bodies we lay aside at death, as the bodies we lay aside at death are identical with the bodies with which we were born.

2.But our bodies, although identical, will be changed, modified (not exchanged), so that they will then be perfectly adapted (a) to the instincts and faculties of our glorified souls, and (b) to the physical conditions of the new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. The body of Christ is now material, as Thomas proved when he thrust his fingers into the print of the nails, and as Christ asserted when he said, after his resurrection, " A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have " (Luke 24:36-40). If so, it must have a material home to live in. Hence the material universe, in some form, will be as everlasting as the spiritual world. Therefore our bodies will be material like his. The essential definition of a body is " a material organism personally united to a soul, to be the organ of that soul in perception, in volition and in expression." Every body as

an organism, therefore, must be constructed of matter, and must be adjusted in every case to the appetites, instincts and passions of the soul to which it is united, and to the physical conditions of the ' environment in which it exists. It is plain that the soul of a sheep never could exist in the body of a lion, nor the soul of a lion in the body of a sheep. It is just as plain that if a body is to inhabit any element, it must be physically adjusted to its conditions. Thus, if it is to inhabit the water it must have the body of a fish, or if it is to inhabit the air the body of a bird. So our new bodies must be transformed into complete adjustment to the glorified spirit and to the glorified world it is to inhabit and in which it is to act. In this life our body is called " animal," psuchikon (1 Corinthians 15:44). In the new life it will be what the New Testament calls "spiritual," pneumatikon. The established meaning of that phrase in the New Testament is, that which has been made the temple of the Holy Ghost, and which consequently has been transformed by his indwelling (1 Corinthians 2:12-15). The " spiritual body " will therefore be our very same material body, modified by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost so as to be no longer " animal," but rather so as to be a fit temple for the divine Guest and a fit organ for the perfectly sanctified and spiritualized soul.

3. Our bodies will be rendered perfect as the organs of our souls in perception. Here we possess but five bodily senses, and hence come into contact with the material world only on five sides. We can take knowledge only of its tangible, visible, audible and odoriferous properties. Beyond doubt, the world, even as at present constituted, possesses far different properties and presents other aspects, perhaps far deeper, grander, larger, than any now open to us. At present our existing senses are feeble and of narrow range, and we need to increase their powers by the use of instruments, such as the microscope, the telescope and the spectroscope, whereby new spheres are opened to us. For illustration, imagine the case of Laura Bridgman, born without the sense either of sight or hearing, and of course utterly unable to conceive the use or the essence of either experience. Suppose that her teacher, endowed with supernatural power, should have placed her some day of the year, in the spring days of her life, on some central tower in the harbor of Boston. At first she would stand in absolute isolation, teeming with force and life and mind, touching the world only through the soles of her feet and the zephyr which fanned her cheek, yet enveloped in darkness and silence infinite, alone and apart as really as if sunk in the abysses of night beyond the orbit of the nethermost sun. Suppose then her teacher should touch her and say, " Daughter, hear!" and at once there should flow into her open soul all the myriad voices of the globe. Suppose, again, the teacher should touch her and say, " Daughter, see!" and suddenly that hitherto isolated soul should pass out in one instant into the infinite world and take into her irradiated consciousness all the visions of the sea and earth under the stupendous sky. Without moving herself or any change of environment, the mere opening of ear and eye would widen her horizon infinitely and bring her face to face with a thousand worlds, all new.

Some such experience will be yours and mine when we are clothed upon by our glorified bodies on the morning of the resurrection. Coming up from rural or urban graveyards, rising before the awful whiteness of the throne and the intolerable glory of Him that sits thereon, and passing through the interminable ranks of flaming seraphs and diademed archangels, the perfect senses of our new bodies will bring us at once into the presence of the whole universe, of the music of all its spheres and of the effulgence of all its suns; of the most secret working of all its forces, and of the recorded history of all its past.

4. Our new bodies will be no less perfect as the organs of our souls in volition. At present our volitions have direct control only of a few voluntary muscles and of the course of our thoughts. Besides this, our physical energies need constant reinforcement from nutrition and sleep, and are rapidly exhausted by fatigue, and in a few years entirely decay. Man in this world could not stand the competition of any but the weakest of the lower animals if it were not for his superiority of intellect and for the characteristic fact that he alone is a tool-making and tool-using animal. It is by machinery to which he harnesses all the forces of material nature that man maintains his lordship of the world. But completely redeemed humanity is symbolically represented in the ancient ritual by the cherubim which surrounded the ark of the covenant, the throne of Jehovah over the mercy-seat, and which were inwrought in all the walls and curtains of the tabernacle and temple. This composite symbol consisted of the ox, the lion, the eagle and the man. Here were symbolically gathered into one focus, and set forth as the attributes of every redeemed man, all the energies now distributed through all the provinces of the animal world. The ox represents brute strength, the power that cultivates and renders fruitful the earth and that bears the burdens of mankind. The Hon is the king of beasts, at whose voice and tread all the denizens of the forest tremble. The eagle is the king of birds, who soars upward to the seats of the sun, and who sleeps in perfect equilibrium upon his inexhaustible wing. Man is the sovereign intelligence, who gathers all the energies of the physical world and sways them to his use.

Taken together, they constitute the type or prophetic symbol of our resurrection bodies. There will be there no need of grosser nutriment and no need of sleep. Our energies will not flag with fatigue, nor will they be exhausted with age. Our wills will not be confined to indirect and difficult action through cumbrous machinery, but the whole soul will act directly upon every subservient force. Without inertia or friction our purposes will be spontaneously executed by inexhaustible energies, to which all exercise will be pleasure, and continuous activity the unshadowed rapture of an immortal life.

5. Our new bodies, finally, will be perfect as the organs of our souls in expression. The expression of mental characteristics and states is a great mystery. Yet we are absolutely dependent upon it for all of our knowledge of, and for all our communion with, each other. In some exceptional cases the power of expression acquired by some souls through their bodies opens to as a grand conception of what in the resurrection may become the common property of all saints. We have all of as experienced something of the magic power wielded by the great masters of the art of expression, the poets, painters, singers and orators of all time. Yet even in these the present body of flesh is only a coarse and opaque medium for the spirit’s light. I have no doubt that the resurrection bodies of the saints will be of more than crystal translucency, through which each glorified soul will dart his rays through myriad facets. The recognition of friends, then, will not be the recognition of souls through the remembered features of the body, but rather the recognition of persons through irradiating characteristics of their souls. When we rise on that great Easter morning, and our new senses sweep the historic generations of the redeemed, we will know the great masters of thought and song, and the great leaders of the sacramental hosts in instant glances, from our long knowledge of their thoughts and deeds. And when, in the centre of the hosts, we meet the Object to which all thoughts and hearts converge, there will be no need of introduction between the glorified Lord and his glorified servant, however humble he may be. The instant rapturous recognition will be mutual and spontaneous: Rabboni! Mary!

03.19. LECTURE 19 - FINAL REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS

LECTURE XIX FINAL REWARDS AND PUNISHMENTS.

It is a very striking infelicity that so many of our systems of theology end as their last words with " hell" and " eternal punishment," as if these were the climacteric categories in which the study of the nature, purposes and works of the Lord must find their final and characteristic goal. Such an arrangement has little influence upon the substance of the doctrine held, but it mars the symmetry of truth, it misrepresents the real facts of the case, and it must depress the enthusiasm of the believer and give unnecessary occasion of stumbling and of offence to the unbeliever.

We will therefore purposely reverse the common order, and consider, first, what the Scriptures teach us as to the future of those who depart this life finally impenitent, and after that close with a short study of the glimpses they afford us into the endless blessedness of the redeemed.

I. It seems to be very clear that there "are only seven distinct views as to the final destiny of man which are possible, one or other of which, with very slight modification, must be held by all who think upon the subject.

1. It has been held by many that one end happens to man in common with all other animals, that his conscious intellectual life is inseparable from his body, and that when the one falls to pieces and decays at death the other ceases absolutely and for ever. Against this materialism human nature in all its varieties and throughout its entire history has protested. The false religions have here joined voices with Christianity in holding before all the inhabitants of the earth the certainty of a future life.

2.Again, many parties with whom the sense of sin and its ill-desert is vague and slight have flattered themselves that the benevolence of God was his only characteristic moral attribute, and the universal happiness of his creatures his one chief end. These have consequently held an indiscriminate Universalism, including the immediate happiness of all men after death, without reference to distinctions of moral character or to the redemptive work of Christ.

This, of course, is abhorrent to an enlightened moral sense, and derogatory to the personal holiness and governmental rectitude of God. All who bear, however loosely, the Christian name must repudiate this view, since it absolutely repudiates Christ and the value and dignity of his mediation.

3.Universalists, who have at the same time endeavored to justify their claim to being a Christian sect, have maintained that since Christ died for all men, all men must be saved; that this salvation, depending as it does upon what Christ has done and will do in man’s behalf, cannot be rendered of no effect by what men themselves may do or experience on earth ; that in some way and at some time, and probably sooner and with far less difficulty than we are apt to fear, Christ will draw the spirits of all men to himself and secure for them the conditions of perfect happiness for ever. This view, although it names the name of Christ, and professes to rest all its hopes upon his

mediatorial achievements, nevertheless is essentially as anti-Christian as those we have just dismissed. It puts a higher estimation upon happiness than upon holiness. It puts mere benevolence on a higher rank among the attributes of God than purity and righteousness. It regards deliverance from the mere punishment of sin as of greater importance than deliverance from the pollution and power of sin itself. It is founded not in the least upon positive revelations of God's purposes, but is maintained upon grounds of human sentiment and reason exclusively, against evident testimony of God's inspired Word and the uniform belief of God's historic Church.

4. In latter times the view has been entertained by many that although the Scriptures plainly teach that all who reject Christ and die finally impenitent shall be condemned in the judgment of the great day and condignly punished, yet two immutable facts remain which must always afford a rational basis for an eternal hope with regard to all men:

(1) They are essentially free agents, and as such possess an inalienable power of self-determined choice. As soon as they cease to be moral agents they must cease to be proper subjects of punishment. As long as they continue to be moral agents they continue (so it is claimed) to possess the power of repentance and the will (at least) to reform. No one can predict (it is argued) that penal sufferings will be unending, because no one can be certain of any sinner, in any state or in any world, that he will not repent and return.

(2) God is immutably and before all things merciful. All his government, penalties as well as blessings, looks to pronioting the excellence and happiness of all his creatures. He has sought by temporal dispensations to bring men to repentance in this life; so he will ceaselessly continue to seek to bring the condemned and suffering spirits of lost men in the world of penal inflictions to repentance by means of those more tremendous and more cogent disciplines. Reason and conscience will always be pleading with men to repent and throw down the weapons of rebellion. The sufferings of perdition will afford the most powerful arguments conceivable to induce men to close their ears to the suggestions of sinful passion and to open them obediently to the influence of reason and conscience. And all the while the eternal God is eternally the God of mercy and grace, and to the latest moment yearning to receive the prodigal with open arms upon the first indication of his willingness to return. Immediate punishment after death of all who reject the gospel and die unreconciled to God, and the ultimate restoration of all during the future ages, are the hope of many.

5.Others, who cannot admit that the Scriptures leave any opening for the indulgence of this eternal hope in behalf of all souls, nevertheless maintain, both on the ground of justice and upon that of harmony with the characteristics of God as revealed in nature and in revelation, that hereafter, at some time between death and the final judgment, the gospel will be offered under favorable conditions and with hopeful results to all to whom it was not clearly revealed and upon whom it was not urgently pressed in this life.

6.Many others, who cannot disguise to themselves the obviously anti-scriptural character of this so-called "eternal hope," admit that the Word of God plainly teaches that all human probation, in every sense, ceases with the close of the present life; that the sentence pronounced on the reprobate in the judgment of the great day is absolutely final and irreversible; that those upon whom the sentence is pronounced will never be restored. But they claim that continued conscious existence after death and after judgment is no part of man's natural inheritance and no part of the

sinner's doom. They hold that immortality is conditioned upon the personal attainment of eternal life, and that it is a gift which Christ graciously bestows only upon his redeemed. The penalty of eternal death, which will certainly be inflicted upon all who depart this life impenitent, is just the ceasing to be, the being cast utterly and finally out of existence, as the penalty exacted of the sinner by the law of God.

7. There remains room in this series of alternative hypotheses only for the catholic doctrine of the entire historical Church:

(1) that the probation of man in every sense, under both gospel and law, terminates with death;

(2) that the state of the relations subsisting between any man and God at that crisis will remain absolutely irreversible for ever;

(3) that neither during the intermediate state between death and the resurrection nor after the judgment, at any time through the endless ages, will any conditions of restoration be offered, or efficient grace extended;

(4) that all the lost will continue conscious rebels and sufferers through absolutely unending duration.

II. It appears that this classified statement of opinion is absolutely exhaustive. Any possible opinion on the subject of man's future destiny must be capable of being brought in under one or other of these heads. Such a position can differ from the corresponding statement here made only in the details. Leaving aside the first three views as plainly beyond the pale of Christianity, it seems that the choice is necessarily confined to the following positions:

(1) Either universal restoration of all to holiness and happiness;

(2) or the offer of the gospel in the future world under more favorable conditions to all those who were left to live and die ignorant of it in this world;

(3) or the annihilation of all the finally impenitent ,·

(4) or the Church doctrine of the eternal conscious misery of all those who depart this life unreconciled to God.

III. In preparing ourselves for an examination of the testimony of the Word of God on this subject, we should, in the first place, seek to be profoundly impressed with its vital importance. Before any other knowledge attainable by us in the compass of the universe, it is most essential for us to know what our Creator and sovereign Lord intends to do with us after death—whether deliverance from the sin and misery and the fearful looking-for of judgment which afflict us in this world is possible for us, and upon what conditions. If any preparation is to be made for the future, it must be made now. If there await us any future dangers which are in any way avoidable, the present time affords us the only possible opportunity of avoiding them. What we need above all other things that God can give us is a clear, certain knowledge of the actual truth. It is very natural for us to shrink from facing the truth boldly and to turn away from the evidence of coming danger, and to fix our attention upon every flattering light which appears to promise some relief from danger. If we really wish to be safe, we must be honest with ourselves. If we really wish to be honest with

ourselves, we should suspect our natural tendency to shrink from the evidence which threatens danger, and to resist it with all our might.

More than all this, we should recognize the superficiality and essential cruelty of that mock charity which makes so many professed theological reformers disguise from sinners or explain away the real facts as to the attitude of the Word of God on this subject. Even if mistakes should be made in the way of rendering the aspect of scriptural teaching more menacing than it really is, while it might give unnecessary pain for the present, it could not betray souls to unexpected dangers hereafter. But there is no more deadly injury, no more wanton cruelty, which any man can perpetrate upon a fellow-creature, than that which the theological reformer is in danger of when, against the apparent meaning of God's Word, against the unanimous judgment of Christ's Church, he softens the emphasis of warning, and assures the incorrigible sinner that it is not, after all, so certain that he must die the second death of eternal pain and shame.

IV. Unquestionably, every Christian who understands his own heart will recognize the fact that he Sympathizes profoundly with the feeling of his brethren who from a mistaken philanthropy seek relief from the plain teachings of Scripture as to the fearful doom of the finally impenitent. To human view the conception of never-ending, hopeless sin and misery is absolutely overwhelming. If we could realize its tremendous meaning it would paralyze our minds and hearts. We think and speak of it so calmly because it is so far off and so vague that it fails to impress us as an actual reality.

There is nothing on earth more outrageously vulgar and profane than the coarse and careless shouting out of threats of damnation against heedless sinners by an orthodox ranter. When we declare the terrible judgments of our Lord against our fellow-sinners, of our own flesh and blood, who by nature are no worse than we are, we should do it tremblingly and with tears. We should remember that in all respects we deserve the same fate ourselves, and that it is only infinite undeserved grace which has made us to differ. We should seek to treat all impenitent sinners with the yearning tenderness with which our blessed Lord wept over Jerusalem, with outstretched arms and heaving breast: " If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace; but now they are hid from thine eyes."

V. Our appeal must be made exclusively to the Scriptures. We accept these as the infallible rule of faith because they are the very Word of God. They were designed to furnish us all the information which is needed by us, and all that God intends us to have on this subject.

We must come to the study of this Word in a teachable spirit, with a mind open to receive all that it has to convey to us, with simplicity and godly sincerity, without prejudice. What we need above all things to know is, not what we think or what other men think, ought to be, but what is, in fact, the real, plain meaning of God's declaration on this subject. The question is not what can we, with skillful exegeti-cal management, get out of the Bible on this question by breaking up the text and bringing the stress of our strong wills to bear against the natural sense of each separate clause. The question is not, What may the several passages possibly mean in the way we wish ? but What, upon the whole and along the entire line of Scripture, did God the Holy Ghost intend us to believe; what impression did he intend to make upon us as to these stupendous subjects by the language he has chosen, by the general method in which he has conducted the argument?

1.Remember that it was "the Lamb of God," the tender and compassionate Saviour, who gave himself to die for the sins of men, who taught the most frequent and the most terrible lessons upon this subject. He addressed the common people in common language, and his representations, statements and metaphorical descriptions were of one consistent tone from the beginning to the end of his ministry, without the least variation or modification of view. They must have understood him in the common meaning of terms as then currently received. Josephus (Antiq., xviii. ch. i. 2; Bell. Jud. ii. ch. viii. 14) says that the Pharisees of that day taught that the souls of the wicked after death were consigned to an everlasting imprisonment, to be punished with eternal vengeance. Christ, therefore, knew perfectly how his hearers, holding these opinions, would understand his frequently-repeated " gehenna of fire " (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).

2.As to either the restoration or the annihilation of those who depart this life impenitent, the Scriptures say absolutely nothing. There is no single passage in the whole New Testament which indicates or suggests either of these views when frankly and reasonably interpreted. On the contrary, the ceaseless, hopeless, conscious suffering of those who die impenitent, both during the intermediate state before the resurrection and in the final state after the resurrection and judgment, is asserted over and over again in every form, in the most definite language and with the greatest emphasis possible.

(1)In the first place, it is explicitly declared that the sufferings of the wicked shall have no end: Their fire is not quenched, and shall never be quenched, and " their worm dieth not" (Mark 9:44-46). Because the fire is unquenchable (Matthew 3:12): "The smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever, and they have no rest day nor night" (Revelation 14:11).

(2)In the second place, the Word of God explicitly affirms that this suffering shall last, shall endure, for ever: " The children of the kingdom shall be cast into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth " (Matthew 8:12). Jude 1:13 says the wicked " are wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever." And Peter (2 Peter 2:17) says of them, "To whom the mist of darkness is reserved for ever." The fire (which is the metaphor expressing their torment) is declared to be " everlasting " (Matthew 25:41-46; Mark 9:43), and the wicked are declared "to suffer the vengeance of eternal fire " (Jude 1:7). It is an " eternal judgment" which comes after the resurrection of the dead (Hebrews 6:1-2). Those who obey not the gospel "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power " (2 Thessalonians 1:9); "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).

It is never said that the " effects" of this punishment are everlasting, which might be true if that punishment were a condign annihilation of the sinner once for all. The effects would continue for ever, even although the punishment itself was inflicted in one act. But, on the contrary, the Scriptures declare that not the "effects" only are everlasting, but that " the condemnation," " the punishment," "the contempt," "the torment," "the fire," "the worm," "the chains," are everlasting, are never to cease to be. What is the sense of " everlasting" "torment," "chains," "fire," "worm," of "no rest day nor night for ever," if the sinner himself has ceased to be, or if the sinner himself has in the mean time been restored to the divine favor?

This, we assert, is the general, uniform and characteristic language of the Scriptures on this awful subject. It is the most intensely practical of all subjects, and as far removed from a merely theoretical and speculative interest as the heavens are above the earth. This is language addressed by God to plain, practical people of all classes, who would only be deceived by any subtleties of language. It is addressed to Jewish hearers and readers, who, God knew, understood this very same language in their ancient Hebrew Scriptures to mean definitely and surely this awful doctrine of endless conscious suffering, and this only.

Now, we charge you that God is always true and frank. He speaks, not to frighten, but in order to be understood. And he means what he says—just what he says. Is it not infinite blasphemy for man to dare to modify his words on such a subject? Is it not the utmost reach of human folly to attempt to erect flimsy gauze barriers to shut out the approach of the intolerable fires he declares it to be his purpose to pour out? Is it not the last refinement of cruelty to administer to bewildered sinners moral anaesthetics, assuring them of an " eternal hope," only that they may meet " the vengeance of God's eternal fire" with drugged consciences?

3. As to the supposition that to those to whom the gospel has not been plainly offered in this life it must in justice be offered hereafter, there are two things to be said, very plain and very certain:

(1.) And first, this supposition, even if it should turn out to be true, would bring no relief to us who have had the gospel offered to us in this world. It would still remain true, what God so terribly affirms, that " if we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking-for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries" (Hebrews 10:26-27.)

(2.) The second thing to be said is that the Scriptures from beginning to end do not afford any ground for this " supposition." We are told to believe in Christ now or we shall be damned. We are told to take our lives in our hands and make every sacrifice to preach the gospel to every creature in this life, in order that he may be saved. Christ promises to bless the preaching of the gospel in this world unto the end of the present age. But there is not the slightest suggestion that if men die without hearing the gospel in this life it will be preached to them in the next.

(a) It is not promised. (6) The presumptions are all against it. The circumstances of the unregenerate in the next world are all unfavorable. The world into which they pass immediately after death is everywhere and uniformly described in Scripture as a place of awards, and not of probation, and as the scene of sufferings absolutely endless, (c) The Bible always speaks of death as closing probation : "Now is the accepted time; now is the day of salvation;" "After death comes the judgment;" "For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law" (Romans 2:12). Remember that the term " law" with Paul included the sum of all God's revelations to men, the " gospel" as well as the moral law. The matter of the judgment is to be " the deeds done in the body." The question, as Christ puts it, is the treatment we extended to him in the persons of his disciples in this life, (d) Christ owes the unevangelized nothing, absolutely nothing. Salvation is of grace. The gift of Christ to expiate the sins of men was wholly and simply gratuitous. If God owed salvation, then expiation was a farce. If God owed salvation, then it was the height of false pretences for him to pretend that " he so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son." If he did not owe it to all, he did not owe it to any. He was then absolutely free to grant it to none, or to all, or to few, or to many, as he pleases, " according to the good pleasure of his will."

Considering what we are and what Christ is, and what he, out of his infinite love, has done for us, it is the last and meanest insult that either man or devil can give, to cast in his face that his amazing self-sacrifice was the payment of a debt—that he ought to have made it—that we had a right to expect it for ourselves, and have a right to expect, independent of all promise on his part, that he will send the knowledge of it to others, either in this life or in that which is to come.

4. The Greek words and phrases in the New Testament (aion, aionios, eie ton aiona, eis tons aionas, etc.) translated " eternal," " everlasting," " for ever and ever," and applied to the never-ending sufferings of the lost, mean in the usage of the Greek language precisely what their English equivalents mean in the usage of the English language. The attempt of a class of Bible-interpreters to establish a new sense to the term " eternal" or " aionion" shows how far scholarly men, otherwise honest, may be warped by a determined bias of desire in representing the plainest and most certain and universally-known matters of fact They maintain that these terms, as used in the Bible, do not express measures of duration, but express only the quality of the things of which they are predicated.

It is a simple matter that endless duration should also carry with it, because endless, an added idea of quality. If a man believes in Christ, he has " eternal life" already abiding in him. This life is not without either beginning or end in us, but it is without beginning or end in God : it is self-originating, self-existent and inexhaustible and endless in God, from whom we receive it; and therefore it is called eternal. And in us also it will prove inexhaustible and endless.

It is simply absurd to deny that these terms originally, naturally and always mark duration, and duration corresponding to the nature of the object of which they are predicated. Applied to God, they express his infinite duration as the metaphysical eternity, without beginning, end or succession. Applied to the soul of man and his future experiences, they express the strictly everlasting, that which has beginning, but no end. Applied to the " everlasting mountains " (Habakkuk 3:6), they express the duration of mountains.

They are the very words used in the New Testament to express the eternal duration of God (Romans 1:20; 1 Timothy 1:17; Romans 16:26; Hebrews 9:14), and the endless reign of Christ (Revelation 1:18), and the unending duration of the happiness of the redeemed (Matthew 19:29; Matthew 25:46; Mark 10:30; John 3:15; John 6:57-58; Romans 2:7; 2 Corinthians 9:9), as well as the unending duration of the miseries of the lost

They always express the idea of " unending continuance." The existence of God, the glory of God, the reign of Christ, the blessedness of the saints (Galatians 1:5; Ephesians 3:21; Revelation 1:18; Revelation 4:9; Revelation 10:6; Revelation 15:7; Revelation 22:5), all continue for ever. So, of course, will the suffering of the impenitent continue for ever (Revelation 14:11; Revelation 19:3; Revelation 20:10). These terms are used to express a state of things opposed to this present life as one that passes away, that ceases to be (Luke 18:30), and they are used as synonymous with apthartos, incorruptible, immortal, that which never ceases to be (Romans 1:23; 1 Timothy 1:17; 1 Corinthians 9:25; 1 Peter 1:4), and with akataluto8, indissoluble, and hence endless, enduring for ever (Hebrews 7:16).

VI. Human reason is not qualified to judge of the absolute justice or of the governmental propriety of eternal suffering as the penalty of sin.

1. In comparison with God the human intellect is very narrow in its range and imperfect in its processes.

2.In comparison with God our point of view is infinitely inferior. We see from beneath, he sees from above; we see only in part, his vision comprehends the whole sphere, and discerns all objects in their true proportions and relations. He alone can judge of the real evil of sin and of the measures proper to its punishment and restraint.

3.We are ourselves the malefactors. It is self-evident that self-interest, that moral blindness and callousness, for ever render every criminal an utterly incompetent judge of the measure of guilt attaching to his own wrong-doing. All experience proves this in criminal jurisprudence and in private life. If this be true when we judge of the heinousness of our offences against our fellow-men, how much more must it vitiate our judgments as to the heinousness of our sins against the infinitely holy God!

We are not required to assent to the abstract metaphysical dictum that every sin, being committed against an infinite God, is essentially an infinite evil and intrinsically deserves an infinite penalty. It is perfectly sufficient, in order to establish the abundant justice of eternal suffering, for us to recognize the common-sense principle that never-ending sin richly deserves never-ending punishment. Every sin continues as long as it is unrepented of. And every sin continues unless the wrong-doer not only repents, but also reforms. But sinners in hell never repent nor reform.

Even if a sinner, by a miracle, did repent and reform, it would still remain that his guilt would demand condign punishment or vicarious expiation. But in that case, on the hypothesis of a sinner's repenting and reforming, God has never revealed to us that the guilt of his temporal sin, now repented of and reformed, deserves or would be punished with unending suffering. But that is a purely hypothetical case, which never, absolutely never, occurs. Surely a Christian who has lifted his eyes to the divine Victim upon the cross can never feel any difficulty in recognizing the perfect justice of the unending suffering of the finally impenitent. Surely, sinners who never repent nor reform, who continue in a course of never-ending sin, deserve, yes, demand imperatively from justice, never-ending punishment. The plea is now frequently offered that the stern doctrines of unending punishment are offensive to the sense of justice of an enlightened age, and are the exciting causes of a great deal of the infidelity now prevalent. This is utterly false as a fact, and as a plea is most unworthy and degrading in spirit. Infidelity has its source not in the injustice of God, but in the rebellious will and impenitent blindness of men. Men doubt about eternal punishment because they are blind to the infinite evil of sin; and they are blind to the infinite evil of sin because they have inadequate and unworthy views of the absolute holiness of God. In an age of general peace and epicurean luxury, when, in the whole sphere of human thought, the supernatural has been overcast and hidden by the natural, God appears to us "altogether such an one as ourselves." We conceive of him as confederate with us in our pleasures and as connivent with us in our sins.

What is needed to break down rebellion is not the lowering of the claims of the government. What we need to render infidelity impossible is surely not a further obscuration of the awful majesty and holiness of God. What we need to render moral evil infamous is surely not the lowering the standard either of the laws demands or its penalties. There will be no infidelity in hell, nor before its opened mouth in judgment. And there will be far less infidelity when all who speak for God in the

pulpit or in the press cease from human sentiment or speculation, and conform their utterances, both in matter and form, to the frank, explicit, majestic, though terrible, utterances of God's Word.

VII. We have in support of this doctrine also the true and genuine witness of the " Christian consciousness." The organ of this "Christian consciousness" cannot be any particular age of the Church nor any self-appointed school of Christian thinkers, no matter how cultured or self-conscious of their own superiority. The presumption is ten thousand to one that the Bible does teach that God wills the finally impenitent to suffer endlessly. The Old Testament was in the hands of the Jews centuries before Christ came. They uniformly understood these Scriptures as teaching that the wicked are to suffer for ever (Josephus, Wars, ii., ch. viii. 14; Antiq.y xviii., ch. i. 2; Philo Judaeus, i. p. 65 and p. 1391). The New Testament has been in the hands of Christians for eighteen hundred years. All the great Church fathers, Reformers and historical churches, with their recensions and translations of the sacred Scriptures, their liturgies and hymns; all the great evangelical theologians and biblical scholars, with their grammars, dictionaries, commentaries and classical systems,—have uniformly agreed in their understanding of the teaching of the sacred Scriptures as to the endlessness of the future sufferings of all who die impenitent. And this has come to pass against the universal and impetuous current of human fears and sympathies. The only exception to this unanimous judgment of the Christian Church of all ages consists of relatively a few men, who, hating this doctrine, have beforehand determined that the Bible cannot teach it, and so afterward easily persuade themselves that it does not

VIII. Heaven ! Of heaven, the final home of Christ and his people and of the eternal rewards of well-doing, we are told far more in the Scriptures than we are told of the final punishment of the wicked. The facts are no surer, but the details are much clearer. And yet we do not need to say much on the subject. There is prevalent no prejudice against the doctrine of heaven, as there is in this day against that of hell—no array of objections to the Church doctrine to be refuted. It is sufficient for Christians that, with the Bible in their hands, they set their affections on things above, and seek, through grace and the diligent observance of all means and duties, to grow constantly in meetness for the inheritance of the saints in light. The main points embraced within our present knowledge can easily be stated.

1. Heaven, as a place, is where Christ, the God-man, is. Heaven, as a state, is one of intimate knowledge of him and of the whole Godhead in him, and of fellowship with him. Although we shall be perfectly holy and confirmed in grace, so that we shall never more be liable to sin, nevertheless the atoning, sin-expiating blood of Christ will for ever be the only foundation of our claim and our only plea for life or blessedness. It will always be our " purchased possession." As Christ is inexhaustible, so heaven is inexhaustible. There is room and verge for every capacity, for every idiosyncrasy, and indefinite progress in all directions through the eternal ages.

2.Heaven, as the supreme centre of divine revelations and communications through Christ, must pre-eminently bear the characteristics of God. It will be absolutely pure, majestic, holy, noble in all its elements and characteristics. Everything that is impure and that defileth will be excluded. Its inhabitants will all be arrayed in linen fine and white which has been washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb. Everything, therefore, that encompasses our life on earth, which is narrow, dark, selfish, petty, ungenerous, untrue, unclean, must be faithfully cut away at every cost. There can absolutely be no compromise between light and darkness—between the candidate for heaven

and the spirit and fashion of this world.

3.Heaven, as the eternal home of the divine Man and of all the redeemed members of the human race, must necessarily be thoroughly human in its structure, conditions and activities. Its joys and its occupations must all be rational, moral, emotional, voluntary and active. There must be the exercise of all faculties, the gratification of all tastes, the development of all latent capacities, the realization of all ideals. The reason, the intellectual curiosity, the imagination, the aesthetic instincts, the holy affections, the social affinities, the inexhaustible resources of strength and power native to the human soul, must all find in heaven exercise and satisfaction. Then there must always be a goal of endeavor before us, ever future. It will never be said there that we have already attained or have already finished, but, forgetting the things which are behind, and reaching forth unto the things which are before, we will press toward the ever-advancing mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. Ever upward and onward the pathway of the redeemed and glorified will always be, with Christ God ward.

4.The constitution of heaven will be related not only to human nature, redeemed and glorified, but also to angelic nature in all its grades and orders. Christ and the commonwealth of his redeemed kindred after the flesh will be central. But with us all holy intelligences in all their infinite varieties of rank and gifts and functions will be comprehended. Heaven will prove the consummate flower and fruit of the whole creation and of all the history of the universe. Every sun and all the stars will send tribute. All nations and generations of mankind, all varieties of rational spirits, all angels and archangels, all cherubim and seraphim, will send representatives. For this is the mystery of God’s will according to his good pleasure, which he has purposed in himself, that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together, under one Head, all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth, even in him (Ephesians 1:9-10).

5.Although heaven can only be entered by the holy, yet such, we are assured, is the infinite provision made for human salvation, and such the intense love for human sinners therein exhibited, that the multitude of the redeemed will be incomparably greater than the number of the lost. My father, at the close of his long life spent in the defence of Calvinism, wrote on one of his conference papers, in trembling characters, a little while before he died, "I am fully persuaded that the vast majority of the human race will share in the beatitudes and glories of our Lord’s redemption." Remember that all who die before complete moral agency have been given to Christ. Remember that the vast populations of the coming millenniums are given to Christ. Then shall the promises of Christ to the great Father of the faithful be fulfilled to the letter: " Thy seed shall be like the sands of the sea-shore;" " Thy seed shall be like the stars of heaven for multitude," and recollect that when God made this promise, while Abraham saw only with the naked eye, God took in far more than even the telescopic heavens in magnitude.

6. While heaven is thus infinitely comprehensive, and all the more blessed because it is so, yet each individual, however humble and useless, will have his special individual place prepared expressly for himself. Every glorified body will be articulated to the idiosyncrasies of each individual soul. Every glorified person will be exactly adjusted to his personal friends, associations, relations and personal work. Paul said of Christ in his personal relation to himself, u Who loved me, and gave himself for me," We will never, not the least one of us, be lost in the crowd. Our infinite-sided Saviour will have his special recognition, his special communion and his special

tokens of love for each of us. We will all be exalted by being parts of an infinite whole. But we will none of us be lost in the mass. Each will retain his personal value, and in Christ his private life. "To him that overcometh will I give a white stone, and in the stone a new name written, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth it" (Revelation 2:17). And now, ladies and gentlemen, let me congratulate you. You have exercised great patience of faith in holding out through these trying Lectures to the end. The end is now come when you, having finished the course, may rest from your labors. We shall not meet together here any more. Let us pledge one another, as we part, to reassemble in heaven. We are now parting from one another, as pilgrims part upon the road. Let us turn our steps homeward, for if we do we shall soon—some of us now very soon—"be at home with the Lord." Adieu! *

* So ended the first course of Lectures delivered by Dr. Hodge in Philadelphia, Tuesday, May 30, 1886. The propriety of leaving this conclusion unchanged is obvious. How sadly the words were verified!

S. A Short History of Creeds and Confessions

A Short History of Creeds and Confessions by Dr. A. A. Hodge

It is asserted in the first chapter of this Confession [The Westminster Confession of Faith], and vindicated in this exposition that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, having been given by inspiration of God, are for man in his present state the only and the all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. All that man is to believe concerning God, and the entire duty which God requires of man, are revealed therein, and are to be believed and obeyed because contained therein, because it is the word of God. This divine word, therefore, is the only standard of doctrine which has intrinsic authority binding the conscience of men. And all other standards are of value or authority only in proportion as they teach what the Scriptures teach.

While, however, the Scriptures are from God, the understanding of them belongs to the part of men. Men must interpret to the best of their ability each particular part of Scripture separately, and then combine all that the Scriptures teach upon every subject into a consistent whole, and then adjust their teachings upon different subjects in mutual consistency as parts of a harmonious system. Every student of the Bible must do this, and all make it obvious that they do it by the terms they use in their prayers and religious discourse, whether they admit or deny the propriety of human creeds and confessions. If they refuse the assistance afforded by the statements of doctrine slowly elaborated and defined by the Church, they must make out their own creed by their own unaided wisdom. The real question is not, as often pretended, between the word of God and the creed of man, but between the tried and proved faith of the collective body of God's people, and the private judgment and the unassisted wisdom of the repudiator of creeds. As we would have anticipated, it is a matter of fact that the Church has advanced very gradually in this work of the accurate interpretation of Scripture and definition of the great doctrines which compose the system of truth it reveals. The attention of the Church has been specially directed to the study of one doctrine in one age, and of another doctrine in another age. And as she has thus gradually advanced in the clear discrimination of gospel truth, she has at different periods set down an accurate statement of the results of her new attainments in a Creed or Confession of Faith, for the purpose of preservation and popular instruction. In the mean time, heretics spring up on all occasions, who pervert the Scriptures, who exaggerate certain aspects of the truth and deny others equally essential, and thus in effect turn the truth of God into a lie. The Church is forced, therefore, on the great principle of self-preservation, to form such accurate definitions of every particular doctrine misrepresented as shall include the whole truth and exclude all error, and to make such comprehensive exhibitions of the system of revealed truth as a whole that no one part shall be either unduly diminished or exaggerated, but the true proportion of the whole be preserved. At the same time, provision must be made for ecclesiastical discipline, and to secure the real co-operation of those who profess to work together in the same cause, so that public teachers in the same communion may not contradict one another, and the one pull down what the other is striving to build up. Formularies must also be prepared, representing as far as possible the common consent, and clothed with public authority, for the instruction of the members of the

Church, and especially of the children.

Creeds and Confessions, therefore, have been found necessary in all ages and branches of the Church, and, when not abused, have been useful for the following purposes: (1.) To mark, disseminate and preserve the attainments made in the knowledge of Christian truth by any branch of the Church in any crisis of its development. (2.) To discriminate the truth from the glosses of false teachers, and to present it in its integrity and due proportions. (3.) To act as the basis of ecclesiastical fellowship among those so nearly agreed as to be able to labor together in harmony. (4.) To be used as instruments in the great work of popular instruction.

It must be remembered, however, that the matter of these Creeds and Confessions binds the consciences of men only so far as it is purely scriptural, and because it is so; and as to the form in which that matter is stated, they bind those only who have voluntarily subscribed the Confession, and because of that subscription. In all churches a distinction is made between the terms upon which private members are admitted to membership, and the terms upon which office-bearers are admitted to their sacred trusts of teaching and ruling. A Church has no right to make anything a condition of membership which Christ has not made a condition of salvation. The Church is Christ's fold. The sacraments are the seals of his covenant. All have a right to claim admittance who make a credible profession of the true religion – that is, who are presumptively the people of Christ. This credible profession of course involves a competent knowledge of the fundamental doctrine of Christianity – a declaration of personal faith in Christ and consecration to his service, and a temper of mind and habit consistent therewith. On the other hand, no man can be inducted into any office in any Church who does not protest to believe in the truth and wisdom of the constitution and laws which it will be his duty to conserve and administer. Otherwise all harmony of sentiment and all efficient co-operation in action would be impossible. The original Synod of our American Presbyterian Church in the year 1729 solemnly adopted the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms as the doctrinal standards of the Church. The record is as follows:

"All the ministers of the Synod now present, which were eighteen in number, except one, that declared himself not prepared, [but who gave his assent at the next meeting], after proposing all the scruples any of them had to make against any articles and expressions in the Confession of Faith, and Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, have unanimously agreed in the solution of those scruples, and in declaring the said Confession and Catechisms to be the Confession of their Faith, except only some clauses in the twentieth and twenty-third chapters, 'Concerning the Civil Magistrate.'"

Again, in the year 1788, preparatory to the formation of the General Assembly, "the Synod, having fully considered the draught of the Form of Government and Discipline, did, on review of the whole, and hereby do, ratify and adopt the same, as now altered and amended, as the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in America, and order the same to be considered and strictly observed as the rule of their proceedings, 'by all the inferior judicatories belonging to the body.

"The Synod, having now revised and corrected the draught of a Directory for Worship, did approve and ratify the same, and do hereby appoint the same Directory, as now amended, to be the Directory for the worship of God in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. They also took into consideration the Westminster Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and, having made a

small amendment of the Larger, did approve and do hereby approve and ratify the said Catechisms, as now agreed on, as the Catechisms of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. And the Synod order that the Directory and Catechisms be printed and bound up in the same volume with the Confession of Faith and the Form of Government and Discipline; that the whole be considered as the standard of our doctrine, government, discipline and worship, agreeably to the resolutions of the Synod it their present session."

What follows is a very brief and general history of the principal Creeds and Confessions of the several branches of the Christian Church. In this statement they are grouped according to the order of time and the churches which adhere to them:

I. The ancient Creeds, which express the common faith of the whole Church. The Creeds formed before the Reformation are very few, relate to the fundamental principles of Christianity, especially the Trinity and the Person of the God-man, and are the common heritage of the whole Church.

1st. The Apostles' Creed. This was not written by the apostles, but was gradually formed, by common consent, out of the Confessions adopted severally by particular churches, and used in the reception of its members. It reached its present form, and universal use among all the churches, about the close of the second century. This Creed was appended to the Shorter Catechism, together with the Lord's Prayer and Ten Commandments, in the first edition published by order of Parliament, "not as though it were composed by the apostles, or ought to be esteemed canonical Scripture, . . . but because it is a brief sum of Christian faith, agreeable to the Word of God, and anciently received in the churches of Christ." It was retained by the framers of our Constitution as part of the Catechism. 1 It 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 (Hades); the third day he rose again from the dead, he ascended into heaven, and sitteth at 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."

2d. The Nicene Creed. This Creed is formed on the basis of the Apostles' Creed, the clauses relating to the consubstantial divinity of Christ being contributed by the great Council held in Nice in Bithynia, A.D. 325, and those relating to the divinity and personality of the Holy Ghost added by the Second Ecumenical Council, held at Constantinople, A.D.381; and the "filioque" clause added by the Council of the Western Church, held at Toledo, Spain, A.D. 569. In its present form it is the Creed of the whole Christian Church, the Greek Church rejecting only the last added clause. It is as follows:

"I believe in one God, Maker of heaven and earth, and 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 Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried; and the third day he rose

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 the Giver of life, who proeeedeth from the Father and the Son (filioque), who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped 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."

3d. As subsequently heretical opinions sprang up in its bosom with respect to the constitution of the person of Christ, the Church was forced to provide additional definitions and muniments of the truth. One heretical tendency culminated in Nestorianism, which maintains that the divine and human natures in Christ constitute two persons. This was condemned by the Creed of the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431. The opposite heretical tendency culminated in Eutychianism, which maintains that the divine and human natures are so united in Christ as to form but one nature. This was condemned by the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. These Creeds, defining the faith of the Church as embracing two natures in one person, are received and approved by the entire Church. They are sufficiently quoted in the body of the following "Commentary."

4th. The Athanasian Creed. This Creed was evidently composed long after the death of the great theologian whose name it bears, and after the controversies closed and the definitions established by the above-mentioned Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. It is a grand and unique monument of the unchangeable faith of the whole Church as to the great mysteries of godliness, the Trinity of Persons in the one God and the duality of natures in the one Christ. It is too long to quote here in full. What relates to the Person of the God-man is as follows:

"27. But it is necessary to eternal salvation that he should also faithfully believe in the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. 28. It is therefore true faith that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ is both God and man. 29. He is God; generated from eternity from the substance of the Father; man born in time from the substance of his Mother. 30. Perfect God, perfect man, subsisting of a rational soul and human flesh. 31. Equal to the Father in respect to his divinity, less than the Father in respect to his humanity. 32. Who, although he is God and man, is not two, but one Christ. 33. But two not from the conversion of divinity into flesh, but from the assumption of his humanity into God. 34. One not at all from confusion of substance, but from unity of Person. 35. For as rational soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ," etc.

II. The Creeds and Confessions of the different branches of the Church since the Reformation.

1st. The Doctrinal Standards of the Church of Rome. In order to oppose the progress of the Reformation, Pope Paul III. called the last great ecumenical Council at Trent (1545-1563). The deliverances of this Council, entitled Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, form the highest doctrinal rule known to that Church. The decrees contain the positive statements of doctrine The canons explain the decrees, distribute the matter under brief heads and condemn the opposing of Protestant doctrine on each point. The Roman Catechism, which explains and enforces the canons of the Council of Trent, was prepared and promulgated by the authority of Pope Pius IV., AD. 1556. The Tridentine Confession of Faith was also imposed upon all the priests and candidates of the Romish Church and converts from other churches. In addition to these, different papal bulls and some private writings have been authoritatively set up as standards of the true

faith by the authority of popes; e.g., the Catechism of Bellarmine, A.D. 1603, and the bull Unigenitus of Clement XI., 1711. The theology taught in all these papal standards is Arminianism.

2d. The Doctrinal Standards of the Greek Church. The ancient Church divided from causes primarily political and ecclesiastical, secondarily doctrinal and ritual, into two great sections – the Eastern or Greek Church, and the Western or Latin Church. This division began to culminate in the seventh, and was consummated in the eleventh century. The Greek Church embraces Greece, the majority of the Christians of the Turkish Empire and the great mass of the civilized inhabitants of Russia. All the Protestant churches have originated through the Reformation from the Western or Roman Church. This Church arrogates to herself pre-eminently the title of the "orthodox," because the original creeds defining the doctrine of the Trinity and the Person of Christ, which have been mentioned above, were produced in the Eastern half of the ancient Church, and hence are in a peculiar sense her inheritance. Greek theology is very imperfectly developed beyond the ground covered by these ancient creeds, which that Church magnifies and maintains with singular tenacity.

They possess also a few confessions of more modern date, as "The Orthodox Confession" of Peter Mogilas, A.D. 1642, metropolitan bishop of Kiew, the Confession of Gennadius, A.D. 1453.

3d. The Confessions of the Lutheran Church. The entire Protestant world from the time of the Reformation has been divided into two great families of churches – the LUTHERAN, including all those which received their characteristic impress from the great man whose name they bear; the REFORMED, including all those, on the other hand, which derived their character from Calvin. The Lutheran family of churches embraces all those Protestants of Germany and the Baltic provinces of Russia who adhere to the Augsburg Confession, together with the national churches of Denmark, of Norway and Sweden, and the large denomination of that name in America. Their Symbolical Books are: The Augsburg Confession, the joint authors of which were Luther and Melancthon. Having been signed by the Protestant princes and leaders, it was presented to the emperor and imperial Diet in Augsburg A.D. 1530. It is the oldest Protestant confession, the ultimate basis of Lutheran theology, and the only universally accepted standard of the Lutheran churches. The Apology (Defence) of the Augsburg Confession, prepared by Melancthon A.D. 1530, and subscribed by the Protestant theologians A.D. 1537 at Smalcald. The Larger and Smaller Catechisms, prepared by Luther A.D. 1529, "the first for the use of preachers and teachers, the last as a guide in the instruction of youth." The Articles of Smalcald, drawn up by Luther A.D. 1535, and subscribed by the evangelical theologians in February, A.D. 1537, at the place whose name they hear. The Formula Concordiae (Form of Concord), prepared in A.D. 1577 by Andrea and others for the purpose of settling certain controversies which had sprung up in the Lutheran Church, especially concerning the relative activities of divine grace and the human will in regeneration, and concerning the nature of the Lord's presence in the Eucharist. This confession contains a more scientific and thoroughly developed statement of the Lutheran doctrine than can be found in any other of their public symbols. Its authority is, however, acknowledged only by the high Lutheran party; that is, by that party in the Church which consistently carries the peculiarities of Lutheran theology out to the most complete logical development.

4th. The Confessions of the Reformed or Calvinistic churches. The Reformed churches embrace all those churches of Germany which subscribe the Heidelberg Catechism; the Protestant

churches of Switzerland, France, Holland, England and Scotland: the Independents and Baptists of England and America, and the various branches of the Presbyterian Church in England and America. The Reformed Confessions are very numerous, although they all substantially agree as to the system of doctrine they teach. Those most generally received, and regarded as of the highest symbolical authority as standards of the common system, are the following: The Second Helvetic Confession, prepared by Bullinger, A.D. 1564. “It was adopted by all the Reformed churches in Switzerland, with the exception of Basle (which was content with its old symbol, the First Helvetic), and by the Reformed churches in Poland, Hungary, Scotland and France,”[2] and has always been regarded as of the highest authority by all the Reformed churches. The Heidelberg Catechism, prepared by Ursinus and Olevianus, A.D. 1562. It was established by civil authority, the doctrinal standard, as well as instrument of religious instruction for the churches of the Palatinate, a German State at that time including both banks of the Rhine. It was endorsed by the Synod of Dort, and is the Confession of Faith of the Reformed churches of Germany and Holland, and of the German and Dutch Reformed churches in America. The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. These were originally drawn up by Cranmer and Ridley, A.D. 1551, and revised and reduced to the present number by the bishops, at the order of Queen Elizabeth, A.D. 1562. These Articles are Calvinistic in doctrine, and constitute the doctrinal standard of the Episcopal churches in England, Scotland, America and the Colonies. The Canons of the Synod of Dort. This famous Synod was convened in Dort, Holland, by the authority of the States General, for the purpose of settling the questions brought into controversy by the disciples of Arminius. It held its sessions from November 13, A.D. 1618, to May 9, A.D. 1619. It consisted of pastors, elders and theological professors from the churches of Holland, and deputies from the churches of England, Scotland, Hesse, Bremen, the Palatinate and Switzerland; the French delegates having been prevented from being present by order of their king. The Canons of this Synod were received by all the Reformed churches as a true, accurate and eminently authoritative exhibition of the Calvinistic System of Theology. They constitute, in connection with the Heidelberg Catechism, the doctrinal Confession of the Reformed Church of Holland, and of the [Dutch] Reformed Church of America. The Confession and Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly. A short account of the origin and constitution of this Assembly, and of the production and reception of its doctrinal deliverances, is presented in the next chapter. This is the common doctrinal standard of all the Presbyterian churches in the world of English and Scotch derivation. It is also of all Creeds the one most highly approved by all the bodies of Congregationalists in England and America. The Congregational Convention called by Cromwell to meet at Savoy, in London, A.D. 1658, declared their approval of the doctrinal part of the Confession and Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly, and conformed their own deliverance, the Savoy Confession, very nearly to it. Indeed, “the difference between these two Confessions is so very small, that the modern Independents have in a manner laid aside the use of it (Savoy Conf.) in their families, and agreed with the Presbyterians in the use of the Assembly’s Catechisms.”[3] All the Assemblies convened in New England for the purpose of settling the doctrinal basis of their churches have either endorsed or explicitly adopted this Confession and these Catechisms as accurate expositions of their own faith. This was done by the Synod which met at Cambridge, Massachusetts, June, 1647, and again August, 1648, and prepared the Cambridge Platform. And again by the Synod which sat in Boston, September, 1679, and May, 1680, and produced the Boston Confession. And again by the Synod which met at Saybrook, Connecticut, 1708, and produced the Saybrook Platform.[4]

Endnotes 1. Assembly's Digest, p. 11.

2. Shedd's History of Christian Doctrine.

3. Neal: Puritans, II. 178 4. Shedd's History of Christian Doctrine.

S. Assurance and Humility

Assurance and Humility by A. A. Hodge

I think the first essential mark of the difference between true and false assurance is to be found in the fact that the true works humility. There is nothing in the world that works such satanic, profound, God-defiant pride as false assurance; nothing works such utter humility, or brings to such utter self-emptiness, as the child-like spirit of true assurance. Surely this can be known. If a person is self-confident, there is self-assurance; if there is any evidence of pride in connection with his claim, it is a most deadly mark- it is the plague-spot which marks death and corruption. But if there is utter humility, you have the sign of the true spirit. This will manifest itself in connection with another mark. If one is really united to Christ in a union so established that Christ is indeed in possession of the soul, the whole consciousness will be taken up with what I would call Christ-consciousness, and there will be no self-consciousness. Little children are very prompt to show their character. There is a great difference in them. Bring a child into a room. She comes thinking about nothing in particular, looking at her mother, then looking at the guests or anything that objectively strikes her, not thinking of herself. That is pure, sweet, and lovely. She grows older, and she comes to think of herself and what people think of her, and her manner has lost its unconsciousness. A great deal of what you call bashfulness is rottenness at the heart; it is self-consciousness. Nothing in the world so tends to defile the imagination, to pervert the affections, and to corrupt the morals, as self-consciousness. You know it is connected with every diseased and morbid action of the body. A young woman told me that she wanted the witness of the Spirit, and she talked about it everlastingly; she wanted to tell her own experience and feelings always. I told her she must forget herself, not think of her own feelings. The man who is talking about his love unceasingly has no love; the man who is talking about his faith unceasingly has no faith: the two things cannot go together. When you love, what are you thinking about? Are you not thinking about the object of your love? And when you believe, what are you thinking about? Why, the object that you believe. Suppose you ask yourself, 'Am I believing?' Why, of course you are not believing when you are thinking of believing. No human being believes except when he thinks about Christ. Am I loving? Of course I am not loving when I am thinking about loving. No human being loves except when he is thinking about Christ as the object of his love. In Virginia I once saw one human being in whom there was the perfect work of grace, as far as I could see as her pastor, and I was intimate with her six years. Even on earth she was one of those who had made their garments white in the blood of the Lamb, and she seemed always to walk upon the verge of heaven. I never heard her speak of any one particular of her character or of her own graces. I have come out of the pulpit when the congregation had gone, and have found her upon her knees in her pew, absolutely unconscious of all external objects, so far was she absorbed in worship. When I roused her from her trance, she cried instantly, 'Is He not holy? Is He not glorious? Is He not beautiful? is He not infinite?' She did not speak of her own love or of her feelings. A great deal of Perfectionism is rotten to the core. All self-consciousness is of the very essence and nature of sin. Then, again, true confidence leads necessarily to strong desires for more knowledge and more

holiness, for unceasing advances of grace.

I was told once, in a congregation where I preached, that I need not tell a certain young man anything about religion; he had finished it - that is, that, having finished it, he found nothing else to do. That is what the word 'perfect' means. Now, when a man has finished eternal life, when he has finished learning all the revelation of God, when he has experienced all the infinite benefits of Christ's redemption, when he has finished all the mysterious work of the Holy Ghost in his heart, he ought to be annihilated. There is no place in heaven or on earth for such a man. But a man who really has the love of God in his heart is always reaching forward to the things which are before. The more he loves, the more he wants to love; the more he is consecrated, the more consecration he longs for. He has grand ideas and grand aims, but they lie beyond him in heaven.

S. Free Will

Free Will

A.A. Hodge

Free-will is a question of great interest. I do not assert, nor is it necessary that I should, what are the essential elements of free agency. Men may differ about that. But we know we have a conscience, and that a person is not a mere machine — for that a machine cannot have an obligation, cannot be subject to command, is certainly proved; but that a person is subject to command, is subject to obligations of conscience, is a matter of universal consciousness. This is very true, more so than any fact of science. The most certain things in the world are not the things you can prove. You say, “I have proved this, and therefore I believe it to be true.” The fact that you have got to prove things shows that there is doubt, for it is only doubtful things you have to prove. The things which you cannot prove are the eternal verities.

How do you prove things? You prove things by deducing the unknown from the known, the uncertain from the certain, by referring particulars to general laws — that is, you prove through a medium. But how do you prove the medium? Now, logic is a great thing. How does logic work? Of course, step by step. You know that in logic you cannot separate the links; if you get hold of one end of the chain, you keep following it up. But what is the force of the chain? You have got a chain of logic hanging down, and you climb up that chain link by link; but what supports the chain at the other end? Logic is like a ladder — by means of it you go up step by step. But how are you going to prove that the bottom of it is all right? The ladder rests on the ground; but what supports the ground? You prove this by that; but what proves that? You must have a starting-point, an ultimate fact, and these ultimate principles are the most sure, because if the ground is not steady the ladder is not steady; the ground must be more steady than the ladder. The things which you start from, which are the means of bringing us results, are more sure than other things which are proved by them. You and I know that we are free. You and I know that we are responsible. You and I have that assurance of knowledge which is before all science. This matter of free-will underlies everything. If you bring it to question, it is infinitely more than Calvinism. I believe in Calvinism, and I say free-will stands before Calvinism. Everything is gone if free-will is gone; the moral system is gone if free-will is gone; you cannot escape, except by materialism on the one hand or pantheism on the other. Hold hard, therefore, to the doctrine of free-will. What is it? I say to my class, but I do not know whether it will do to say it here, “I have my will, but my will is not free; it is myself that is free.” Now it makes a difference whether you have freedom of will or the freedom of man in willing. I am conscious that my will is free. But am I free when I will? That is what I mean to indicate. Consciousness tells me that I am free, therefore I am responsible. Then I have this freedom. It is not an abstract quality, it is not an abstract faculty; it has a whole meaning, it is the I that is free; the reason is free, as free as the consciousness. It is the I that is free, and has got a will; it is the I that is free, and has got a character.

Now, so understanding this freedom of the I, not of the will, but of the whole soul, what is freedom? I say it is just this, as far as I know anything about it, that it is just the self-originating, self-directing I, and that is the whole that it is. Let me illustrate. Suppose I should put upon your table, or you should see resting there, with nothing to interfere with it, a ball of something. It is a ball of yarn. Now suppose you begin to see the yarn moving; you would be sure to say, “Some one is moving it.” It is yarn; nothing is more certain than that the thing cannot move itself; if it moves, it moves by reason of some life connected with it, and you settle that question right off. You look again, and you say, “It is not a ball of yarn; it is a mouse.” The thing started itself; it could not move unless it had life from within that is self-originating motion. Now, has the mouse free-will? No, because the mouse has not reason and conscience; therefore I would amend my definition. The mouse has self-originated action, the mouse has self-electing action; but it has not reason and conscience. I say it is self-originated, self-elected action, with the illumination of reason and conscience, that makes free-will.

You are sitting in a summer-house; you see something darting about. What is it? It is nothing but a speck of dust. That is not self-directed action; it is governed by the wind. Suppose that you look and see that it is motion directed from within, that this darting and stopping is self-moved. Why, that is not governed by the wind; it is governed by instinct, which is not reason or conscience. Suppose that you or I at sea should observe a great ship at a distance just carried about. We look at it; we take our glasses, and you say, “It has no life about it,” It is moved by the current; and you say that it is an abandoned thing that is carried about and swept along by controlling circumstances and outside causes. But instead of this object floating about, suppose we see a steamship. The steam is on, the wheels are revolving, the action that you see is controlled from within; and you have there self-originated action — the action comes from within the ship. A gale is blowing, and the waves are dashing against the vessel; but you see the royal mail steamship fully manned and equipped; the forces are all at work, and there is a man at the helm; and there you have free-will in its highest form — self-originated force, self-directed force, under the lead of reason and conscience: that I believe to be free-will.

Now, the second question is the influence of character on the will. A great many seem to think free-will a simple matter. I believe it is the greatest mystery of the world. Man has a fixed character which determines all in a certain track, and yet that man is free; whereas, you say a man to be free ought to be perfectly uninfluenced. Suppose I bring up before you to-day in illustration a child. It has no past, no history. It can do what it pleases, of course; and if I say to it, “Will you do this?” it replies, “I will.” The child does just what any one wishes it to do. Now, take a man of education and of character, a man of principle, a man of convictions, a man of purpose, a man of fixed habits, and you cannot make him do this or that. What he does is already determined by the character of the man, habits which have been crystallized into character. The child is unformed — he can do anything; but the character of the man is fixed, and he cannot do what is against his conscience, and he cannot do what is improper in his mind or view. It is uncertain what the child will do, hut it is very certain what the man will do. Now, I ask you, Which is the more free? Is it the child or the man? Is the child free, or is the father free who can stand up in the most trying times, determined from within by the forces of his character and by the good habits of his life? You take a man — take a father and compare him with God: concede the father to be a man of high character, such as General Grant, and sanctified by the Spirit of God, firm as a rock. Yet, after all, the strongest

human being may be tempted, may be overcome by seduction. But when you look up at Jehovah, whose character is not uncertain, whose character is eternal, who cannot do that which is foolish and who cannot do that which is wrong, which is the more free? Is Jehovah freer than man? Is the man freer than the child? Therefore, I hold that a man is free just in proportion to his convictions, just in proportion to his capability of determining his action from experience, just from his fixedness and crystallization of character. A man is free in proportion to the direction and development of his character. A holy character is the highest form of freedom.

I believe a sinful character leaves man responsible; for the sinner is just as free as the saint, the devil is just as free as Gabriel. Now, what is freedom? It is self-originated, self-directed action under the law of reason and conscience. But the devil has all that, just as much as Gabriel; the sinful man has all that, just as much as the saint. The difference is here. I have the power of willing as I prefer, but I have no power of creating a holy character for myself. If I have a holy character, my character coincides with my views, my judgment, my reason, my conscience, and my spontaneous affections; they all go in one direction. But if I am a sinner I have no right-directing heart. Reason says go one way, conscience says go the same way, the affections and the dispositions say go another way; and therefore the sinner, according to the language of the Bible, although really free and morally responsible, is in bondage to corruption; the impulses of his heart are in the wrong direction.

Apply that to the fourfold state of man. There are only four states, and there have been only two human beings who occupied all the four states — namely, Adam and Eve. There is the state of innocency, the state of sin, the state of grace, and the state of glory.

Now, we know what it is to be sinners; but can we cease to be sinners, and can we obey the law of holiness? We know what it is to be Christians through divine grace. How was it with Adam? Adam was created, according to the Bible, with a perfectly holy nature, without sin; and yet he was able to sin, and he was able to do right. You have not had that experience. No one but Adam ever had that experience or ever can have it.

If you will read the ninth chapter of our Confession of Faith, on the “Freedom of the Will,” you will find it one of the most wonderful treatises you have ever seen.

You are familiar with the fact that theologians always escape from difficulties by using the word “mystery,” and that the mystery of mysteries is the origin of sin. The great mystery is a theological one. How is it possible that a God of infinite holiness, of infinite compassion, of infinite knowledge, of infinite power, ever allows sin to exist? Why, sin is the very thing he hates. This is an absolutely insoluble mystery. How did sin begin? Why did God permit it? If we are all free, if we are created by God, and there is nothing which exists which God did not create except himself, how did sin come? That is an insoluble mystery. St. Augustine attempted to account for it, and I believe his suggestion is the very nearest to it possible. It is that sin in its origin is not a positive entity, but it is a defect.

Take this for an illustration: Suppose you have a fiddle that has been out of tune: you hang it up on the wall, and a year after you come back and take it down, and the fiddle is all in tune. You know that the fiddle must have been put in tune; it could not have got into tune spontaneously. But suppose your fiddle is perfectly in tune when you hang it up, and you go away, and when you

return you find that it is out of tune. It does not follow that somebody did it. You do not say that somebody did it, but that it got out of tune. Now, in the case of Adam I have no doubt sin began in that way — not as sin, but it began to be through inattention, it began to be through defect in love, through defect in faith; it was an omission, and it was thus through a rift in the lute, through a crack here and another there, with a want of harmony. And with this want of harmony came the awful discord that has sent the world into a bedlam, and made a division between God and man. Adam sinned, and then we got into the condition with which we are familiar, with a will to sin, and with a power only to sin. And then, through the cross, we are lifted into a condition of grace, in which we have power to obey; and the power grows stronger and stronger, and the disposition and desire to sin grow weaker and weaker. That is before us. Thank God we shall come at last to the stature of perfect manhood in Christ Jesus, when the character, amplified and regenerated, shall come to its full divine crystalline beauty; and then we shall partake of the divine nature, and have a perfect freedom of will, as free as Adam, yet certain as God.

S. GOD -- His Nature And Relation To The Universe

GOD -- His Nature And Relation To The Universe by A. A. Hodge

THREE questions obviously lie at the foundation, not only of all man's religious knowledge, but of every possible form of knowledge: -- 1. Is there a God?

2. What is God?

3. What is God's relation to the universe? And if he does sustain a relation to the universe which is in any degree intelligible to us, a fourth question emerges: -- 4. What is the sphere, nature, and extent of his providential action upon or in reference to his creatures The answer to the first question, as to the fact of God's existence, we propose to assume as granted. The most certain of all truths is the existence of God.

I. The second question, therefore, presents itself: WHAT DO WE KNOW AS TO THE ESSENTIAL NATURE OF GOD?

God reveals himself to us through the simultaneously concurrent action of two sources of knowledge, neither of which could give us the information separately. We are, each one, immediately conscious that we are intelligent, moral, voluntary agents and true causes. This, and all that this involves, comes to us by consciousness. It is the most immediate and certain of all knowledge, and that upon which all other knowledge rests; and we give definite expression to this self-knowledge when we call ourselves spirits and persons. It is precisely this, and nothing else, that we mean by the words "spirit" and "person." When we come to look upon the course of external nature, to reflect upon our own origin and history internal and external, and upon the history of the human race and the life of the general community of which we form a part, we immediately and indubitably discern everywhere the presence and control of a Being like ourselves in kind. In that intelligible order which pervades the infinite multiplicity and heterogeneity of events, and which makes science possible, we see and certainly know the presence of intelligence, of personal will, of moral character -- that is, of all that is connoted by our common term "personal spirit." God is seen to be of common generic character with ourselves. The great difference we see is that, while we are essentially limited in respect to time or space or knowledge or power, God, the personal agent we see at work in nature and history, is essentially unlimited in all these respects. The only reason that so many students of natural science have found themselves unable to see God in nature, is that their absorption in nature has made them lose sight of their own essential personality. Hence they have attempted to interpret the phenomena of self-consciousness in the terms of mechanical nature, instead of interpreting nature under the light of self-conscious spirit. But the scientist, after all, comes before his science, the reader before the book he deciphers. And the intelligibility of nature proves its intelligent source, and the essential likeness of the Author of nature, who reveals himself in his work, and of the interpreter of nature, who retraces his processes and appreciates alike the intellectual and the artistic character of his design.

Since God is infinite, of course a definition of him is impossible. Obviously, no bounds can be drawn around the boundless. God can be known only so far forth as he has chosen to reveal himself. And being essentially infinite, every side and element of his nature is infinite, and every glimpse we have of his being involves the outlying immensity or the transcendent perfection which cannot be known, But since we have been created in his likeness, and since we discern him in all his works as, like ourselves, an intelligent and moral personal spirit, we can define our idea of him by stating (1) the genus, or kind, to which he is known to belong, and (2) the differentia, or differences, which distinguish him from all other beings of that kind. The best, definition of the idea of God ever given is constructed on this principle. First, as to his kind: God is a personal Spirit, Second, as to his difference from all other spirits: God is infinite, eternal, unchangeable, and in all his moral attributes absolutely perfect; and he is infinite, eternal, and unchangeable alike in his being, in his wisdom, in his power, etc., etc.

First, as to his kind. God is a personal Spirit. We mean by this precisely what we mean when we affirm that we ourselves are personal spirits. This conception comes wholly from consciousness, and it is absolutely certain. We see, and know God, as manifested in his activities alike in the whole world within us and around us as far as the remotest star, to be another of the same kind with ourselves. We know ourselves to be intelligent causes. We see him likewise to be an intelligent Cause, and the original, the absolute, and the perfect One. In applying this law in constructing our idea of God, we proceed according to three principles of judgment: -- (1.) That of causality. We judge the nature of every cause from what we see of its effects; we judge the character of every author from what we read of his works, So the manifold works of God; past and present, physical and spiritual, reveal his nature as First Cause. (2.) That of negation. We deny of him all those attributes and conditions the possession of which involves imperfection -- for example, materiality, bodily parts or passions, the limitations of time or space. (3.) That of eminence. We attribute to him all that is found to be excellent in ourselves, in absolute perfection and in unlimited degree.

Second. This leads, necessarily, to the discrimination, in the second place, of those properties which distinguish God from all other personal spirits.

(1.) We know ourselves as causes: we can really originate new things. But we are dependent and limited causes. We did not originate, and we cannot sustain, ourselves. We can put forth our causal energy only under certain conditions, and we can bring to pass only a very limited class of effects. But God as a cause is absolutely independent and unlimited. He is the uncaused First Cause of all things. He is an eternal and necessary Being who has his own cause in himself. He is not only the first link in the chain of causation, but he is the everywhere present sustaining and actuating basis of all dependent existence and the originating con-cause in all causation, because we and all other dependent causes act only as we live and move and have all our being in him.

(2.) We know ourselves always and necessarily as existing, thinking, and acting under the limitations of time and space; we can think or act only under these limitations. But God necessarily transcends all these limitations, and condescends to them only on occasion, at his own pleasure, in the way of self-limitation.

We began to be at a definite period in the past. We continue to exist and to think and to act through a ceaseless succession of moments, the present, moment ever emerging out of the past

and emerging into the future. But God is without beginning or succession or end. All duration, past, present, and future, is always equally comprehended in his infinite consciousness as the ETERNAL Now.

We are in space definitely, and are surrounded by it, and pass from one position to another through all the intermediate portions of space in succession. But God fills all space: not by extension, like the water of the sea or as the atmosphere; not by multiplication, nor by rapid movement, like an ubiquitous general along the line of his army; not as represented by his agents, as the head of an army or state may be said to be, and to act wherever his agents carry out his orders; not by his knowledge or his power merely, as when an astronomer may be said to be in thought wherever his telescope points, or a great sovereign to reign wherever his laws are obeyed. But by reason of his own infinite perfection, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are in their whole undivided being present at every point of space at every moment of time. The whole God is always everywhere: within all things, acting from within outward from the center of every atom, and from the innermost springs of the life and thought and feeling and will of every spirit; without all things, embracing them as an infinite abyss, and acting upon them in a thousand ways from without.

(3.) We know ourselves as possessing the spoiled and defaced lineaments of a moral character, the main elements of which are truth, purity, justice, benevolence. We know that God, who has revealed his character in the external physical world, in human history, and in the person of his Son Jesus Christ, is the absolutely perfect norm of our moral idea. Our morality is reflected, his is original and radiant,. Ours is defective, his is absolute. It has become the mode of those who pose as the advanced thinkers of this luxurious age to emphasize the benevolence of God at the expense of his immaculate holiness and justice. They teach us that the cultured mind finds the old doctrines of expiation and perdition utterly inconsistent with its better idea of God. They think the great God "altogether such an one as themselves." The ground of this widely-advertised opinion is purely subjective -- the Christian consciousness of the cultured elite in contradistinction to the historic Christian consciousness of the ages. The fact are all on the other side. The terrible record of him in history, blazed all along its line with the fires of judgment kindled by a sin-hating God, the death-throes of individuals and of nations, the answering cry of the human conscience uttered in the ceaseless rites of blood on altars and penitential stools -- the entire voice of revelation, from the cherubim with the fiery sword driving out the homeless, helpless first pair from Eden, the frowning thunders and blasting lightning’s of Sinai, the history of Canaan exterminated and of Israel chastised, the awful horrors at Gethsemane and Calvary, the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion and bondage of the Jews, to the final issue of the lake of fire set as the background of the picture of the Paradise regained, the eternal wailing and the smoke of torment ascending for ever and ever,-- all these FACTS stand as the unquestionable evidence of the existence of other perfections in God besides benevolence.

II. The third question remains: WHAT RELATION DOES GOD SUSTAIN TO THE UNIVERSE HE HAS CALLED INTO BEING?

It is very evident that since we are able to comprehend neither God’s essential being, nor his mode of existence superior to the limits of either time or space, nor the nature of his agency in creating, upholding in being or in governing his creatures, we cannot by any central principle or a priori mode of reasoning think out a perfect theory of his relation to the universe. We can only state

severally the separate facts as we know them, leaving their complete elucidation and reconciliation to the future. And we are both assisted and confirmed in oui efforts to present all the facts comprehended, by the circumstance that different heretical schools of thought emphasize one or another of these facts, while they deny or suppress the rest. Here we have a new and striking illustration of the universal principle that all heretical dogmas are partial truths -true in what they assert, false in what they deny or ignore. Orthodoxy is always catholic truth, embracing and integrating all the possibly separate and apparently incongruous parts and aspects of the truth. Thus in the present instance we have the Agnostics, who maintain that the Infinite is the Unknowable; the Deists, who set God apart from the world, separate upon his throne in heaven; and those who maintain exclusively the fact that God is immanent, or uniformity and universally present in all things, while they deny or ignore his equal transcendence above and over all things. True Christian Theism maintains all these partial truths as equally parts of the one truth. God is at once the unfathomable Abyss, the transcendent Father, king, and Judge, the immanent and vital Spirit.

First. God is unknowable, the infinite Abyss of darkness in which the universe floats as an atom. Herbert Spencer's philosophy emphasizes the truth that the more science advances, the more must the questions as to origin, first cause, ultimate force and end, be pushed back into darkness. If you light a spark in a starless night, it will fill a small sphere of illuminated space extending equidistant in all directions. If the spark becomes a candle, if the candle becomes a flame of gas, if the gas-flame becomes an electric arc, if the electric arc becomes a sun,-- in every case the sphere of light will grow as the cube of its radius; and as the sphere of light becomes larger and larger, in exact proportion will it, be enfolded within an ever-growing sphere of darkness. In this sense, the more we meditate upon him, God is ever beyond. In this sense, while the sphere of human knowledge is ever increasing, and will through eternity never cease to increase, God is always unknowable. And the sphere of a creature's knowledge, be it that of an infant, or of a-man, or of a philosopher, or of a prophet, or of saint or archangel in heaven, will float as a point of light athwart the bosom of that God who is the infinite Abyss for ever. This tremendous fact conditions all human knowledge in every stage of it. We can know anything only imperfectly, whether in science or in theology, because we know things only in parts, and can never comprehend the absolute whole. The botanist cannot comprehend a single flower except as he takes in the whole plant, nor the whole plant except as he takes in the whole species, nor the whole species except as he takes in the whole genus, nor the whole genus except as he takes in the whole system of organized life, the entire fauna and flora and all their history on the earth. The teacher may easily explain the laws and movements of the solar system to his class, but he knows them himself very partially, since he knows so little of the realities or of the history of the stellar universe of which the solar system is so small a dependency. All things go out into mystery. All our knowledge is conditioned upon the essential unknowableness of God. In all our knowing and in all our worship, the infinite God is always beyond. This side of the truth is taught as clearly in the oldest word of revelation as it is in the latest word of science. "Canst thou by searching find out God? canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than hell; what canst thou know? The measure thereof is larger than the earth, and broader than the sea," (Job 11:7-9).

Second. God is transcendent; that is, he is a distinct Person, separate from the world and from all other persons --who speaks to us face to face, who commands our wills and regulates our lives from on high; who upon occasion, when he wills, acts upon the universe or any part of it from without. He is objective to each one of us, as a distinct Person, alike when he speaks to us and when we speak to him. He created all things out of nothing. The universe is not a modification of his essence, nor is it confused with his substance; he is essentially something other than any one of his creatures -- the extramundane God. The relation he sustains to the universe, therefore, is analogous to that of a maker to his work, of a preserver and governor to a mechanism, of a father to his children, of a moral ruler to his intelligent and responsible subjects. This view of the nature of God and of his relation to the world, and especially his relation to created spirits, is common to Deists and Christian Theists. It is denied utterly by Pantheists, and it is ignored in whole or in part by the modern special advocates of the immanence of God as containing all the essential truth related to our interests in the matter. Yet this view just presented of God's separate personality and agency and objectivity to man and transcendence above the world is true and infinitely important, although we concede that it is not the whole truth known to us on the subject. The view of God as extramundane is essentially the moral view of his relation to the world: that which recognizes his immanence is preeminently the religious view. If he be not extramundane, if he be not a separate transcendent Person revealing himself objectively, commanding from above and working upon his creatures from without, it follows that he cannot sustain either social or governmental relations to us. He cannot be truly our Father, our Lawgiver, or our moral Governor, or our Judge distributing rewards and punishments; he cannot come down at his will from without and work miracles of grace or power as signs and seals to his intelligent creatures. This is the prominent, view embraced by the mass of the worshipers in all theistic religions, Jews, Christians, and Mohammed's alike, among all historic bodies of Christians, Greeks, Romanist, and all classes of Protestants. It is realized in the consciousness of every repentant sinner and of every believing Christian. It is implied in all faith and obedience, in all prayer and praise, and hence in all the psalms, hymns, and prayers of the Church. It is taught equally in all Scriptures, the New Testament as well as The Old, which show forth Jehovah as sitting upon his throne in heaven, and as sending his messengers and as transmitting his energies and his judgments from heaven to earth, and as marshaling the hosts of heaven and the nations of the earth from afar. Above all, is this truth made patent as the sky, a matter of daily personal experience, in the personal incarnation of God in Christ. Christ is God. Christ is the same to-clay and for ever as he was when he lived on earth. God is therefore a Person who is outside of and distinct from the world and all other persons; who speaks to us, and we speak to him; who hears us, and we hear him; who commands, leads, and guides us from without as another; and in whose personal society and under whose blessed reign we shall be transcendently happy for ever.

Third. God is immanent. He is everywhere present in every point of space and within the in most constitution of all created things at the same time. God's activity springs up from the central seat of energy in all second causes, and acts from within through them as well as from without upon them. He reveals himself in us and to us through our own subjectivity, as well as objectively through the things presented to our senses. He is the universal present and active basis of all being and action, the First Cause ever living and acting in all second causes. This is evident -- (1.) From the essential nature of God as omnipresent and as First Cause, the foundation of all dependent existence and the ultimate source of all energy.

(2.) This is evident from what we see very plainly in the entire sphere and history of the physical universe. The impression made by the most transient observation is abundantly confirmed by science, that the continuity of physical causation through all worlds, through every sphere of mechanical, chemical, and vital action, and through all the succeeding ages, is absolutely unbroken. There are no broken links, no sudden emergencies of disconnected events, but a continuous sequence of cause and effect everywhere. The deistical conception of God's relation to the universe is analogous to that of a human mechanist to the machinery he has made and operates. He sits outside his engine, feeds its forces, adjusts its parts, controls its action, and thus directs its energies upon the accomplishment of its appointed ends. The conception of God and of his action as immanent in the universe, acting from within through the spontaneities of the things he has made, rather than upon them from without, is analogous rather to the action of the vital principle of a plant, which as a plastic architectonic energy is ever present within the germ from its first formation, and continues to control all the natural physical forces engaged in the up building of the organism through all its organs during its entire life. The works of man are built up by the adding of part to part by external forces. The works of God grow continuously through the evolution of germs from within, by internal forces. Thus, in spite of the infinite number and diversify of the forces interacting in all the physical universe, and of all the wills interacting in human society, the history alike of the physical universe and of human society presents the absolutely continuous unfolding of a single plan. The same great truth is illustrated in our religious experience. A divine power not ourselves, working for righteousness, enters us on the side of our own subjectivity, and is confluent always with our most spontaneous and least deliberative exercises. Thus, regeneration is an effect of God's immediate working within the soul below our consciousness, giving a new character to all our conscious states and acts. God works within us constantly to will, and by willing to do, of his good pleasure. And thus also, while each book of Holy Scripture was written by a human author in the language and style peculiar to his age, his nation, and his personal character, and in the perfectly free exercise of all his faculties, yet all the books are the WORD OF GOD. His suggestive, elevative, and directive influence has so worked in them from within, mingling freely with their own spontaneities, that the writing is at once both God's and theirs, both supernatural and natural, because they, being men, wrote as they were moved by the immanent Spirit of God. Angels and men influence one another from without, by objective presentations; God influences all from within by subjective impulses. Hence we realize the complementary truth that we live and move in him and have all our being in him. In some distant sense, as the birds draw their life and have their being in the air, God is the one essential, fundamental environment and life-condition of all creatures. The consequences of this great fact of the divine immanence are: --

(1.) The whole universe exists in God. As the stars in the ether, as the clouds in the air, the whole universe floats on the pulsing bosom of God.

(2.) All the intelligence manifested in the physical universe, all that larger and timeless intelligence which embraces and directs the limited and transient intelligence of the human actors in the drama of history, is of God. In the physical world we see an infinitude of blind, unconscious forces, apparently independent in their nature and source, working together harmoniously to build upon a continuous and universal plan the most intricate and harmonious results; as the great cathedral dedicated to St. Peter in Rome rose out of the marble quarries of Italy through the agency of

multitudes of thoughtless men and beasts of labour working without concert for many years, yet conspiring to balance harmoniously in the air a miracle of mechanical construction and of artistic beauty. It was because all the agents in that work, of all kinds and during the entire period of its development, were subject to the suggestive, elevative, and directive inspiration of the great Michael Angelo.

(3.) Hence, also, in the third place, it follows that all the effect-producing energy seen in the physical universe is ultimately the efficiency of God. The First Cause must be the efficient cause of all second causes and the source of all the dependent energy they ever exercise. As the sun's rays, shining on the tropic seas, raise by evaporation the vast oceans of aerial vapors which, condensed by our northern cold, precipitate in rain and generate the immense forces of our rivers and waterfalls; as ultimately all the energies of nature distributed from our central suns hold the worlds together in the form of gravity; and are differentiated into the thousand forms of vegetable and animal life, and into the mechanical movement of the currents of winds and tides and of electric currents and of radiant light,-- so all these issue ceaselessly from their ultimate seat in God. What the sun is to the solar system, what the furnace is to the steamship, what the great center of nerve-force is to our bodies, that God is to his universe, and infinitely more.

(4.) Hence, lastly, it follows that everywhere the universe reveals God. The power of the indwelling spirit to express its changing modes through the changes of the body is a great mystery, and nevertheless is one of the most obvious and constant of all facts. Pallid fear, ragging passion, calm contemplation, assured confidence, radiant joy, determined purpose, have each their universally recognized signs of expression current among all nations of men and animal tribes. So the constructive dream of the architect, the ideal of the sculptor and painter, the high theme of the musician, are all expressed in the several forms of their respective arts. The great artists are immortal, since they ever live, speaking and singing in their works. As our souls animate and manifest their presence and their changing modes in every part of our bodies, and as God is immanent and active in all his works, so all nature and the course of universal history reflect his thoughts. All men always recognize events of extraordinary character as expressions of the will of God. Whatever is recognized by us as providential expresses to us the divine thought. Even Shakespeare says that Providence "shapes our ends, rough-hew them as we may." The Christian recognizes every event as providential. Every hair of our head is numbered, and not one sparrow falls to the ground except as our Father wills it. He, works in us all to will and to do of his good pleasure in all things. Hence every flower is a thought of God. The firmament reflects his immensity, and the order of the stars his limitless intelligence, and the myriad-fold beauty of the world unveils the secret chambers of his imagery. The tempest is the letting loose of his strength, and the thunder utters his voice. To the Christian the universe is not merely a temple in which Goal is worshiped, but it is also the ever-venerated countenance on which the affections of our Lord toward his children are visibly expressed. Everywhere we see God, and everywhere his ever-active and fecund benevolence toward us is articulated in smile and word and deed. This view of God, which we signalize by the word " immanence," is not a new one, nor is it confined to philosophers or to theologians. The plainest and most practical Christians of all Churches live in the exercise of this faith every day. To the babes in Christ every event is providential, and marks the constant thought and care of God. Especially have evangelical Christians of the school of Augustine and Calvin always recognized the constant dependence of the creature and the,

constant in working of the divine energy as the controlling source of all our spontaneous affections and actions. It is a first principle in their theology that the creature can act only as it, is first acted upon by the First Cause. The doctrine of prevenient grace, which is the grand evangelical distinction, implies this. God must first move the sinner to good before the sinner can begin to cooperate with that grace which ever continues to prompt and assist; him. Thus they argue for a previous, simultaneous, and determining concursus -- that is, continuous co-working -- of the ceaseless activities of God with the activities of his creatures. They hold that even the sinful actions of men originate in God as to their matter, while as to their form or moral quality they originate in the creature alone; as when a great artist handles an instrument out of tune, the sound that issues is due to the artist; but the discord which deforms it issues only from the unbalanced organism of the instrument, the unstrung cords or the unadjusted pipes. The claim made by the advocates of the "New Departure" in theology, that this view of God as immanent and constantly active in all his works is new in the thoughts of Christians, is absolutely without shadow of evidence. It has never been denied or seriously ignored; nor is it in the least inconsistent with the complementary view of his personal transcendence and objective presentation and working from without. The Church has always held both sides together of this double truth, as both equally essential and precious.

Neither is this view of the divine immanence to be confounded with Pantheism. They both alike emphasize the common truth that God is within us; that he is to be sought in the sphere of the subjective as well as of the objective; that he is the immediate basis of all created existence and the ultimate source of all the intelligence and energy manifested in the external world. But Pantheism holds that the whole universe of extension and thought is one substance, and that substance God -- that God exists only in the successive forms or events which constitute the universe. These forms are various, but God is one. They are successive, but God endures the same. He is not a person, but all persons are transient forms of his being. He has no existence other than that of the sum of all finite existence, and no consciousness nor intelligence other than the aggregate of the consciousness and intelligence of the transient creatures.

Hence Pantheism denies the freedom of man and the personality of God. It makes all events proceed by a law of absolute necessity. All evil, precisely as all good, comes immediately from God, and evil men are related to him precisely as are saints and angels. It confounds the doctrine of immanence with ontological identity, and it turns it into a heresy by denying the complementary truth of the divine transcendence. It allows no place for a heavenly Father beholding us complacently and providing for us benevolently. It makes no place for a moral Governor and Judge ruling over us, distributing rewards and punishments, teaching, disciplining, and acting upon us from without. It makes no place for a supernatural world, for revelations or supernatural truths, for miracles or supernatural works, for a "kingdom of God," a supernatural state, or for a future or supernatural life. Therefore Pantheism, in its very essence renders all morality and religion alike impossible. The Christian doctrine of the divine immanence, on the contrary, is the very essence of all religion. It admits and adjusts itself to the complementary doctrine of the divine transcendence. We begin, as we have shown above, with the conception of God as a distinct Person of absolute intellectual and moral perfection, self-conscious, self-determinate, absolutely free and sovereign, righteous and loving. This is our heavenly Father, the God and Father of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. He created us in his likeness, rules us as our righteous moral Governor and Judge;

and executes through all the universe and through all ages his all-perfect and immutable plan conceived in the infinitely wise and righteous counsel of his sovereign will. This Being, moreover, transcends all the limitations of space and time. He is everywhere present in his eternal essence. The whole essence, with all its inherent properties, is present at every moment of time to every point of space. As First Cause he is the constant, abiding, supporting, and actuating basis of every second cause. All creatures exist, and act only as they exist, in him. At the same time, he acts through every atom from within and upon every atom from without. " In him all things live and move and have their being; " he turneth the hearts of men even as rivers of water are turned; he worketh in us to will and to do of his own good pleasure. This is a function of the divine personality. The fact that the whole indivisible God is eternally in each point of space transcends our understanding, but it does not rationally necessitate the belief in many gods nor in a divided God; nor does it in any way invalidate the proof we have establishing his personality. The Scriptures clearly treat both truths together. The practical faith and experience of all Christians embrace both of these truths together in the same acts of trust and love. Both truths are together implied in all religious experience, recognizing God as our Father, speaking to him and listening to his voice, obeying his word, trusting to his love, and at the same time recognizing him as present everywhere and in all things and events, recognizing his hand in every object and occurrence, trusting him in everything, because all nature executes his will, and hence reveals his presence and expresses his thought. The extension of our knowledge of the physical universe effected by modern science, rendering visible to us the absolute unity of the cosmos, the uninterrupted continuity of the chain of cause and effect, as well as of design, through all space and time, has not altered, but it has greatly emphasized, this religious conception of "the divine immanence." An eminent Christian scientist said to me recently, "God is either in all or in none." It is not possible to believe, when looking upon the course of natural creation and providence, that God comes down upon them at disconnected intervals from without. In the miracle he does that very thing, for "a miracle" is a sign the essence of which is its articulate significance to the answering intelligence of man. But in the natural course of providence the immanent God works continuously, without interval, from within through the spontaneities of the things themselves in which he dwells. He is not in one object or event any more than in all others. The whole course of the universe is divine in every part, except so far as sin has marred it, and all the normal activities of men and angels are religious -- that is, have their source and their end in God. This view, therefore, evidently differs from Pantheism in that -- (1.) It asserts the distinct personality of God as the Head of a moral government administered over free and responsible agents by a system of ideas and motives. (2.) It asserts the distinct personality and moral freedom and responsibility of men. (3.) It maintains the distinction of the human and the divine agency, although making the former depend upon the latter. (4.) It embraces and adjusts itself to the complementary doctrine of the divine transcendence, which Pantheism renders impossible. (5.) While Pantheism makes freedom, morality, and religion impossible, this view of the divine immanence in all things is the necessary basis of the highest freedom and of the most exalted morality and of the most vivid religion conceivable. (6.) This view, as held by Christians, not only admits, but affords the most rational basis attainable for the supernatural -- that is, for the activity in the sphere of nature of that God who in himself infinitely transcends all nature.

III. In this catholic Christian doctrine of the relation of God to the universe we comprehend all the half-truths or heresies which have divided the schools. We recognize all the facts, and we

reconcile the practical faith of Christians with the highest science, and we provide a rational basis alike for the natural and the supernatural, for the reign of law and for special miracle, for science and for practical religion.

Here we stand under the blended light of nature and of grace, of science and of revelation, God the infinite, and therefore the timeless and spaceless, the absolutely unknowable, remains ever the unfathomable Abyss. In all our knowing, God is always BEYOND us, hid in the light, which is impenetrable. At the same time, he is always ABOVE us, enthroned in heaven, commanding, revealing, ruling, showering myriad blessings from above. At the same time, the same infinite God is BEFORE us, looking upon us and speaking with us face to face. He is our heavenly Father. He has formed us in his own image. Our highest life and blessedness are found in his personal communion -- that is, personal interchange of ideas and of affections, for our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ. At the same time, God is ever WITHIN us, the ultimate ground of our being and the unfailing source of our life, the wellspring of eternal life, the inspiration of all spiritual knowledge and beatitudes, springing up within us to the ages of the ages.

All these glimpses of this immeasurable mystery, of God’s nature and of his relation to the universe, afforded by the light of nature, are reinforced and gloriously supplemented and illumined by the revealed truths of the Trinity of Persons and of the incarnation of the Eternal Word.

S. God's Covenants With Man--The Church

God’s Covenants With Man--The Church

by A. A. Hodge

Our present subject is a wide one. It comprehends the covenants of God--his covenant of works and covenant of grace. It is very obvious that because God is an intelligence he must have a plan. If he be an absolutely perfect intelligence, desiring and designing nothing but good--if he be an eternal and immutable intelligence, his plan must be one, eternal, all-comprehensive, immutable; that is, all things from his point of view must constitute one system and sustain a perfect logical relation in all its parts. Nevertheless, like all other comprehensive systems, it must itself be composed of an infinite number of subordinate systems. In this respect it is like these heavens which he has made, and which he has hung before our eyes as a type and pattern of his mode of thinking and planning in all providence. We know that in the solar system our earth is a satellite of one of the great suns, and of this particular system we have a knowledge because of our position; but we know that this system is only one of myriads, with variations, that have been launched in the great abyss of space. So we know that this great, all-comprehensive plan of God, considered as one system, must contain a great many subordinate systems which might be studied profitably, if we were in the position to do so, as self-contained wholes, separate from the rest.

Now, the great system of human redemption must in some respects stand alone, conspicuous and pre-eminent, above all other plans and systems of God. Even though God work through eternity, even though he work through infinity, God has but one Son The incarnation of the Son of God cannot be repeated. This is an event, even in the annals of eternity and in the annals of the universe, without precedent, without parallel, without equal. And this incarnation of the Son of God, this taking upon himself the very nature of man, this uniting himself through the body of man with the whole material universe, and through the soul of man with the whole moral and spiritual universe, must in its very nature have wrought a change affecting universally and intimately all the provinces and kingdoms and all the individuals which it embraces. Besides this, a system which is worthy of the incarnation and the death of the Son of God must be something transcendently superior. I do believe that among all the commonwealths of the sons of God--and I believe these are infinite in number, in extent, and in variety--this commonwealth of redeemed humanity must occupy a central and interior position; that it is something unique, unparalleled, which cannot even in the universe of God be frequently experienced by any of his creatures. And this which seems to us to be possible and probable appears to be absolutely confirmed by the apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians, where he says, as you will remember, that in the fulness of time this great undiscovered secret, which God had hitherto kept to himself, he had now begun to unveil gradually and slowly through the gospel; to wit, his purpose to make men "accepted through the Beloved," his purpose to bring us under one Head in Christ, and to consolidate under one Head in Christ all things which are in heaven or upon the earth, "even in him."

Now, this plan is in effect a covenant. A great many, comparatively recently, have come to doubt whether it is proper to apply terms so human to the transactions and relations of God. And yet I do believe that I can show to you that the very facts of the case justify this language, and that they implicitly and necessarily contain all these principles. The term "covenant" is not commonly found in ancient theology. Hints of it--that is, the recognition of God's plan and purpose--began to appear in the century preceding the Reformation in the Roman Catholic Church, and then among the first Reformers. It was developed very distinctly afterward by one of the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism. That form of theology itself is generally attributed to the agency of Dutch theologians, who introduced it about the middle of the seventeenth century. But it is found in the early part of that century, in a book of great simplicity, called The Body of Divinity (compiled by Archbishop Usher, who was a man of very great learning).

Now, I believe that some foreign divines, and some in England, carried out this covenant form of theology in detail in a manner that might be called anthropomorphic. Yet it is evident that if God's dealings with man are ethical, if in their essential nature the system of redemption grew out of the relations of persons, and if the process consisted in the way of teaching, of commandments, of promises, of threatenings, of the presence of motives addressed to the will, and of determinate actions of form and character, then, in its last analysis, all the dealings of God must necessarily come back to this form of a covenant. What is the essence of a covenant between equals except a mutual understanding and the agreement of two wills ? What is the essential nature of a covenant formed between a superior and inferior but this--a conditional promise? The promise is a reward on the condition of obedience, associated with threatening of punishment on the condition of disobedience. It follows from this, necessarily, that if you begin with an eternity, an eternal plan of God must be a mutual one in which the three Persons come to an understanding and knowledge of that common purpose in which they distribute among themselves reciprocally their several functions. Then when God comes to deal with any intelligent creature, whether it be an angel or a man, under any circumstances, if he commands or promises, or if he threatens, you have there all the elements of a covenant, because a, covenant is simply a mutual understanding, and the covenant imposed by a superior upon an inferior is simply a conditional promise. Hence we have the covenant of works, the covenant of redemption, and the covenant of grace.

Now, the covenant of works is so called because its condition is the condition of works. It is called also, and just as legitimately, the covenant of life, because it promises life. It is called a legal covenant, because it proceeded, of course, upon the assumption of perfect obedience, conformity in character and action, to the perfect law of God. And it is no less a covenant of grace, because it was a covenant in which our heavenly Father, as a guardian of all the natural rights of his newly-created creatures, sought to provide for this race in his infinite wisdom and love and infinite grace through what we call a covenant of works. The covenant of grace is just as much and just as entire a covenant, receiving it as coming from an infinite superior to an inferior.

Now look precisely to the facts in the case. Let there be no speculation, let there be no inferences, but take the facts as they are. In the first place, God created man, as we saw in our last lecture, a newly-awakened being, intelligent, moral, with free-will, with a natural character through which he was able to do right, able to do wrong, apparently. In the second place, we know it to be a universal principle--and as it is of God, it seems to us to be a very just principle--that holy character is made to depend upon personal choice. But it does not seem to me that this is always

and absolutely essential. We know that the immutable, holy character of God did not originate in personal choice; that God's existence is eternal; his existence is absolutely necessary, absolutely immutable, and that God is from eternity and essentially God, rational, holy, and wise. And yet it does seem as if God had determined to make the moral character of all the subjects of his moral government to depend upon personal choice; and it seems to us as if that was right. He made man, in the first place, holy and capable of doing right, but without a confirmed character he was liable to fall. Ought this confirmed character to result from and depend upon his own personal actions.

I say that this seems to be God's plan everywhere, because we find it true, without exception, wherever we have any record of God's doings. In the first place, He created the angels, and gave the angels an opportunity of obedience or an opportunity of falling. Each one of them seems to have stood in his own person, and those who fell remained fallen. Those who maintained their first state continued afterward absolutely and eternally in the image of God. Then when God brings forth the gospel, his method is to preach the gospel to every creature, and to offer to all men this amazing gift of eternal life which covenants confirmed moral character, and which we may receive or refuse according to our personal choice.

Then, if this were so, obviously man must have had a probation--a probation in its very essence, because a time of trial and state of trial must be given. That is, God put man in a state of existence, in a state of moral equilibrium. He was in equilibrium because he was holy. His heart was disposed aright; his impulses were right. God endowed him thus with original righteousness; but he was in a state of freedom. His character was not confirmed; he was capable of either obeying or sinning. Now, it would have been an infinite loss to us, an inconceivable danger, if God had determined to keep us for ever, throughout all the unending ages of eternity, hanging thus upon the ragged edge of possible probation, and always in this unstable condition, this unstable equilibrium, able to do right, and liable also to fall; and, therefore, God offered to man in this gracious covenant of works an opportunity of accepting his grace and receiving his covenant gift of a confirmed, holy character, secured on the condition of personal choice.

God gave Adam and Eve the best chance he could, and he put them surely under absolutely the most favorable conditions that we can conceive of. He brought them into a new garden, and he introduced them under the most favorable circumstances, with one exception--he allowed the devil to go into the camp. Why he did that I do not know; but with that exception the conditions were the most favorable we can conceive of. Then he reduced the test to the simplest and easiest--the test simply of a personal violation of law, a test simply of loyal obedience. He did not make the condition, Thou shalt not lie; which, under the circumstances, would have been utterly impossible to Adam, who was a holy, honest man. He did not make the condition, Thou shalt not abuse thy wife Eve; which would have been impossible with Adam in his state as he was originally created. But be reduced the condition to one of specific obedience to a positive command, in itself absolutely distinct. Now, the only difficulty that seems to inhere in this view of man's original condition lies in the fact that the destinies of all Adam's descendants were made to be suspended upon his action. We all inherit what we call original sin. And two questions here start up, the question as to how original sin comes upon us, and the question why original sin, under the government of a holy God, is allowed to come upon us.

These are two entirely distinct questions. You do not answer the question why when you explain the method by which original sin comes down to us in the order of generation; you must carry the question up to a higher plane and solve it in the light of divine choice. Undoubtedly, this bringing down upon each individual this original taint of our nature, which is the fontal source of all evils--moral, physical, temporal, eternal--is the greatest of all judgments, and it is either a tyrannical act of the Creator or it is a sublime act of justice. Every angel was created a spirit; every angel was constituted self-determining in his own person. But constituted as we are, possessing a responsible and moral nature like angels, which comes into existence in connection with propagated animal bodies, such an individual probation is absolutely impossible. From the very constitution of the human body, and from the nature of the case, anything that Adam did must determine his destiny and that of his children. As Hugh Miller says:

"It is a universal law, just as wide as the providence of God and as the history of man, that God has so constituted men everywhere that the free-will of the parent becomes the destiny of the child."

If this be so, we must believe in the covenant of works, and that God has ordained this relation, not only in infinite wisdom and in infinite power, but in infinite justice and righteousness. But this fact of the covenant of works does not stand by itself. It is a part of a great whole, and if you leave out any element of the system you will not get an understanding of the covenant. This covenant of works which God introduces, and the subject of which is the government of man and his whole career in this world, is part of that greater system which culminates in the covenant of grace, with its headship in the first Adam introducing us into the headship of the second Adam. There has been no Christ except among men. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh sad blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same.....For verily not of angels doth he take hold, but he taketh hold of the seed of Abraham." Angels had a nature, but angels did not have a seed. Christ's relation to the seed of Abraham results from the generic nature of maxi, from the very constitution of the covenant of works. If there had been no covenant of works, there could have been no covenant of redemption; if there had been no fallen Adam, there could have been no redemption in Christ. You must study the covenant of works always in the light of that larger system wherein it is established that where sin abounded grace has infinitely more abounded.

Further: we say, then, that if the Father and Son and Holy Spirit constitute one Trinity, the plan must be a mutual one, and must contain within it all the elements of such a plan. According to the intimation of this plan given in the Bible, the Father must be an absolute God; the Son must represent his own people, whose nature he was to take. We know such an arrangement was made. Christ often speaks of the work which his Father, God, had, sent him to do. Be says, " This commandment have I received from my Father." Then he says, "All that the Father giveth Me shall come to Me." Here are all the elements of a covenant. There was an understanding between the Father and the Son as to the reward which the Son was to gain, so that we have all the elements of the covenant of redemption. The Father undertook all the providential conditions; the Son was to do all the work in the world, and to that end the world is to be prepared for it, and that he might have the proper conditions of life, and afterward that he should see his seed and be satisfied with the results, with the crowning fruits that he should receive. Then the Son undertook, on behalf of his own people, to take upon himself their nature, to meet their obligations, and to suffer the penalty which had been pronounced upon them. The Holy Ghost undertook also afterward to

apply these benefits, and undertook this part of the work because it is the covenant of three Persons, you must remember. He undertook the work of generating the body of the Son, of preparing his human nature, an entire human nature in its fulness, so as to render Him , on the human side, a proper. being. The Holy Ghost undertook to co-operate with him in every part of his earthly being, and then to constitute himself the other Advocate, which completes the whole work of redemption. He comes to us and takes the things of Christ and applies them to us. He makes continual intercession within us as Christ makes continual intercession for us.

Now, what is commonly called the covenant of grace as distinct from the covenant of redemption is just the human and external side of this eternal covenant of redemption.

Both the covenants are executed in our behalf, both under one name, the covenant of grace. It is better, however, to distinguish them, and to call the covenant between the Persons of the eternal Godhead, the covenant of redemption, which is eternally transcendent, and which is full of light and love, and life and power, the provisions and scope of whose grace transcend the imaginations of man or the tongues of angels. But the covenant of grace is just the human temporal side, which makes human redemption possible and gives its benefits freely to us. In the case of every one to whom the gospel comes, and to whom it gives salvation, it is done upon the condition of faith. Now, here is a covenant with a condition whosoever believes shall be saved, whosoever believeth not shall be damned. Then the Lord Jesus Christ comes to view and is represented as the Mediator of the covenant, because it all depends upon his mediatorial work, and, above all, he is represented as the Surety. We promise and he indorses. You promise faith upon your knees, and the Lord Jesus Christ indorses for you. You promise service upon your knees, and the Lord Jesus Christ indorses for you. You see how much it is that God asks of you. He says you hall be saved. If we have no belief, we are utterly incompetent to attain to that salvation. Christ gives us faith: we promise trust, and Christ indorses it. We are offered salvation if we will serve; but we have no strength, no merit. Christ gives us the grace: we promise, since Christ indorses it. We are offered salvation if we fight the battle and persevere unto the end: we make our pledge, Christ indorses it. Thus our salvation is absolutely and infinitely secure.

Now, of course this covenant sustains to the whole work in the whole sphere of redemption the same relation as the constitution of a republic or of a limited monarchy sustains to the government of a land. Potentially, all the powers of government, all the elements of political society, are represented and granted in the provisions of our constitution; and so, potentially, all the elements of salvation, everything that can be experienced in the body of Christians in the earth, everything that can be distinct to the soul of the Christian on earth, everything that can be experienced throughout all eternity, everything that can be realized in the individual, everything that can be realized in the community, the whole body of the redeemed--all this is contained potentially in the provisions of the covenant of grace. But this covenant, like all other covenants and constitutions, must be administered; and there is a difference between the covenant and its administration. The covenant is one; it is the administration which varies continually. This is a form of language which it would have been very well for the translators of our Bible to have adopted. The Greek word diatheke means constitution as much as anything else in the world. It is a constitution. In the old classical language it was used to express that kind of a constitution which a man makes when he makes a will, a testament. You have the unalterable inheritance, and you can never get rid of it. I prefer the old Latin word "dispensation'' to the words New Testament and Old Testament. These

are not proper terms. The diatheke occurs dozens of times in the Bible; you can see the use of it and determine the sense--the constitution, the administration of the constitution. That is, it is a covenant or it is a dispensation of God. If you will then just go back to your Greek concordance and take up your New Testament where this word first occurs, and carry it through, you will find how exactly it has this meaning. You see that covenant, or constitution of grace in the form of a covenant, which provides for the salvation of man from the beginning of the history of the human race to the present. So there has been but one redemption, there has been but one atonement and one offer of justification, there has been but one offer of regeneration, there has been but one principle of sanctification, there has been but one operation of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, from the time that the first gospel was preached to the woman in the garden, until the present day. But then this wonderful constitution has been administered in an infinite variety of ways, and it is capable of twofold unfolding. You take up this constitution, and subject it to a logical unfolding, and you have in it, of course, all possible theology. It has been shown over and over again how all the unfolding of God's plans, as far as those plans have been disclosed to us, and can be exhibited, makes manifest infinite variations and provisions for the redemption of men which can be exhibited under this form, logically and unvaryingly.

There is a second unfolding of the covenant of grace which is chronological: not only is it unfolded logically in itself, but it brings out all the different elements in time. It has been unfolded chronologically from the Garden of Eden up to the present time in the wonderful development of the Church of the first-born, the Church of the covenant, the Church purchased by Christ's blood.
THE CHURCH AND ITS UNITY

What is the Church ? There is one thing certain about it: the Church has a great many attributes, but that which is absolutely essential is its absolute unity. There is no doubt if there be but one God, there is but one Church; if there be but one Christ, there is but one Church; if there be but one cross, there is but one Church; if there be but one Holy Ghost, there is but one Church. This is absolutely settled--there can be but one Church. We have heard about the visible and invisible Church, as if there were two churches. There cannot be two churches, one that is visible and another that is invisible. There is but one Church, and that Church is visible or invisible just according to the eye that is looking, just according to the point of view taken.

Now, I take the true distinction to be, the Church as we see it, the normal Church, and the Church as God sees it. In respect to this matter our vision is limited in the way of discrimination. You and I cannot discriminate in regard to the Church; we have to take presumptions, we have to take the outward indications, when we make an examination. God's eye is absolutely discriminating. Looking down, he sees the line of demarcation which separates the Church and the world; his vision is sharp and keen. Then, again, our view is not very comprehensive; we see what we call the Church, and we conclude that it is the Church. I have often thought of this as an illustration. I ask a man, "Have you seen the planet, the Earth? " he would say, "Yes, I live on it." That is one of the reasons you never saw it. You never saw the planet Earth as you see the planet Jupiter; you never saw the planet Earth as you see its satellite, the moon. It is absolutely impossible; you are too near it; you see but one little segment of it; nothing but a fraction--a very little at a time. You must get away from the object in order to take it in as a whole, and you must have the advantage of perspective. So in regard to the Church: it is so vast, it has been gathering through the ages, through the centuries, through millenniums; its members come from the ends of the earth; and

myriads, ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands beyond the calculations of angels, have been gathering there in white robes around the throne of Christ. Can you see it ? We are too purblind, too earthly in our conditions; but we may see a part of it. What is called the invisible Church is the most conspicuous object in the universe; it has come to shine, to be like the Sun, and like an army with banners. What is called the invisible Church is the only Church that exists. We see parts of it; it becomes visible to us in sections, in partial glimpses; but yet it is the same Church. Now, the distinction I make is, the Church as God sees it, and the Church as man sees it.

There have been two distinct conceptions of the Church: one is the theory that the Church consists of an organized society which God has constituted, that identity consists in its external form as well as in its spirit, and that its life depends upon continuity of officers from generation to generation This is held by a great many able men, men of intellect, and by many respectable, level-headed Christians as well.

I hold this to be simply impossible. The marks of the Church are catholicity, apostolicity, infallibility, and purity. Now, apply that to any corporation--to the Church in Jerusalem or to the Church in Antioch; to the Congregational Church, to the Presbyterian, or to the Prelatical Churches. I do not care as to the form; but there never did exist, and there does not now exist, any organized society upon the face of the earth of which these qualities could be predicated. Not one of these societies has apostolicity--that is, precisely the apostolic form as well as the apostolic spirit; not one of these societies has had an absolute organic continuity, or has, without modification, preserved it. Societies, like the Church of Rome, which are most conspicuous in claiming these marks for themselves, are most conspicuously unworthy of them, because there is no comparison between their ritual of service, their organization, and the apostolic Church with which they claim to be identified. The only possible definition of a Church is that it consists of what is termed "the body of Christ"--that is, human souls regenerated by the presence and power of the Holy Ghost, kept in immediate union with Christ. Of this you can predicate apostolicity, catholicity, and the sanctifying power and perpetual presence of the Holy Ghost, which belongs to the Church of Christ. This is the true Church, which exists through all the successive generations of men, which is united to Christ, and which shares in the benefits of his redemption through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. This great body is one because the Holy Ghost dwells in it and makes it one. This Church is apostolical, because it is unchanging as to apostolic doctrine; it is catholic, because it contains in one body all of God’s people in all worlds and in all time; it unites all from the creation of the world to the coming of Christ, and all from the coming of Christ to the end of the world, in one body--absolutely one, both visible and invisible. But you may ask me, as a good Presbyterian, a High Church Presbyterian--because we have a High Church as well as a Low Church---you may ask me, Do you not think there is a visible Church? Yes, I believe the true Church is visible. It consists of men and women who are regenerated, who have divine life, and whose divine life is shown in their holy walk and conversation. You ask if the Church must not be organized ? I say yes; but organization is never an essential of the Church. Organization is a simple accident; it is a necessary accident; it is a very important one with us; it is, according to our mode of thinking, obligatory, because it is commanded. By means of organization we have solidification and growth, and it is a great means of self-propagation in accomplishing the great missionary work of carrying the gospel to the ends of the earth. But Christ never did make organization needful in the sense

that our being Presbyterians is an essential of the Church.

You and I believe that immortality is provided for all souls before birth, as well as after birth, and for infants that have not come to free morel agency, irrespective of their knowledge of Christ. Now, think of the history of the world since Adam: all the souls of those that have died before birth or between birth and moral agency have been redeemed in Christ. You see that organization cannot be the essence of the Church. I tell you that the infinite majority of the spiritual Church of Jesus Christ come into existence outside of all organization. Through all the ages, from Japan, from China, from India, from Africa, from the islands of the sea, age after age, multitudes flocking like birds have gone to heaven of this great company of redeemed infants of the Church of God; they go without organization. Now this is demonstration: that if the great majority of the Church always has existed outside of organization, then organization, while of assistance, is not essential to the Church. You may add church to church; these are but the incidental forms which the universal Church of God assumes on different occasions under the guidance of the Spirit, under the guidance of God's providence, as great propaganda for the purpose of accomplishing the great and divine work of carrying the gospel to the ends of the earth. The Church had its beginning in the family. The plan of redemption assumes and presumes the original state of human beings as in the family. How has the Church been logically and chronologically composed? In the first place, we have what is called the patriarchal administration in the original constitution of the race. There was no organization of the Church then; there was not much organization in the world, none of the state as distinct from the family. The father was the sovereign; the great father--that is, the patriarch--was the head of the Church; and just as Adam had led his descendants away from God, so under the covenant of redemption did these patriarchal fathers, these prophets, priests, and kings, lead their people back to him. In that age there was no priesthood, there were no sacraments. The next form was the Abrahamic dispensation, which was a more specific promise to the Church, the promise connected with the covenant of grace. There was more light, more doctrine, and we have here the specific sacrament of circumcision which was added to the specific covenant.

Then we come, in the third place, to the Mosaic dispensation. It is well recognized that the wonderful phenomena of this dispensation must be understood as presenting a threefold aspect or character, and it becomes very much more simple when we do this. In the first place, these Jews were a people who, in their own time, constituted a distinct nation. God was their God, and a large portion of his providences toward them had reference simply to their temporal interests and to their relations as a specific people. They had a government which guarded the relations they sustained. to other nations; therefore you must understand a great many of their laws with reference to this specific characteristic. The Jews were constituted a kingdom, and God was their God.

Another far more important aspect of the Jewish system was this: it was a promulgation of the covenant of works which was introduced at Sinai, and the design of this promulgation was to lead those generations to the gospel, for the gospel presupposes the law. The law has been from the beginning the schoolmaster to lead us to Christ. Therefore in this aspect it was a missionary institution, and must be understood as preparatory; it was the preaching of the doctrine of sin and condemnation in order to prepare man for the preaching of the doctrine of grace and salvation.

Then, again, it did most characteristically in the specific form of its administration outline the covenant of redemption; it was the setting forth of Christ--Christ as the Prophet, Priest, and King--in the method of his redemption and our personal reception of its benefits. The conditions of salvation were the same, and salvation was secured by the same plan. The Jew, if he believed in Christ's coming, was justified and received the Holy Ghost, although without understanding it, and was regenerated, sanctified, and justified; and being thus justified and sanctified, when he died he went to be, not with Christ--there was at that time no incarnate Christ; he did not exist--but he went into that happy place in which God gathered all his Old Testament people--in Abraham's bosom.

Now, how shall we regard the logical unfolding of the covenant from the time of Moses to the time of Christ? First, we have the breaking down of the middle wall of partition by the taking away of the limitation presented by the institution of the Church as a nation: it was confined under these circumstances to one people; it was incapable of being expanded among the nations of the earth. It is a remarkable fact that the Old Dispensation opened with the tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues, and the New opens with the Pentecost and the gift of tongues. The Old Dispensation began with the process of selection and exclusion: there was an election of the children of Israel out of all mankind, and a rejection of all the rest; a selection of the Israelites out of the Hebrews, and the rejection of the rest; and the selection of Judah out of Israel, and the rejection of the rest. But now see how the principle changes. Under the Old Dispensation it was exclusion and segregation; under the New Testament it is expansion and comprehension. The new Church begins in a little upper chamber in Jerusalem. The Church becomes the Church of the Jews; it becomes the Church of the Roman empire; it becomes the Church of Europe; it becomes the Church of the world.

Now, as to the unity of this Church I have something to say. A great many are agitated at present with regard to Church unity and its manifestations, and I think there is a great deal of confusion of thought as to the original conception of the Church itself. If the Church be an external society, then all deviation from that society is of the nature of schism; but if the Church be in its essence a great spiritual body, constituted by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost through all the ages and nations, uniting all to Christ, and if its external organization is only accidental and temporary, and subject to change and variation, then deviation of organization, unless touched by the spirit of schism, is not detrimental to 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 older, is multiplicity in unity and unity in multiplicity; the higher the order of unity, the greater must be the multiplicity. This is so everywhere. Go to the ocean: every drop of water is the repetition of every other drop, and there is union simply without diversity. Go to the desert of Sahara, and every grain of sand is the duplicate of every other grain of sand; but there is no unity, no life. You could not make a great cathedral by piling up simple identical rhomboids or cubes of stone. It is because you differentiate, and make every stone of a different form in order to perform a different function, and then build them up out of this multitudinous origination into the continuity and unity of the one plan or architectural idea, that you have your cathedral. You could not make a great piece of music by simply multiplying the same tone or sound. In order to obtain the harmony of a great orchestra, you get together a large number of musical instruments, or you have a great number of human voices in a choir, and you combine them, then you have an infinite variety of quality and infinite variety of tone. You combine

them in the absolute unit of the one great musical idea which you seek to express. But if this is true of such things, it is more true of Christ's Church. If God had followed our idea, how simple a thing it would have been to make a united Church descending from Adam and Eve! We might think that was all that could be done, and there would be then no stones of stumbling. You could then watch this Church, and it would go on indefinitely and without limit.

Now, what has God been doing? He has broken humanity up into infinite varieties. This has been his method. He has been driving it into every clime. He has been driving it into every age through the succession of centuries. He has been molding human nature under every variety of influences through all time, until he has got men in every age, every tribe, every tongue, every nation, every color, every fashion--in order to do what? Simply to build up a, variety, to build up the rich, inexhaustible variety which constitutes the beauty in unity of this great infinite Church of the first-born, whose final dwelling-place is to be in heaven.

I say, under this dispensation God has left us free to form organizations. He has left us free to experience Christianity under all the conditions in which he has placed us; and the Christian religion which we receive takes various colors and tones from the nationality, from the tribe, and from the race. Undoubtedly, there is such a thing as schism. Schism is a great sin. But if the Church is a spiritual body, the sin is a sin against spiritual unity.

All high-churchism, all claims that our Church is the one Church and only Church, are of the essence of schism; all pride and bigotry are of the essence of schism; all want of universal love, all jealousy, and all attempts to take advantage of others in controversy or in Church extension, are of the essence of schism. But surely it is not schism for each one of us to go out and develop in our own way. What is the result? I trust in this I am not narrow. I am not making any claim for Presbyterianism; I am talking of the whole Church of God that is truly loyal to Christ, animated by one Spirit, comprehended in one body. On the other hand, I hold that it is our interest to have denominational differences in order to maintain what God has given us.

I believe the Church is like the world, and consists of many forms, many races. I say to every race, Maintain the integrity of your race; and to every nation, Maintain the integrity of your nation, that it be not antagonized by other nations. This is the duty which God has historically devolved upon us. I say, then, if Presbyterianism be true, maintain the type which God has given you; and I would say the same to our Baptist friends, and to our Episcopal friends and Methodist friends. I believe all our denominations are historically justified; that they all represent great ideas, either theoretically or practically, which God commits to them, in order to have them act upon them; that our duty is to maintain our true inheritance, and to prove true to the stock from which we came. 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 working from without, but from within outward; by taking on more of Christ, more of the Spirit, that we will realize more and more the unity of the Church in our own happy experience.

S. Predestination

Predestination

A. A. Hodge THIS is a subject which is very little understood, even by those Christians who profess to embrace it in their creed. This is due in part to the nature of the subject, to its profundity, and to the infinite range of its complications with other important truths. But it is also in large measure due to inattention, and to the general prevalence of a natural though an unfounded and ignorant prejudice. This prejudice has become in many quarters an epidemic irresistible to persons of more zeal than judgment. Now, I wish to urge a plea in favour of an earnest, frank, patient study of the subject. Vague prejudice unsupported by definite knowledge has no value. It is unquestionable that the Scriptures do teach some doctrine of predestination, and a very strict doctrine of unconditional election has been held by the greatest and most thoroughly biblical theologians, and by whole denominations of Christians most conspicuous for their evangelical character and fruitfulness. It will not do for any of us to dismiss such a subject with supercilious impatience. We should at the very least do our best to secure a clear conception of the doctrine, and of its relation to other doctrines, before we make ourselves sure that it is not true.

I. In the first place, it should be clearly understood that this great principle of divine predestination is held in two entirely different connections and interests. It has by a great many been discussed simply as a question of transcendental theology, as concerning the acts of God enacted in eternity in a sphere above and behind the external phenomena which are obvious to our senses. If there be a God, he necessarily exists in eternity, while the creation exists in the successions and limitations of time. The universe as a whole and all the parts of it originate in him and depend upon him, and therefore are determined by him. According to the precise language of the Westminster Shorter Catechism, Ques. 7, “The decrees of God are, his eternal purpose, according to the counsel of his will, whereby, for his own glory, he bath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass.” This sweeps the whole universe, and is a proposition of the highest and most general speculative importance. This position is unquestionably, in this form, true and logically involved in all scriptural views of the doctrine of grace in all its elements. It is therefore rightly embraced in our Confession of Faith, and the present writer with all his heart believes it to be true. It is in this spirit and from this speculative point of view that Zwingli discusses this subject in his De Providentia. And it is this aspect of the question which is habitually considered by the general Christian public in their hostile criticisms of this doctrine. Now, I am perfectly free to confess that however true this view of the general principle of predestination is, and however much it is logically implicated in the essentials of the Christian doctrines of grace, nevertheless this transcendental way of conceiving of the matter is more speculative than practical. Although I heartily accord with the view in my own mind, I feel no disposition to insist upon the assent of any Christian brother as a matter of loyalty to the Christian faith. No element of the Creed is essential unless it practically determines the attitude of the soul in its relations to God through Christ. And only those aspects and modes of conceiving Christian truth should be insisted upon and imposed upon others as obligatory which do directly determine this Godward attitude of our souls, or, in other words, which directly enter into and give

form to our religious experience. On the other hand, Calvin presents his characteristic doctrine of eternal election in living connection with the great practical experimental questions of personal salvation and of divine grace. If we are sinners, it is evident that the practically essential thing in religious experience is to appreciate truly our guilt, unworthiness, and helplessness before God, and God's free grace toward us to its full extent. If God is infinitely gracious and just, if at measureless expense he redeemed us at the cost of the pain, shame, and death of his Son, it follows that any failure in our appreciation of our own unworthiness and helplessness, or of God's gracious activity in our salvation, would be absolutely insufferable. To claim more for ourselves or to ascribe less to God than the facts of the case justify would he the greatest of all sins, and would be the very thing to make salvation impossible. The sense of our own guilt, pollution, and impotence, and of the absolute unconditioned freeness of the grace which saves us, is involved in every case of genuine religious experience. The expiatory work of Christ which is sufficient for, adapted to, and freely offered to all men, being presupposed, the question of questions is, How — by what agencies and on what conditions — is it effectually applied to any individual? The Scriptures make it plain that the condition of its effectual application is an act of faith, involving real spiritual repentance and the turning from sin and the acceptance and self-appropriation of Christ and of his redemption as the only remedy. But what will prompt a sinner in love with his sin, spiritually blind and callous, thus to repent and accept Christ as the cure of the sin he loves? The first movement cannot begin with man. The sinner of himself cannot really desire deliverance from sin; of himself he cannot appreciate the attractive beauty, loveliness, or saving power of Christ. The dead man cannot spontaneously originate his own quickening, nor the creature his own creating, nor the infant his own begetting. Whatever man may do after regeneration, the first quickening of the dead must originate in the first instance with God. All Christians feel this as the most intimate conviction of their souls. Yet it involves necessarily this very doctrine of eternal predestination or election. If God begins the work, if our believing follows his quickening, then it is God, not man, who makes the difference between the quickened and the unquickened. If we believe, it is because we have been first quickened. If any man does not believe, it is because he is yet dead in his natural sin. God's eternal choice therefore cannot depend upon foreseen faith, but, on the contrary, faith must depend upon God's eternal choice. As between the man who believes in Christ and the man who finally rejects him, the source of the difference is put by the Pelagian entirely in the inalienable, unassisted power of the human will. All that can be said in the case is that the one man has accepted Christ because he chose to do so, and the other man has rejected Christ because he chose to do so. Each has acted as he has done in the unfettered and unfetterable exercise of the human will. But Pelagianism makes no room for original sin nor for the necessity of divine grace. It is diametrically opposed to the Scriptures, to the religious experience of all Christians, and it has been rejected as anti-Christian by the unanimous consent of the whole historic Church. The semi-Pelagian, admitting that man is morally sick, holds that every sinner must make the first movement Godward spontaneously in his own strength, after which, if his effort is sincere, however ineffectual, God will co-operate by his grace with him and make his effort successful. The Arminian, on the other hand, admitting that all men, being dead in trespasses and sins, are absolutely incapable of spontaneously originating any good desire or effort, yet holds that God gives the same sufficient grace to all men; and he makes the difference between the believer and the unbeliever to lie in the fact that the former co-operates, and thus renders the grace in his case effectual, and the other fails to co-operate with it, and thus renders it ineffectual. The

Lutheran, who maintains that men are in such sense dead in sin that they are utterly unable to co-operate with grace before they have been themselves quickened to life by grace, yet makes the difference between the believer and the unbeliever to consist in the fact, that while no man can co-operate with grace previous to regeneration, every man is free to resist it. With the Lutheran, therefore, the believer is the non-resistant, the unbeliever is the resistant, subject of a common universal grace. The Calvinist, on the other hand, glorifies the free and sovereign grace of God by attributing to it alone all the efficiency in saving the believing sinner. It is God's grace which makes the believer all he is. He feels this; of this at least he is absolutely sure. He is nothing more than a poor wandering sheep. The Good Shepherd has sought him out, found him, and carried him back on his breast. In himself and of himself in his entire history he is no better than his fellowmen who are lost. It is only God's free grace, therefore, which has made the difference. The faith he has cannot have been the precondition of God's choice, but God's choice must have been the precedent cause of his faith. In this form of the doctrine, we did not first choose him, but he first chose us. This truth enters into all genuine Christian experience. It is of the essence of the universal Christian sentiment. It finds its expression in the sacred hymns and in the prayers of our fellow-Christians who call themselves Arminians, as it does in the prayers and hymns of those commonly styled Calvinists. All alike wrestle in prayer as if God's grace determined the decision. All alike cry, "Make them willing, O God, in the day of thy power!" It is the common confession of all alike that it is God who in all things works in us to do, by "working in us to will, of his good pleasure." All alike ascribe to him the prerogative of turning the hearts of men even as rivers of water are turned. All Christians with one voice cry, "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto thy name give glory, for thy mercy and for thy truth's sake." In the theology of the heart all Christians are Calvinists — that is, all Christians ascribe all their salvation unto God. And this is the only form in which the doctrine of sovereign predestination should be insisted upon as of vital religious interest.

II. The real question remains, What does the Word of God say upon the subject? In all matters of controversy between Christians the Scriptures constitute the single court of last resort. This is an historical principle. To-day it remains as true as ever, no matter what crude theories of inspiration some parties may proclaim. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments have been for eighteen centuries, are to-day, and always will remain, the only common authority of Christendom, acknowledged by all alike.

These Scriptures do certainly teach a divine election of persons and foreordination of events. This fact all educated persons acknowledge. The only controversy among Christians relates to the range of the foreordination, whether it comprehends all events or is limited to certain classes; and to the subjects, the objects, and the conditions of the election which the Scriptures teach.

1st. All Christians of course admit that the eternal Creator of the world, in the very act of creation, intelligently comprehending the end from the beginning, really, immutably, and unconditionally determined all classes of events subsequently brought about by the necessary sequences of natural forces and laws. As far as the universe is a machine, God, in bringing it into being, and in implanting its forces, and in ordaining its laws, necessarily determined all movements of the machine and its results from the beginning to the end. But there has been a natural shrinking from attributing to the foreordination of God all the free acts of men and angels, and especially the sinful acts of men and devils.

Nevertheless, the Scriptures are very explicit upon these points. (1.) The foreordination of God does include the free actions of men and angels, as it does all other classes of events whatsoever. God works in man freely and spontaneously to will according to his good pleasure (Php 2:13). Men and nations are the mere instruments (the axe, saw, rod) in the hand of God to do his will (Isaiah 10:15). God definitely predicts the free actions of men ages before the men themselves exist (Isaiah 44:28; Isaiah 45:1-4). All prophecy implies foreknowledge; and all foreknowledge on the part of a God who has intelligently and of purpose created all things out of nothing, of course implies the foreordination of all the foreseen results of that creation. If even one so limited in knowledge and power as you or I should place in the hands of a dependant a horse that we certainly knew would run away on that road and in the hands of that man, beyond question we would predetermine that runaway and all of its foreseen results. (2.) The Scriptures go even further, and declare that even the sinful acts of men are foreordained by God. This does not mean that God regards the wicked acts with complacency, or that he will condone them, or that we are in any degree excusable for acting them, much less that God is their author or cause, directly or indirectly. It means, simply, that these wicked actions were a clearly foreknown part of a system of things which God freely chose, and the future existence of which he freely and righteously determined for good and sufficient reasons, the evil never being ordained as an end in itself, but always as a means to an infinitely greater and better end. Thus, in the history of Joseph (compare Genesis 37:28 with Genesis 45:7-8; Genesis 50:20), Joseph said to his treacherous brethren who sold him into slavery, “So now it was not you that sent me hither, but God ;“ “But as for you, ye thought evil against me; but God meant it unto good.” (Psalms 17:13-14, and Isaiah 10:5-15) The greatest crime ever committed in the universe was the crucifixion of the Son of God. To accomplish this, Gentiles and Jews in vast numbers and of all classes freely conspired. Yet their wicked act was “determined beforehand to be done” by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God: “Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain” (Acts 2:23). “For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod, and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done” (Acts 4:27-28; Acts 13:29; 1 Peter 2:8; Jude 1:4; Revelation 17:17).

2nd. As to the doctrine of election, and of the confessedly various “elections” which are asserted in Scripture, there have been very different opinions held among Christians. Those who lay emphasis upon what has been entitled the “theory of national election,” as eminently the late Archbishop Sumner, maintain that the only election taught in Scripture concerning human salvation consists in the divine predestination of communities and nations to the knowledge of the true religion, and to the external privileges of the gospel. This form of election is an unquestionable biblical fact, and has been pre-eminently illustrated in the people of Israel, in the ancient world, and in the great English-speaking nations of modern times.

Those who, like Mr. Stanley Faber and Archbishop Whately, emphasize what they call the “theory of ecclesiastical individualism,” hold that the only personal election taught in the Bible respects the election of individual men to membership in the external Church and the means of grace. This also is an unquestionable scriptural fact, realized in the experience of all the members of the Christian community.

Both these types of election, both of nations and of individuals, to the external means of grace are obviously sovereign and unconditioned. Both men and nations are born to these privileges, irrespective of any previous merits or actions of their own. And as to these forms of God's sovereign election, there is no difference of opinion between Arminians and Calvinists or other Christians of whatever name. But students of the Scriptures see that they do moreover teach explicitly that God does elect some individuals to eternal blessedness and to all the means thereof. Here the precise point of difference between Arminians and Calvinists comes in. The old Arminian statement was that God graciously elected the class of believers to everlasting life, and that if any individual man was included in the election it was because he was included in the class of believers. The more modern Arminian statement is to the same effect; in other words, that God elected certain individuals to eternal life, on the ground of their faith as foreseen by him. But the question necessarily arises, Where did these individuals come by their faith? If they got the faith of themselves, then their salvation is not entirely of grace and of God. If God gave them their faith, then it was in his purpose; and if it was embraced in his purpose, it could not have been the condition on which it was suspended. But the Scriptures and Christian experience unite in affirming that "faith is the gift of God" (Ephesians 2:8; Acts 5:31; 1 Corinthians 4:7). The designed effect of this eternal election is " that we should he holy, and without blame before him in love" (Ephesians 1:4; Ephesians 2:10; 2 Thessalonians 2:13; 1 Peter 1:2), and therefore that holy state could not have been the foreseen condition of his choice. The very gist of the election is that of the children who "neither had done good or evil," "that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth." God chose one and rejected the other. The very gist was that "the potter hath power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour " (Romans 9:11-21). The order in which the Holy Spirit puts the matter is very clear: "As many as were ordained to eternal life believed" (Acts 13:48). It was the personal foreordination to eternal life which determined the believing, and not the foreseen believing which conditioned the foreordination. The true comprehensive statement of the scriptural teaching as to election includes all those just stated. The purpose of God is sovereign, absolute, and all-comprehensive, relating to all classes of events whatsoever. All nations and communities and individuals have been predestined precisely to all the relations and means of grace they experience, and to all the results thereof. But beides this, the Scriptures explicitly teach an election (a) of individuals (b) to salvation, and to all the means and conditions thereof, (c) founded, not upon the foreseen faith of the persons elected, but upon the infinitely wise and sovereign purpose of God alone (Ephesians 1:5-11; 2 Timothy 1:9; John 15:16-19; Matthew 11:25-26; Romans 9:10-18).

III. The difficulty which all feel in attempting to receive this unquestionable truth of revelation, and assimilate it to the whole mass of our own thinking, respects (1) the freedom and responsibility of man, and (2) the holiness of God. How can man he free if from eternity all his actions have been certainly determined? And if God by his decree makes the future occurrence of each sin absolutely certain, how can he be holy? These combinations doubtless present puzzles of considerable difficulty to our minds in their present state of enlightenment. But these do not in any degree differ from a large class of problems which the imperfection and narrowness of our knowledge prevent us from solving. God's decree, it is obvious, is not an immediate efficient cause which interferes with natural causes or which brings anything into being. It is simply an immanent plan or purpose in the divine mind which determines the certain occurrence of the events to which it relates. The

same precisely is true with respect to the divine foreknowledge. All Christians believe that God eternally foreknows whatsoever shall be in the future. If his knowledge is real knowledge, it is certain; and if it is certain as knowledge, the events to which it relates must be certainly future. If the difficulty of reconciling certainty with the freedom of man or with the holiness of God does not move us to abandon his foreknowledge, it cannot be a rational motive for our denying the truth of his universal predestination. A God without foreknowledge would be only a blind force. Every argument which establishes theism on the evident teleology of the universe by equal cogency establishes the divine foreknowledge. Without the foreknowledge of God there would be no intelligent creation, no wise moral government, no ground for religious trust, no confidence for the future, no basis for either the prophecies or the promises of God. The foreknowledge admitted, there is no logical reason for excepting to his foreordination.

1st. As to the bearing of this doctrine upon the freedom of man's will. It must be remembered that uncertainty is never essential to liberty. The essence of liberty is that the free act shall be self-originated and self-directed. The self-determination of an undeveloped child is uncertain. It is swayed every moment by external influences; and in just that proportion the child's action is uncertain, and lacks the highest quality of moral freedom. But the choices of the educated and thoroughly developed man in his ripe maturity are far more certain both to himself and to others. He is not open to external influence or liable to internal whim or change; and exactly in that proportion does he rise to the highest level of moral freedom. He thoroughly understands himself and his permanent needs and wishes. His character is formed, and freedom is the genuine and adequate expression of character. God's purposes and self-decisions are the most certain, and at the same time the most free, of any actions that are conceivable. A drifting boat at sea, swept hither and thither by the winds and waves, is an admirable type of action utterly devoid of freedom and of certainty. It has no self-control, and therefore its action is equally unfree and uncertain. But a great steamship, at the same time self-propelled and self-steered, is an admirable type both of freedom and of certainty. Its action is predetermined, foreseen, and may confidently be relied upon, because it is free — that is, in the intelligent will of its navigator, acting through its powerful machinery, it possesses in the highest degree self-control and intelligent self-direction. The eternal foreordination of God, which determines at once the certainty and the freedom of man's free actions, can in no way interfere with man's freedom. The action is not free if it is determined from without, but it is free if determined from within a rational will. Now, this is precisely what God's foreordination of man's free action effects. The decree at the same time determines that man shall be a free agent, shall possess a certain character, shall be surrounded by a certain environment, shall be specifically solicited by certain external influences, shall he internally moved by certain spontaneous affections, shall deliberately canvass certain reasons, and shall freely make a certain choice. The man thus is, as far as a finite creature may be, entirely self-moved and self-determined, and therefore he is free. The fact that his act is also certain is, as we have seen, and as Richard Watson, the great theologian of the Wesleyan Arminians, admits, no ground of presumption that it is not also absolutely free.

2nd. As to the consistency of God's foreordination of sin with his holiness, we have nothing to say except to admit the mystery, and to affirm that there is no possible escape except in denying the fact either of the existence of God on the one hand, or of the existence of sin on the other. If the cause which produced the universe did not foresee the sin which the present system embraces,

then that cause was a blind, unintelligent force, and not God. If he did foresee it, and notwithstanding proceeded to bring that system, involving these sins, into existence, then he made their occurrence certain; he foreordained them. God did with his eyes open choose, out of a myriad of other possible systems, this actual system involving sin. He nevertheless is holy. He hates, forbids, punishes, restrains, and overrules the sin for good. In the light of the cross of Christ, on which God lays upon his Son the penalty of human sin, in the light of the great white throne and of the Lamb which irradiates the eternal city, the mystery of the divine permission of sin loses its overwhelming force. We have no complete solution of the problem, and it is not to be expected in our present stage of education. But we do see the light underneath the curtain. We do possess pledges for the immaculate holiness of God, and for the future moral perfection of his realm, and for the moral vindication of his reign, which suffice for the perfect assurance of our faith.

IV. Everything depends, in all departments of human thought, upon the point of view. Every one knows that, when traversing the scenes of a great battle, what appears to be inextricable confusion to us while we are passing along the outskirts and through the lower grounds, falls into complete order and appears as clear as light when we overlook the whole field from the strategic centre from which the eye and mind of the fieldmarshal beheld and controlled the contest. We all know that the heavens continued through all past ages to he an insoluble riddle to all looking upon them from the exterior and shifting standpoint of the earth. The movements of the sun and moon and of the wandering planets could be reduced to no intelligible plan. But the moment that in imagination the great Copernicus transferred the point of view from the earth to the central sun, all the hosts of heaven fell into rank, and have ever since been seen to march onward in a symmetrical order absolutely divine. In the morning, if we look eastward over a vast landscape with the sun before us, we see all things obscurely on their shadowed side. But if we look from the same point eastward in the evening, with the sun behind us, we see all the objects contained in the vast panorama glorified on the sunlit side. In like manner must it be with all men when looking over the vast reaches of Jehovah's plans or works from below. No matter how intellectual they may be personally, no matter how vast their knowledge otherwise, it is just a matter of course that, from their human, changing outlook, as they are themselves swept along in the current of events, the relations of all objects should be confused. And especially must the relation of the several parts to God be misconceived, seen as they are on their shadowed side.

But, on the contrary, if we take our mental stand at the centre, and from God's point of view look down upon the events of time from their common centre, with their eternal side illumined, as far as our vision goes we shall see then fall into perfect order, and especially will we discern their symmetrical relation as a whole to the Source from which they issue, and the presiding Authority by which they are marshalled on their way.

It is self-evident that if we look out at any time and from any point upon our environment, we must see things in the accidental relations in which they happen to group themselves along our line of vision as we sweep past on our course. We must also, by the same necessity, see things in partial groups detached from their surroundings. If we conceive of any one event being caused by any other single event, we are led to confusion, because all things that exist constitute one articulated system, and every event is determined not by one single antecedent cause, but by the whole system of things, the entire equilibrium of the universe, that precedes it. So if we conceive of God as absolutely foreordaining individual events disconnected from the entire system of causes,

conditions, and consequents of which they form a part, we shall necessarily be embarrassed by contradictions. God could not certainly foreordain one event without foreordaining every event, without tearing the system to pieces and bringing utter confusion into natural law and human thought. For instance, a chronometer is a whole consisting of many parts rigidly articulated and exquisitely adjusted to each other. It would, evidently, be impossible for the most skilful mechanic to run his fingers into the plexus of the wheels anti springs, with the intent of controlling the action of one part irrespective of the rest, without working confusion and ruin. Nevertheless, the chronometer as a whole, with all its contents freely working according to their law, undisturbed, may he lifted and carried round the world without changing the relation of interdependence of part on part. In like manner, if we will only make the effort to look upon the universe from God's point of view, as one all-comprehensive, complete system in itself, much of the apparent difficulty attending the principle of eternal predestination will disappear.

We can possibly conceive of the intelligence of God only so far forth as its laws are analogous to those of time intellect of man. We can only think of his mind as eternally teeming with all possible systems, embracing all possible creatures, grouped in all possible relations, and subject to all possible laws. By the "possible" we mean every existence that can be under the limits of God's infinitely wise and righteous nature. Out of all possible systems as wholes God chose the existing system of the universe, including all existence, spiritual and material, that has been, is, or will be, constituted as it is, with all its parts mutually interdependent as they are, as one whole. Viewed in this way, there is no conflict. The cause produces its effects, the event depends on its conditions; necessary agents act according to their nature, and free agents exercise spontaneously their perfect freedom: all the parts of the system act according to their several kinds; nevertheless, the system as a whole, including all its parts, has been from eternity made certain by the sovereign choice of God. The point of view from which all difficulty disappears is infinitely higher and commands infinitely wider reaches of thought than the point of view from which foreordination and free-will are seen to be inconsistent. The new theology, asserting the narrowness of the old, is discarding the foreordination of Jehovah as a wornout figment of the schools discredited by the advanced culture of to-day. This is not the first time that the owls, mistaking the shadow of a passing eclipse for their native night, have prematurely hooted at the eagles, convinced that what is invisible to them cannot possibly exist.

V. It is often objected to the biblical doctrine of predestination that, however much it may be apparently supported by the language of Scripture, it is utterly antagonized by all established truth in every other department of human thought — by all the united testimonies of philosophy and science. This preposterous claim is loudly voiced, even by some of the professed advocates of progress in theology. But the facts are all absolutely to the contrary. So much is this the case, so universally do all the real governing currents of modern thought outside of Christian theology run in the direction of universal determinism, rather than in that of the admission of the indeterminate, the contingent, the spontaneous and free, that many of us who are the staunchest Calvinists feel that the need of the hour is not to emphasize a foreordination, which no clear, comprehensive thinker doubts, hut to unite with our Arminian brethren in putting all emphasis and concentrating all attention on the vital fact of human freedom. That our consciousness of personal freedom is reliable, that we in a true sense stand outside of the current of necessary causation and do truly originate and give direction to our own actions, is a principle fundamental to all morals and all

religion. Its permanent vindication is the one only and effectual solvent of all pantheism and all materialism. So strong does the current set on all sides throughout the sphere of human speculation, in favour of the conviction of universal preordination, that we can afford to leave its vindication to others, while we support with our suffrages the neglected though essential counter-truth of the real freedom of the human soul.

All the philosophy and science of the century is deterministic. The great argument of Jonathan Edwards against the liberty of contingency and in favour of the liberty of certainty has been taken up and intensified by John Stuart Mill and Herbert Spencer to support the doctrine of necessity. The universally received scientific principle of continuity involves this principle of foreordination. The now almost universally prevalent scientific doctrine of evolution, in all its infinite variety of forms, and in every form alike, involves this principle of foreordination. The funniest reading accessible even in this humorous age is that in which a progressive theologian, committing himself everywhere to the evolution method, yet declares that the doctrine of divine foreordination is false because unscientific. All philosophies which are either materialistic in tendency or pantheistic or purely theistic necessarily involve the principle of foreordination.

Every conceivable philosophy must ultimately found the universe upon mechanism, chance, or upon personal intelligence and will. If mechanism he the ultimate self-existent principle out of which the universe is developed and operated, then fatalism is true. If chance be the ultimate principle, then accident, contingency, uncertainty must be in the method, and chaos the ultimate goal. If a personal, intelligent will be the ultimate principle, then Providence is the executive in time of an eternal purpose. All philosophies may be classified under these heads. All the possibilities of speculation must lie within these limits. Instead of our doctrine of foreordination being the same with the heathen doctrine of fate, it is its absolute opposite and only alternative. We are shut up to a choice between the two — either a fatalism which results from mechanical co-action, or a fatalism which results from a mindless and purposeless chance, or an all-controlling providence of a heavenly Father who, in the exercise of his own personal freedom, has made room for ours. All thinkers who understand themselves know that they run along one or other of these lines. The wiseacres who plead the authority of philosophy and science as inconsistent with the scriptural doctrine of predestination may be safely left to themselves. They will not be found to be dangerous enemies even behind our hacks.

VI. Here, as everywhere else, there is essential truth on both sides of every controversy, and the real truth is time whole truth, its entire catholic body. Arminianism in the abstract as an historical scheme is a heresy, holding half the truth. Calvinism is an historical scheme which in its best representatives comprehends the whole truth with considerable completeness. But the case is essentially different when we come to consider the great co-existing bodies of Christian people calling themselves respectively Calvinists and Arminians. Each of these parties holds all essential truth, and therefore they hold actually very much the same truth. The Arminians think anti speak very much like Calvinists when they come to talk with God in either the confession of sin or the supplication for grace. They both alike in that attitude recognize the sovereignty of God and the guilt anti helplessness of men. Indeed, how could it be otherwise? What room is there for anything other than essential Calvinism on one’s knees? On the other hand, the Calvinist thinks and speaks like the better class of Arminians when he addresses the consciences of men, and pleads with them, as free, responsible agents, to repent and believe in Christ, The difference between the best

of either class is one of emphasis rather than of essential principle. Each is time complement of the other. Each is necessary to restrain, correct, and supply the one-sided strain of the other. They together give origin to the blended strain from which issues the perfect music which utters the perfect truth.

VII. It is now-a-days frequently predicted by men in high places that the distinctive doctrines of Calvinism are doomed. The future is uncertain; the role of prophet is unprofitable and unbecoming. But the history of the past stands fast. The doctrine of predestination, with its associated system of truths, has had a wonderful history. All world-movers have believed it surely and have taught it clearly — Paul, Augustine, all the Reformers without exception. During the eleven hundred years which elapsed from the time of Augustine to that of Luther, all the best of time schoolmen, all the great missionary movements, the revivals of true religion, the extension of popular education, and all great healthy political reforms, had their common inspiration in Augustinian theology. All time great national movements in France, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, and Britain in the era of the Reformation, and all the great national leaders, as Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Cranmer, and Knox, were distinctively Augustinian, and were rooted in predestination. The most moral people of all history, the Puritans, Pietists, Huguenots, Reformed Dutch of Holland and German of the Palatinate, and the Scotch and the Scotch-Irish of Ulster and the United States, were all Calvinists. Calvin, William of Orange, Cromwell, and the Presbyterian and Congregational founders of the government of the United States, and all the great creators of modern civil liberty, were Calvinists. All modern provision for universal education sprang from time Scotch parochial school and the New England college. The patriots, free-state makers, martyrs, missionaries of all the modern era, have been, in nine hundred and ninety-nine parts out of the thousand, distinctively Calvinist. This history is glorious and secure past all contradiction. It is natural also — a natural outgrowth of consequences out of principles. Predestination exalts God, and abases man before God. It makes all men low before God, but high and strong before kings. It founds on a basis of eternal rock one absolute Sovereign, to whose will there is no limit, but it levels all other sovereigns in the dust. It renders Christ great, and the believing sinner infinitely secure in him. It establishes the highest conceivable standard of righteousness, and secures the operation of the most effective motives to obedience. It extinguishes fear, it makes victory certain, it inspires with enthusiasm, it makes both the heart and the arm strong. The Ironsides of Cromwell made the decree of predestination their base; hence they never lost a battle, and always began the swelling chorus of victory from the first moment that the ranks were formed. The man to whom in all the universe there is no God is an atheist. The man to whom God is distant, and to whom the influence of God is vague and uncertain, is an Arminian. But he who altogether lives and moves and has all his being in the immanent Jehovah is a Calvinist.

Author

A.A. Hodge (1823-1886), Professor in Systematic Theology at Princeton Seminary from 1877 until his death in 1886, urged that the aim of every Christian teacher should be to produce a vitalizing impression — giving students ‘theology, exposition, demonstration, orthodoxy, learning, but giving all this to them warm.’ ‘He taught the knowledge of God,’ said one of his hearers, ‘with the learning of a scholar and the enthusiasm of a loving Christian’. These qualities not only crowded his classrooms, they also led to frequent appeals for the delivery of popular lectures. The one presented here is one of nineteen lectures delivered in Philadelphia early in 1886. The whole of

them has been published in one volume, Evangelical Theology: Lectures on Doctrine by the Banner of Truth Trust.

S. ROMANS CHAPTER 5:1-11

Romans 5:1-11

CONTENTS FROM Romans 5:1-11, INCLUSIVE, THE APOSTLE DEDUCES SOME OF THE MORE OBVIOUS AND CONSOLATORY INFERENCES FROM THE DOCTRINE OF GRATUITOUS JUSTIFICATION. FROM THE 12TH VERSE TO THE END, HE ILLUSTRATES HIS GREAT PRINCIPLE OF THE IMPUTATION OF RIGHTEOUSNESS, OR THE REGARDING AND TREATING THE MANY AS RIGHTEOUS, ON ACCOUNT OF THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF ONE MAN, CHRIST JESUS, BY A REFERENCE TO THE FALL OF ALL MEN IN ADAM.

Romans 5:1-11.

ANALYSIS THE first consequence of justification by faith is, that we have peace with God, Romans 5:1. The second, that we have not only a sense of his present favor, but assurance of future glory, Romans 5:2. The third, that our afflictions, instead of being inconsistent with the divine favor, are made directly conducive to the confirmation of our hope; the Holy Spirit bearing witness to the fact that we are the objects of the love of God, Romans 5:3 - Deuteronomy The fourth, the certainty of the final salvation of all believers. This is argued from the freeness and greatness of the divine love; its freeness being manifested in its exercise towards the unworthy: and its greatness, in the gift of the Son of God, Romans 5:6 - 2 Samuel Salvation is not merely a future though certain good, it is a present and abundant joy, Romans 5:11.

COMMENTARY

Romans 5:1. Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God; that is, we are reconciled to God. We are no longer the objects of God’s displeasure, his favor having been propitiated by the death of his Son, Romans 5:10. As a consequence of this reconciliation, we have conscious peace with God, that is, we have neither any longer the present upbraidings of an unappeased conscience, nor the dread of divine vengeance. Both these ideas are included in the peace here spoken of. The latter, however, is altogether the more prominent. The phrase eirhnhn eirhnhn ecomen proV ton Qeon, we have peace in regard to God, properly means, God is at peace with us, his orgh (wrath) towards us is removed. It expresses, as Philippi says, "not a state of mind, but a relation to God." It is that relation which arises from the expiation of sin, and consequently justification. We are no longer his enemies, in the objective sense of the term (see Romans 5:10), but are the objects of his favor. The whole context still treats of reconciliation and propitiation, of the removal of the wrath of God by the death of his Son, and not of inward sanctification. It is true that the immediate and certain effect of God’s reconciliation to us is our reconciliation to him. If he is at peace with us, we have inward peace. Conscience is only the reflection of his countenance, the echo, often feeble and indistinct, often terribly clear and unmistakable, of his judgment; and therefore subjective peace uniformly attends faith in the love of God, or assurance of our justification. Although, therefore, the primary idea of the apostle is, that God is at peace with us, it is nevertheless true that inward tranquility of mind is the fruit of justification by faith. It is peculiarly

an evangelical doctrine, that pious affections are the fruit of this reconciliation to God, and not the cause of it. Paul says this peace is the result of justification by faith. He who relies on his works for justification, can have no peace. He can neither remove the displeasure of God, nor quiet the apprehension of punishment. Peace is not the result of mere gratuitous forgiveness, but of justification, of a reconciliation founded upon atonement. The enlightened conscience is never satisfied until it sees that God can be just in justifying the ungodly; that sin has been punished, the justice of God satisfied, his law honored and vindicated. It is when he thus sees justice and mercy embracing each other, that the believer has that peace which passes all understanding; that sweet quiet of the soul in which deep humility, in view of personal unworthiness, is mingled with the warmest gratitude to that Savior by whose blood God's justice has been satisfied, and conscience appeased. Hence Paul says we have this peace through our Lord Jesus Christ. It is not through ourselves in any way, neither by our own merit, nor our own efforts. It is all of grace. It is all through Jesus Christ. And this the justified soul is ever anxious to acknowledge. "Pacem habemus. Singulalis justitiae fidei fructus. Nam siquis ab operibus conscientiae securitatem petere velit, (quod in profanis et brutis hominibus cernitur,) frustra id tentabit. Aut enim contemptu vel oblivione Divini judicii sopitum est pectus, aut trepidatione ac formidine quoque plenum est, donec in Christum recubuerit. Ipse enim solus est pax nostra. Pax ergo conscientiae serenitatem significat, quae es eo nascitur, quod Deum sibi reconciliatum sentit." Calvin.

Romans 5:2. By whom also we have access by faith into this grace, etc. This verse admits of different interpretations. According to one view, it introduces a new and higher benefit than peace with God, as the consequence of our justification: 'We have not only peace, but access (to God), and joyful confidence of salvation.' Besides other objections to this interpretation, it overlooks the difference between ecomen and eschkamen, rendering both, we have: 'We have peace, and we have access;' whereas eschkamen is properly, we have had. This clause, therefore, instead of indicating an additional and higher blessing than the peace spoken of in ver. 1, expresses the ground of that peace: 'We have peace with God through Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom also we have had access into this grace.' So Meyer, Philippi, etc. 'We are indebted to Christ not only for peace, but also for access to this grace, (this state of justification,) which is the ground of our peace.' The word prosagwgh means either introduction or access. In Ephesians 2:18; and Ephesians 3:12, it has the latter meaning, which may be retained here. In both the other places in which it occurs, it is used of access to God. Many commentators so understand it in this place, and therefore put a comma after eschkamen, and connect pistei with eiV thn carin tauthn. The sense would then be, 'Through whom also we have had access to God, by faith on this grace.' The objections to this explanation are, that it supposes an omission in the text, and that the expression "faith on the grace," has no scriptural analogy. The obviously natural construction is to connect prosagwghn with eiV thn carin tauthn, as is done in our version, and by the great majority of commentators, and to take th pistei instrumentally, by faith. The grace to which we have access, or into which we have been introduced, is the state of justification. The fact, therefore, that we are justified, we, rather than others, is not due to anything in us. We did not open the way, or introduce ourselves into this state. We were brought into it by Christ. "Accessûs quidem nomine initium salutis a Christo esse docens, preparationes excludit, quibus stulti homines Dei misericordiam se antevertere putant; acsi diceret, Christum nihil promeritis obviam venire manumque porrigere." Calvin. In which we stand. The antecedent of the relative (h) is not pistei, but carin; in which grace we stand; that is, we are firm; and immovably established. So in John 8:44, it is said of Satan, that

he stood not (ouc esthken) in the truth, did not remain steadfast therein. 1 Corinthians 15:1, "Wherein ye stand," 2 Corinthians 1:24. The state, therefore, into which the believer is introduced by Christ, is not a precarious one. He has not only firm ground on which to stand, but he has strength divinely imparted to enable him to keep his foothold. And rejoice in hope of the glory of God. The word kaucaomai is one of Paul's favorite terms. It properly means to talk of one's self, to praise one's self, to boast; then to congratulate one's self, to speak of ourselves as glorious or blessed; and then to felicitate ourselves in anything as a ground of confidence and source of honor and blessedness. Men are commanded not to glory (kaucasqai) in themselves, or in men, or in the flesh, but in God alone. In this passage the word may be rendered, to rejoice, 'we rejoice in hope.' Still something more than mere joy is intended. It is a glorying, a self-felicitation and exultation, in view of the exaltation and blessedness which Christ has secured for us. In hope of the glory of God. The object or ground of the rejoicing or boasting expressed by this verb is indicated here by epi; commonly, in the New Testament, the matter of the boasting is indicated by en, sometimes by uper and peri. The glory of God may mean that glory which God gives, or that glory which he possesses. In either case, it refers to the exaltation and blessedness secured to the believer, who is to share in the glory of his divine Redeemer. "The glory which thou gavest me," said our Lord, "I have given them," John 7:22. There is a joyful confidence expressed in these words, an assurance of ultimate salvation, which is the appropriate effect of justification. We are authorized and bound to feel sure that, having through Jesus Christ been reconciled to God, we shall certainly be saved. This is only a becoming confidence in the merit of his sacrifice, and in the sincerity of God's love. This confidence is not founded on ourselves, neither on the preposterous idea that we deserve the favor of God, nor the equally preposterous idea that we have in ourselves strength to persevere in faith or obedience. Our confidence is solely on the merit of Christ, and the gratuitous and infinite love of God. Although this assurance is the legitimate effect of reconciliation, and the want of it is evidence of weakness, still in this, as in other respects, the actual state of the believer generally falls far short of the ideal. He ever lives below his privileges, and goes limping and halting, when he should mount up as with the wings of the eagle. Still it is important for him to know that assurance is not an unseemly presumption, but a privilege and duty. "Hic evertuntur," says Calvin, "pestilentissima duo sophistarum dogmata, alterum, quo jubent Christianos esse contentos conjectura morali in percipienda erga se Dei gratia, alterum, quo tradunt olunes esse incertos finalis perseverentiae. Atqui nisi et certa in praesens intelligentia, et in futurum constans ac minime dubia sit persuasio, quis gloriari auderet?"

Romans 5:3-4. And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also. Not only dowe rejoice in this hope of future glory, but we glory in tribulations also.Since our relation to God is changed, the relation of all things to us ischanged. Afflictions, which before were the expressions of God'sdispleasure, are now the benevolent and beneficent manifestations of hislove. And instead of being inconsistent with our filial relation to him, theyserve to prove that he regards and loves us as his children; Romans 8:18; Hebrews 12:6. Tribulations, therefore, although for the present not joyous,but grievous, become to the believer matter of joy and thankfulness. The words kaucwmeqa en taiV qliyesin do not mean that we glory in themidst of afflictions, but on account of them. They are themselves thematter or ground of the glorying. So the Jews are said to glory (en) in thelaw, others glory in men, the believer glories in the Lord; so constantly. Afflictions themselves are to the Christian a ground of glorying; he feelsthem to be an honor and a blessing. This is a sentiment often expressed inthe word of God. Our Lord says, "Blessed are they who mourn;" "Blessed are

the persecuted;" "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you." He callson his suffering disciples to rejoice and be exceeding glad when they areafflicted. Matthew 5:4, Matthew 5:10-12. The apostles departed from the Jewish council, "rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame forChrist's name." Acts 5:41. Peter calls upon Christians to rejoice when they are partakers of Christ's sufferings, and pronounces them happywhen they are reproached for his sake. 1 Peter 4:13, 1 Peter 4:14. And Paul says, "Most gladly therefore will I glory in (on account of) my infirmities," (i.e.my sufferings.) "I take pleasure," he says, "in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake." 2 Corinthians 12:9, 2 Corinthians 12:10. This is not irrational or fanatical. Christians do not glory insuffering, as such, or for its own sake, but as the Bible teaches, 1. Because they consider it an honor to suffer for Christ.

2. Because they rejoice in being the occasion of manifesting his power in their support and deliverance; and,

3. Because suffering is made the means of their own sanctification and preparation for usefulness here, and for heaven hereafter. The last of these reasons is that to which the apostle refers in the context. We glory in afflictions, he says, because affliction worketh patience, upomonh, constancy. It calls into exercise that strength and firmness evinced in patient endurance of suffering, and in perseverance in fidelity to truth and duty, under the severest trials. And this constancy worketh experience, dokimh. This word means,

1. Trial, as in 2 Corinthians 8:2, "In a great trial of affliction," i.e. in affliction which is a trial, that which puts men to the test.

2. Evidence or proof, as in 2 Corinthians 13:3, "Since ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me." Compare 2 Corinthians 2:9; Php 2:22. This would give a good sense here: 'Constancy produces evidence' of the fidelity of God, or of our fidelity.

3. The word is used metonymically for the result of trial, i.e. approbation, or that which is proved worthy of approbation: 'dokimh est qualitas ejus, qui est dokimoV.' Bengel. It is tried integrity, a state of mind which has stood the test. Compare James 1:12, "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation, (oV upomenei peirasmon;) for when he is tried (oti dokimoV genomenoV) he shall receive the crown of life." _Upomonh, the endurance of trial, therefore, makes a man dokimoV; in other words, it worketh dokimh. It produces a strong, tested faith. Hence the parallel expression, to dokimion umwn thV pistewV, the trying of your faith. 1 Peter 1:7. And this dokimh, well tested faith, or this endurance of trial produces hope; tends to confirm and strengthen the hope of the glory of God, which we owe to our justification through Jesus Christ.

Romans 5:5. And hope maketh not ashamed, (kataiscunei.) Not to makeashamed, is not to put us to the shame of disappointment. The hope of thebeliever, says Calvin, "habet certissimum salutis exitum." It certainlyeventuates in salvation. See 9:33. The hope which true believers entertain,founded on the very nature of pious exercises, shall never disappoint them, Psalms 22:5. The ground of this assurance, however, is not the strength ofour purpose, or confidence in our own goodness, but the love of God. Thelatter clause of the verse assigns the reason why the Christian's hope shallnot be found delusive; it is because the love of God is shed abroad in ourhearts, by the Holy Ghost given unto us. 'The love of God' is his love tous, and not ours to him, as appears from the following verses, in which theapostle illustrates the greatness and freeness of

this love, by a reference tothe unworthiness of its objects. To shed abroad, (ekkecutai, it has been,and continues to be shed abroad,) is to communicate abundantly, and henceto evince clearly, Acts 2:17, Acts 2:10, Acts 2:45; Titus 3:6. This manifestation of divinelove is not any external revelation of it in the works of Providence, or evenin redemption, but it is in our hearts, en taiV kardiaiV hmwn, diffusedabroad within our hearts, where en in, is not used for eiV, into. "The loveof God," says Philippi, "does not descend upon us as dew in drops, but asa stream which spreads itself abroad through the whole soul, filling it withthe consciousness of his presence and favor. And this inward persuasionthat we are the objects of the love of God, is not the mere result of theexamination of evidence, nor is it a vain delusion, but it is produced by theHoly Ghost:" The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we arethe children of God," Romans 8:16; 2 Corinthians 1:21, 2 Corinthians 1:22; Ephesians 1:14. As, however, the Spirit never contradicts himself, he never bearswitness that "the children of the devil" are the children of God; that is, thatthe unholy, the disobedient, the proud or malicious, are the objects of thedivine favor. Any reference, therefore, by the immoral, to the witness ofthe Spirit in their favor, must be vain and delusive.

Romans 5:6. For when we were yet without strength. The connection of thisverse, as indicated by gar, is with Romans 5:5. We are the object of God’s love,for Christ died for us. The gift of Christ to die on our behalf, is everywherein Scripture represented as the highest possible or conceivable proof of thelove of God to sinners. John 3:16; 1 John 3:16; 1 John 4:9, 1 John 4:10. The objection thatthe Church doctrine represents the death of Christ as exciting or procuring the love of an unloving God, is without the shadow of foundation. Thescriptures represent the love of God to sinners as independent of the workof Christ, and anterior to it. He so loved us as to give his only begottenSon to reconcile our salvation with his justice. In the Greek of this passage,eti gar CristoV ontwn hmwn asqenwn, the eti, yet, is out of its naturalplace; it belongs to ontwn asqenwn (as in Romans 5:8, eti amartwlwn,) andnot to CristoV. Such trajections of the particles are not unusual even inclassical Greek. See Winer, § 61, 4: ’Christ died for us, when we were yetweak.’ This slight irregularity has given rise to considerable diversity ofreadings even in the older manuscripts. Some, instead of eti at thebeginning of the verse, have eige or eiV ti, and place et, after asqenwn;others have eti both at the beginning and at the end of the clause. Thegreat majority of editors and commentators retain the common reading, andrefer the eti to ontwn, etc., as is done in our version. We being yet weak.The weakness here intended is spiritual weakness, destitution of strengthfor what is spiritually good, a weakness arising from, and consisting insinfulness. The same idea, therefore, is expressed in Romans 5:8, by the words,eti amartwlwn, when we were yet sinners. What, in Isaiah 53:4, isexpressed by the LXX. in the words taV amartiaV hmwn jerei, hebears our sins, is, in Matthew 8:17, expressed by saying, taV asqeneiaVhmwn elabe, he took our weaknesses. In due time, kata, are not to beconnected with the preceding participial, ’we being weak according to (orconsidering) the time,’ secundum rationem temporis, as Calvin and Luther,after Chrysostom and Theodoret, render it, but with the following verb,apeqane, he died kata kairon. This may mean, at the appointed, or atthe appropriate time. The former is more in accordance with the analogy ofScripture. Christ came at the time appointed by the Father. The same ideais expressed in Galatians 4:4, by "the fullness of time;" compare Ephesians 1:10; 1 Timothy 2:6; Titus 1:3; John 5:4. Of course the appointed wasalso the appropriate time. The question only concerns the form in whichthe idea is expressed. He died uper asebwn, for the ungodly. As theapostle had said, ’when we were weak,’ it would have been natural for himto say,

’Christ died for us,’ rather than that he died for the ungodly, had itnot been his design to exalt the gratuitous nature of God’s love. Christ diedfor us the ungodly; and therein, as the apostle goes on to show, is themysteriousness of the divine love revealed. That God should love thegood, the righteous, the pure, the godly, is what we can understand; but that the infinitely Holy should love the unholy. and give his Son for theirredemption, is the wonder of all wonders. "Herein is love, not that weloved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be a propitiation forour sins." 1 John 4:10. As the love of a mother for her child, with whichGod condescends to compare his love towards us, is not founded on theattractive qualities of that child, but is often strongest when its object isthe least worthy, so God loves us when sinners. The whole confidence ofthe apostle in the continuance of this love (and therefore in the finalperseverance of the saints) is founded on its being thus gratuitous. If heloved us because we loved him, he would love us only so long as we lovehim, and on that condition; and then our salvation would depend on theconstancy of our treacherous hearts. But as God loved us as sinners, asChrist died for us as ungodly, our salvation depends, as the apostle argues,not on our loveliness, but on the constancy of the love of God. This ideapervades this whole paragraph, and is brought more distinctly into view inthe following verses. Christ died for the ungodly; that is, in their place, andfor their salvation. The idea of substitution is not indeed necessarilyinvolved in the force of the preposition uper, which means for, in behalfof, while anti means in the peace of. None the less certainly, however, isthe doctrine here taught. To die for a man, means to die for his benefit.And therefore, if this were all that the Scriptures taught concerning therelation between Christ’s death and our salvation, it would remainundecided, whether he died for us as an example, as a martyr, or as asubstitute. But when it is said that he died as a sacrifice, that he gave hislife as a ransom, that he was a propitiation, then the specific method inwhich Christ’s death benefits us is determined. It is therefore with uper,as with our preposition for; whether or not it expresses the idea ofsubstitution depends on the context, and the nature of the subject. In suchpassages as this, and 2 Corinthians 5:15, 2 Corinthians 5:20, 2 Corinthians 5:21; Galatians 3:13; Philemon 1:13, uper involves in it the meaning of anti.

Romans 5:7. For scarcely for a righteous man will one die, yet peradventurefor a good man some would even dare to die. The greatness and freeness ofthe love of God is illustrated in this and the following verse, by makingstill more prominent the unworthiness of its objects: ’It is hardly to beexpected that any one would die, in the place of a merely righteous man,though for the good man, this self-denial might possibly be exercised. But we, so far from being good, were not even righteous; we were sinners,ungodly, and enemies.’ The difference between the words righteous andgood, as here used, is that which, in common usage, is made between justand kind. The former is applied to a man who does all that the law orjustice can demand of him, the latter to him who is governed by love. Thejust man commands respect; the good man calls forth affection. Respectbeing a cold and feeble principle, compared to love, the sacrifices to whichit leads are comparatively slight. This distinction between dikaioV andagaqoV is illustrated by that which Cicero, De Officiis, Lib. 3:15, makesbetween justus and bonus: "Si vir bonus is est qui prodest quibus potest,nocet nemini, recte justum virum, bonum non facile reperiemus." Theinterpretation given above is the one generally adopted; it suits the contest,the signification of the words, and the structure of the passage. The designof the apostle is to represent the death of Christ as an unexampledmanifestation of love. Among men, it was never heard of that one died fora man simply just; the most that human nature could be expected toaccomplish is, that one should die for

his benefactor, or for the good man- one so good as to be characterized and known as the good. There isevidently a climax in the passage, as indicated by the opposition between(moliV and taca) scarcely and possibly. The passage, however, has beendifferently interpreted. Luther takes both dikaiou and tou agaqou asneuters: "Scarcely for the right will any one die, possibly for somethinggood some one might dare to die." Calvin makes no distinction between thewords: "Rarissimum sane inter homines exemplum exstat, ut pro justo quismori sustineat quanquam illud nonnunquam accidere possit." Meyer takesdikaiou as it is without the article, as masculine, but tou agaqou asneuter, and renders the latter clause of the verse interrogatively: "Hardlyfor a righteous man will one die, for who can easily bring himself to die forwhat is good (to agaqon, the good)?" The common interpretation isperfectly satisfactory, and to these, other objections more or less decisivemay be adduced. Instead of dikaiou, the Syriac reads adikou, 'Scarcelyfor an unrighteous man will one die.' But this is not only unauthorized, butthe sense is not so appropriate.

Romans 5:8. But God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we wereyet sinners, Christ died for us. 'Commendeth,' sunisthsi, proves, orrenders conspicuous; see Romans 3:5 What renders the love of God so peculiarly conspicuous, is his sending his Son to die, not for the good, nor even forthe righteous, but for sinners, for those who were deserving of wrathinstead of love. The word sinners expresses the idea of moral turpitude,and consequent exposure to the divine displeasure. It was for, or in theplace of those who were at once corrupt, and the enemies of God, thatChrist died.

Romans 5:9. Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall besaved from wrath through him. This and the following verse draw theobvious inference, from the freeness and greatness of the love of God, asjust exhibited, that believers shall be ultimately saved. It is an argument afortiori. If the greater benefit has been bestowed, the less will not bewithheld. If Christ has died for his enemies, he will surely save his friends.Being justified. To be justified is more than to be pardoned; it includes theidea of reconciliation or restoration to the favor of God, on the ground of asatisfaction to justice, and the participation of the consequent blessings.This idea is prominently presented in the following verse. 'We are justified by his blood.' This expression, as remarked above (Romans 4:3), exhibits thetrue ground of our acceptance with God. It is not our works, nor our faith,nor our new obedience, nor the work of Christ in us, but what he has donefor us; Romans 3:25; Ephesians 2:13; Hebrews 9:12. Having by the death ofChrist been brought into the relation of peace with God, being nowregarded for his sake as righteous, we shall be saved from wrath throughhim. He will not leave his work unfinished; whom he justifies, them he alsoglorifies. The word wrath, of course, means the effects of wrath orpunishment, those sufferings with which the divine displeasure visits sin; Matthew 3:7; 1 Thessalonians 1:10; Romans 1:18. Not only is ourjustification to be ascribed to Christ, but our salvation is through him.Salvation, in a general sense, includes justification; but when distinguishedfrom it, as in this case, it means the consummation of that work of whichjustification is the commencement. It is a preservation from all the causesof destruction; a deliverance from the evils which surround us here, orthreaten us hereafter; and an introduction into the blessedness of heaven.Christ thus saves us by his providence and Spirit, and by his constantintercession; Romans 8:34; Hebrews 4:14, Hebrews 4:15; Hebrews 7:25; Jude 1:24; 1 John 2:1.Olshausen here also introduces his idea of subjective justification, and saysthat the meaning of this passage is, "If God regenerates a man, we may hope that he will uphold and perfect him, and reduce his liability toapostasy to a minimum."

According to this, to justify is to regenerate, andto save from wrath is to reduce our liability to apostasy to a minimum.

Romans 5:10. For if, when we were yet enemies, we were reconciled to God bythe death of his Son, etc. This verse contains nearly the same idea as Romans 5:9, presented in a different form. The word enemies is applied to men notonly as descriptive of their moral character, but also of the relation inwhich they stand to God as the objects of his displeasure. There is notonly a wicked opposition of the sinner to God, but a holy opposition ofGod to the sinner. The preceding verse presents the former of these ideas,and this verse the latter most prominently. There it is said, 'though sinners, we are justified;' and here, 'though enemies, we are reconciled'.The word ecqroi has the same passive sense in Romans 11:28. And this is theprincipal difference between the two verses. To be reconciled to God, insuch connections, does not mean to have our enmity to God removed, buthis enmity to us taken out of the way, to have him rendered propitious, orhis righteous justice satisfied. This is evident,

1. Because the reconciliation is ascribed to the death of Christ, or his blood, Romans 5:9. But, according to the constant representations of Scripture, the death of Christ is a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, or to propitiate the favor of God, and not immediately a means of sanctification. The former is its direct object, the latter an incidental result. This is the very idea of a sacrifice. The most liberal commentators, that is, those least bound by any theological system, admit this to be the doctrine of Scripture, and of this particular passage. Thus Meyer: "Christi Tod tilgte nicht die Feindschaft der Menschen gegen Gott;" that is, "The death of Christ does not remove the enmity of men towards God, but as that which secures the favor of God, it removes his enmity towards men, whence the removal of our enmity towards him follows as a consequence." So also Rückert: "The reconciled here can only be God, whose wrath towards sinners is appeased by the death of his Son. On man's part nothing has happened; no internal change, no step towards God; all this follows as the consequence of the reconciliation here spoken of." De Wette also says, that "katallagh must mean the removal of the wrath of God, and consequently the reconciliation is of God to man, which not only here, but in Romans 3:25; 2 Corinthians 5:18, 2 Corinthians 5:19; Colossians 1:1; Ephesians 2:16, is referred to the atoning death of Christ."

2. The object of the verse is to present us as enemies, or the objects of God's displeasure. 'If while we were the objects of the divine displeasure,' says the apostle, 'that displeasure has been removed, or God propitiated by the death of his Son, how much more shall we be saved,' etc. That is, if God has been reconciled to us, he will save us.

3. This is the proper meaning of the word, 2 Corinthians 5:18, 2 Corinthians 5:19. See also Matthew 5:24, "First be reconciled to thy brother," i.e. go and appease his anger, or remove the ground of his displeasure; compare Hebrews 2:17, "He is a priest to make reconciliation (eiV to ilaskesqai) for the sins of the people." It is the appropriate business of a priest to propitiate God, and not to reform men. See also 1 Samuel 29:4 : "Wherewith should he reconcile himself (diallaghsetai) to his master? should it not be with the heads of these men?" Ephesians 2:16, "That he might reconcile (apokatallaxh) both unto God by the cross," not remove their enmity to God, but secure for them his favor and access to the Father, Ephesians 2:18. The verbs katallassw, diallassw, and apokatallassw, are used interchangeably. The main idea, of course, as expressed by allassw, to change, is slightly modified by the force of the several prepositions with which it is

combined - to change kata in relation to, dia between, apo from. The three verbs, however, are all used to the idea of reconciliation, i.e. changing the relation of parties at enmity, so that they are at peace. Whether this reconciliation is effected by the propitiation of the justly offended party, or by a change of feeling in the offender, or both, depends on the connection.

4. The context obviously requires this sense here. "Being reconciled by the death of his Son," evidently corresponds to the phrase, "Being justified by his blood." The latter cannot mean that our feelings towards God are changed, but is admitted to express the idea that we are forgiven and restored to the divine favor. Such therefore must be the meaning of the former. Besides, it is the object of the apostle to illustrate the greatness and freeness of the love of God, from the unworthiness of its objects. While sinners, we are justified; while enemies, we are reconciled. To make the passage mean, that when enemies we laid aside our enmity, and became the friends of God, would be to make it contradict the very assertion and design of the apostle. We shall be saved by his life. This rather unusual mode of expression was doubtless adopted for the sake of its correspondence to the words, by his death, in the preceding clause, and is a striking example of Paul's fondness for such antithetical constructions; see Romans 4:25; Galatians 3:3; 2 Corinthians 3:6. The meaning is obvious: 'If while we were enemies, we were restored to the favor of God by the death of his Son, the fact that he lives will certainly secure our final salvation.'

1. His life is a pledge and security for the life of all his people; see John 14:19, "Because I live, ye shall live also;" Romans 8:11; 1 Corinthians 15:23.

2. He is able to save to the uttermost, "because he ever lives to make intercession or us," Hebrews 7:25, etc.

3. At his resurrection, all power in heaven and earth was committed to his hands, Matthew 28:18; and this power he exercises for the salvation of his people; Ephesians 1:22, 'He is head over all things, for the benefit of his Church;' Revelation 1:18; Hebrews 2:10; 1 Corinthians 15:25, etc.; see also the passages cited on the last clause of Romans 5:9. There is, therefore, most abundant ground for confidence for the final blessedness of believers, not only in the amazing love of God, by which, though sinners and enemies, they have been justified and reconciled by the death of his Son, but also in the consideration that this same Savior that died for them still lives, and ever lives to sanctify, protect, and save them.

Romans 5:11. Not only so, but we rejoice in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ; ou monon de, alla kai kaucwmenoi en tw Qew. There are three ways of explaining the participle kaucwmenoi; the one is to make it antithetical to katallagenteV, 'not only reconciled, but exulting in God, shall we be saved.' But this is not only an unnatural form of expression, but in Romans 5:9, katallagenteV is not a qualification of swqhsomeqa. The meaning is not, 'We shall be saved reconciled,' but, 'Since we are reconciled we shall be saved.' Another interpretation supplies the verb from the preceding clause, 'Not only shall we be saved, but saved rejoicing in God.' The best sense is obtained by supplying esmen after the participle, as is assumed in the English version, and advocated by the majority of commentators: 'We shall not only be ultimately saved, but we now glory the God.' The benefits of redemption are not all future. It is not only deliverance from future wrath, but the joy and glory of the present favor and love of God, that we owe to Jesus Christ. Thus the Vulgate, which renders kaucwmenoi as a verb, (sed et gloriamur,) as does Luther, "wir rühmen uns auch Gottes." We glory in God through our Lord Jesus Christ. That is, it is to him that we are indebted for this joy

in God as our God and portion. Through whom we have now received atonement. This is the reason why we owe our present glorying in God to Christ; it is because he has secured our reconciliation. The word rendered by our translators, atonement, is katallagh, the derivative of katallassw, properly rendered in the context, as elsewhere, to reconcile. The proper rendering, therefore, of the noun would be reconciliation: 'Through whom we have received reconciliation, that is, have been reconciled.' This verse therefore brings us back to verse 2. There it is said, 'Having peace with God, we rejoice in hope of his glory;' and here, 'Being reconciled, we glory or rejoice in God.' Salvation is begun on earth.

DOCTRINE

1. Peace with God is the result of that system of religion which alone, by providing at once for the satisfaction of divine justice and the sanctification of the human heart, is suited to the character of God, and the nature of man. All history shows that no system other than the gospel has ever produced this peace, Romans 5:1.

2. All the peculiar blessings of redemption are inseparably connected with and grow out of each other. Those who are justified have peace with God, access to his presence, joy under the most adverse circumstances, assurance of God's love, and certainty of final salvation; see the whole section, and compare Romans 8:30.

3. The Holy Ghost has intimate access to the human soul, controlling its exercises, exciting its emotions, and leading it into the knowledge of the truth, Romans 5:5.

4. The assurance of hope is founded on the consciousness of pious affections, and the witness of the Holy Spirit; and is a grace to which believers may and ought to attain, Romans 5:4-5.

5. The perseverance of the saints is to be attributed not to the strength of their love to God, nor to anything else in themselves, but solely to the free and infinite love of God in Christ Jesus. The praise is therefore no more due to them, than condemnation to a helpless infant for its mother's sleepless care. "Can a woman forget her sucking child," etc., Romans 5:6 - 2 Samuel 6. Redemption is not by truth or moral influence, but by blood, Romans 5:9-10.

7. The primary object of the death of Christ was to render God propitious, to satisfy his justice, and not to influence human conduct, or display the divine character; for the sake of the moral effect of that exhibition. Among its infinitely diversified results, all of which were designed, some of the most important, no doubt, are the sanctification of men, the display of the divine perfections, the prevention of sin, the happiness of the universe, etc. But the object of a sacrifice, as such, is to propitiate, Romans 5:9-10; Hebrews 2:17.

8. All we have or hope for, we owe to Jesus Christ - peace. communion with God, joy, hope, eternal life; see the whole section, and the whole Bible.

REMARKS

1. If we are the genuine children of God, we have peace of conscience, a sense of God's favor, and freedom of access to his throne. We endure afflictions with patience. Instead of making us distrustful of our heavenly Father, they afford us new proofs of his love, and strengthen our hope of his mercy. And we shall have, also, more or less of the assurance of God's love, by the

indwelling of the Holy Spirit, Romans 5:1 - Deuteronomy

2. None of these fruits of reconciliation with God can be obtained until the spirit of self-righteousness and self-dependence is removed. They are secured through faith, and by Christ Jesus, and not by our own works or merit, Romans 5:1, etc.

3. The hope of the hypocrite is like a spider's web; the hole of the believer is an anchor to his soul, sure and steadfast, Romans 5:5.

4. Assurance of the love of God never produces self-complacency or pride; but always humility, self-abasement, wonder, gratitude, and praise. The believer sees that the mysterious fountain of this love is in the divine mind; it is not in himself, who is ungodly and a sinner, Romans 5:8 - 2 Samuel

5. As the love of God in the gift of his Son, and the love of Christ in dying for us, are the peculiar characteristics of the gospel, no one can be a true Christian on whom these truths do not exert a governing influence, Romans 5:9-10; compare 2 Corinthians 5:14.

6. True religion is joyful, Romans 5:2, Romans 5:11.

S. Regeneration

Regeneration by A.A. Hodge; revised by B.B. Warfield The following short essay was originally published in Johnson's Cyclopaedia, 1896.The electronic edition of this article was scanned and edited by Shane Rosenthal for Reformation Ink. It is in the public domain and may be freely copied and distributed.

Regeneration (from Lat. re-, again + generare, beget) is a theological term used to express the initial stage of the change experienced by one who enters upon the Christian life. It is derived from the New Testament, where the "new birth" (1 Peter 1:23; Titus 3:5; John 3:3 f.) is the beginning of that "renewal" which produces the "new creature." In the history of theology the term has been used with varying latitude of meaning. Among the Jews it was employed in an external sense to express the change of relation which took place when a heathen became a Jew; from them it was adopted in this sense by many of the Fathers, and is still so used by many advocates of "baptismal regeneration." It is used in the Latin Church to express the whole real change which corresponds to this external change of relation. The Reformers separated justification by itself as something wrought on, not in, the sinner, and employed regeneration to express the whole process of inner renovation in all its stages. In the development of Protestant theology the term has been still further narrowed: first, to express the opening stage of this subjective work as distinguished from its continuance in sanctification; and then, since the seventeenth century, to express the initial divine act in this opening stage itself, as distinguished from the broader term conversion, which includes, along with the act of God, revivifying man, also the act of man in turning to God. The nature of regeneration is of course variously conceived by different schools, according to their various views of the nature of the soul and its relation to God, of original or habitual sin, and of divine grace.

1. Pelagians, in accordance with their view of freedom and of sin, necessarily regard regeneration as a self-determined change in the general moral course of man's life, an act of the man himself, without any gracious assistance other than that involved in instruction and favorable providential conditions This was the teaching of Pelagius in the early part of the fifth century; and although not adopted by a historical church, it has been reproduced in various combinations by Rationalists and Socinians.

2. The Semi-Pelagian doctrine taught by John Cassian (d. 440) admits that divine grace (assistentia) is necessary to enable a sinner to return unto God and live, yet holds that, from the nature of the human will, man may first spontaneously, of himself, desire and attempt to choose and obey God. They deny the necessity of prevenient but admit the necessity of co-operative grace and conceive regeneration as the product of this co-operative grace.

3. The Mediaeval and Papal doctrine, which is practically that of Thomas Aquinas, and is hence often called "Thomism," admits original sin and the necessity of prevenient grace, but places the efficacy of grace in the non-resistance of the subject.1 But this grace is supposed to be exercised only through the instrumentality of baptism, which acts as an opus operatum, ex vi actionis ipsius,

effecting regeneration and the entire removal of sin, and consequently of guilt, from every infant, and from every adult who does not willfully resist (non ponentibus obicem).2

4. The Arminian view of regeneration admits total depravity and consequent moral impotency, yet holds that man is not really responsible until there is redemptively bestowed upon him for Christ's sake sufficient grace to re-endow him with ability (gracious, substituted for natural) to do right, which grace becomes efficient when the sinner co-operates with it, and thus effects the end intended.

5. The Synergistic view was held by a party among the Lutherans under the leadership of Melanchthon. At the Leipzig conference (1548) Melanchthon said: "there concur three causes of a good action—the word of God, the Holy Spirit, and the human will assenting, not resisting the word of God."3

6. The Lutheran standard, the Formula Concordiae, teaches that: (l) human nature is spiritually dead; and (2) the Holy Ghost is the sole efficient agent who quickens the dead soul to life, without the least co-operation of the will of the subject; but the non-regeneration of the unbeliever is referred not to the absence nor to any deficiency of grace, but to the positive resistance of the man himself.4

7. The Reformed doctrine teaches as follows: (l) As to the nature of regeneration: (a) There are in the soul, besides its several faculties, habits or dispositions, innate or acquired, which lay the foundation for the soul's exercising its faculties in a particular way. (b) These dispositions (moral) are anterior to moral action, and determine its character as good or evil. (c) In creation God made the dispositions of Adam's heart holy. (d) In regeneration God recreates the governing dispositions of the regenerated man's heart holy. Regeneration is therefore essentially the communication of a new spiritual life, and is properly called a "new birth." (2) As to its efficient cause: It is effected by divine power acting supernaturally and immediately upon the soul, quickening it to spiritual life, and implanting gracious principles of action. (3) As to man's action: Conversion (conversio actualis) instantly follows, as the change of action consequent upon the change of character, and consists in repentance, faith, holy obedience, etc.5

What is called baptismal regeneration is held by members of the Church of England and others in various senses. (l) Some hold that the Holy Spirit through the instrumentality of baptism implants a germ of spiritual life in the soul, which may long remain latent, and may be subsequently developed (in conversion) or blasted. (2) Others hold that there are two regenerations one a change of state or relation, and the other a change of nature; the first is baptismal and the second moral, though both are spiritual, since both are wrought by the Holy Ghost.

Notes

1. See the Council of Trent, sess. 6, can. 4, chs. v and vi, and sess 7, cans. 6 and 8.

2. Council of Trent, sess. 7, can. 6; Bellarmin, De Sacramentis, 2,1.

3. Loc. Com., p. 90.

4. Formula Concordiae, pp. 662, 666, 582, 677.

5. Thirty- nine Articles, art. 10; Canons of Synod of Dordt, ch. iii, art 3; Westminster Confession, ch. x. This article was made available on the internet via REFORMATION INK (www.markers.com/ink). Refer any correspondence to Shane Rosenthal: Rosenthal2000@aol.com ÿÿÿ

S. Sacraments - Baptism

Sacraments - Baptism

A. A. Hodge As we have seen before, in Lecture IX., that the Church and Kingdom of God rest upon a covenant, it is evidently appropriate that Christ should provide visible seals by which that covenant should be ratified and its benefits symbolized to all who accept its terms. We have seen also, under Lecture XIV., that the true Church is designed by God to organize itself under his law, under varying historical conditions, in outward visible communities: it is evident, therefore, that it is to be expected that Christ should give to his Church certain divinely-appointed and universally-recognized badges of membership by which they are to be distinguished from others. The word “sacrament” is not in the Bible, and therefore the meaning of that term, and of the other terms by which the class comprising Baptism and the Lord’s Supper have been designated, must be determined from the general usage of the Church.

I. They have been called “mysteries” by a very natural association. The mysteries were the secrets of Grecian religious rites, which could not possibly be discovered by the uninitiated, but which were, while jealously guarded from the outsider, gradually revealed to the initiated in proportion to his grade of membership. The early pastors of the primitive Church were surrounded by heathen communities. On the Sabbath days their congregations at first consisted of three distinct classes—the heathen inquirers, the catechumens, and the communicants. After the sermon had been preached, with singing and prayer, the general audience of the uninitiated heathen were dismissed with the formula, Ite, missa est!—“Go, it is dismissed.” Then the catechumens, or candidates for baptism, the first degree of Christian profession, were instructed, and afterward dismissed with the same formula, Ite, missa est! Then only the communicants of the second or highest grade of Christian profession remained, and they together celebrated the most sacred rite of the Lord’s Supper, at which none of the uninitiated were allowed to remain even as witnesses. Hence the sacraments came by analogy to be regarded as the Christian mysteries, or innermost secrets unveiled only to the initiated; and hence, likewise, the Lord’s Supper itself came to be called the “Mass,” from its being introduced by two repetitions, and followed by a third repetition, of the dismission formula, Ite, missa est!

These rites have more generally and permanently been called “sacraments,” which has mistakenly been taken as the Latin equivalent of the Greek mystery. The sacramentum was anything that renders sacred or binds, as a bail or a soldier’s oath. These sacred rites seal and publicly consummate a Christian’s profession of faith and allegiance. They bind him to a service, like a citizen’s oath of loyalty, which was obligatory upon him antecedently in consequence of his birth. In the same general sense these special rites have been called, especially among Scotch Presbyterians, “sealing ordinances.” By engagement therein the professing Christian openly signifies and seals his profession of faith and promise of service: At the same time, by the admission of the individual to the privilege of participating in them, the Church, through its officers, signifies and seals its recognition of the covenanting believer as an accepted member of the

Church. It is for this reason that the right of admitting to or of excluding from these “sealing ordinances” is called “the power of the keys,” the power of admission or of exclusion, “of binding or of loosing,” of which our Lord speaks in his address to Peter (Matthew 16:19). And for this reason also the right of administering these “sealing ordinances,” which are the keys that open or shut the doors of the visible Church, has always been rigidly confined to the ordained ministry or highest class of church-officers, thus qualified to act in this matter—not as individuals, but as representatives of the whole body of believers and the executors according to law of their corporate will.

II. It is a more important question to ask, what are the real nature and design of these sacraments in the economy of the Christian Church?

Sacraments are symbols, symbolical actions, wherein outward physical signs represent inward invisible grace. The signs consist of the elements, and of the sacramental actions of the minister and of the recipient in relation to these elements. They are symbolical transactions, in which Christ and the benefits of his salvation are represented, sealed, and applied to believers. The grace symbolized is purchased by Christ, is conveyed and applied by the Holy Ghost, and is received by faith. That grace, therefore, as inward and invisible, belongs to the spiritual Church as such, whether organized into visible societies or not. But the sacraments, wherein this inward invisible grace is represented by outward physical signs, belong obviously to those visible societies or organized churches into which the spiritual children of God are gathered. They can have no other sphere. They are signs and seals to men in the flesh of things which relate to the spiritual world. But the outward sign has no pertinency except in relation to the condition of men in the flesh, and sustaining the relations of members of visible organized societies. Their need and use grow out of the two facts—(1) that as long as we are in the flesh the most profound impressions are made upon our souls through our bodily senses; and (2) that as long as we are associated together in these outward visible organizations we need visible, easily recognizable badges of fellowship and seals of a common loyalty.

These symbols are, in the first place, natural. Circumcision and the washing the body with water in baptism are obviously natural signs, significant of the need of a second birth—a new birth, which will be like life from the dead; a life distinguished from the natural life by spirituality. The sacrifice of the paschal lamb, and the sprinkling of his blood on the doorposts, and the eating of his flesh at a sacrificial feast as people in fellowship with God, and the breaking and eating of the bread and the pouring out and drinking of the wine in the Lord’s Supper, are obviously natural signs, significant of our participation in all the sacrificial benefits of Christ’s redemption. In the second place, being selected by God as natural symbols of the spiritual graces represented, they are ordained by him to be so regarded and treated on his authority by his Church for ever. Their suggestive and edifying power is due to both of these facts—the natural likeness and the divine appointment. The design of these sacraments is obvious from their nature and uses, and is, moreover, clearly taught in Scripture.

1st. They are effective objective exhibitions of the central truths of the Gospels. Like pictures, they impressively set forth to the eye and the imagination the same great truths which the Word of God read or preached sets forth to the ear. Their use has proved the wisdom of their appointment The rationale lies in the constitution of human nature as embracing rational spirits incarnate in animal

bodies.

2nd. They are badges of church-membership, and hence at the same time of our relation to Christ as our Teacher, Redeemer, and King, and of our relation to one another as beneficiaries of the same redemption, learners in the same school, brethren in the same family, subjects of the same kingdom, and heirs of the same inheritance. They discharge the same offices as do the pass-signs of the secret societies, the uniform of the army, the standards of the battle, the flag of the nation. They give definite visibility to the professing organized Church of Jesus Christ on earth, at once in the eyes of its own members and of all outsiders.

3rd. They were also designed by Christ to be the seals of his covenant with men. Every covenant implies two parties, who mutually give and receive pledges. A seal is an outward visible thing or action attached by appointment of government, which recognizes and consummates a contract, rendering the contract even more sacred by the governmental recognition. In these sacraments Christ seals his mediatorial undertaking for us, and pledges by an objective declaration, in every case audible and visible, our salvation on the condition of our really and spiritually doing what we in appearance do in receiving the sacrament. We at the same time swear a sacred oath, enacted by word and act, to put ourselves absolutely into Christ's hands, to receive his full salvation, and to be consecrated to his service.

4th. They were also ordained by Christ to be means of grace—not the only means, in the absence of which grace is not given, but real, divinely-appointed means, the use of which is obligatory and most useful to all Christians; the appointed instruments in the hands of the Holy Spirit of effecting and distributing grace to men severally as he wills. "The outward and ordinary means whereby Christ communicates to his Church the benefits of his mediation, are all his ordinances ; especially the word, sacraments, and prayer" (Larger Cat., Ques. 154). Christ uses these sacraments, not only to represent and seal, but also actually to apply, the benefits of his redemption to believers (Shorter Cat., Ques. 92). This efficiency as means of grace does not, of course, inhere in the sacramental elements or actions themselves, nor in the merit or intention of the administrator, but always in the present gracious volition of the Holy Ghost, whose instruments they are; just as the efficiency of the axe or hammer or sword is due to the will and power of the man who wields it. The axe cuts down the tree because it is adapted to cut wood, and because it is energetically and skilfully wielded by a strong man. The sacrament acts as means of conveying grace, because its signs and actions are adapted to affect the mind and the heart and the will of men in the right way at the same time, and because the Holy Ghost, who works in us to will and to do of his good pleasure, uses it as he wills, and to effect his own purpose.

III. It is well known that the Romanists hold that there are, under the new law or covenant, seven sacraments—namely, baptism, confirmation, the Lord's Supper, penance, marriage, orders, extreme unction; although they have always acknowledged that baptism and the Lord's Supper constitute a pre-eminently sacred class by themselves—as Thomas Aquinas calls them, potissima sacramenta. All these, with the exception of penance and extreme unction, are admitted by Protestants to be important divine ordinances. The only question between Protestants and Catholics at this point relates to the proper extension of the word "sacrament," which is not found in the Bible. The true way of putting the question on the Protestant side is not to raise a controversy as to the meaning of a non- biblical word, but to ask, Are there any other divine

ordinances of the same class, possessing the same. qualities, and sustaining the same relations, as baptism and the Lord's Supper? We Protestants answer, emphatically, No! That these special ordinances were designed to be perpetual is as plain as language and reason can make it. In the first place, this is antecedently probable, because the reason for their original institution still continues. In the second place, this continued use, in the case of each sacrament, is specifically commanded: "Go ye into all the world, discipling all nations, baptizing them," etc., and, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of this world-age" (Matthew 28:19-20; Mark 16:15); "Do this in remembrance of me ;" and the inspired comment of the apostle, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come " (1 Corinthians 11:26). These are, therefore, to continue until the second coming of Christ. In the third place, the apostles practised the use of both sacraments as long as they lived. And in the fourth place, the entire Christian Church, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, has continued their observance in unbroken continuity unto the present time.

IV. BAPTISM.

All the world knows the vast volume of controversy and of controversial literature which has been generated in the Church around this immense subject. We have, on the one hand, the great body of the historical Christian churches, and on the other hand, the Protestants of Protestants, our Baptist brethren. In this point of view the advantage appears to be on our side. But this ad vantage is very greatly abated when we come to estimate the average quality of the two great contestant bodies in mass, and recognize the fact that these Baptist brethren stand among those occupying the very foremost rank in intelligence, learning, piety, effective usefulness, and universal and strict fidelity to the Word of God. The questions in debate relate to fundamental points. 1st. What is baptism? What, precisely, are we commanded to do when we are commanded to baptize? 2nd. What classes of persons are we to baptize? These Lectures have nothing to do with controversy. We propose, therefore, in the most friendly spirit toward all those who differ from us, to state with perfect simplicity our own belief as to what is the truth on both these subjects.

[I.] We believe that the command to baptize is precisely and only a command to wash with water as a symbol of spiritual regeneration and cleansing into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The essential parts of the external sacrament are, consequently, (1) the formula; (2) the element: (3) the action; (4) the sense in which the symbol is interpreted.

(1.) It is essential to the validity of this ordinance that it should be administered "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This is certain—(a) because of the words of the great commission in Matthew 28:19; (b) from the essential significancy of the rite. Besides being a symbol of spiritual purification, it is essentially, as the rite of initiation into the Christian Church, a covenanting ordinance, whereby the recipient recognizes and pledges his allegiance to God in that character and in those relations in which he has revealed himself to us in the plan of salvation. The formula of baptism, therefore, is a summary of the whole Scripture doctrine of the Triune Jehovah as he has chosen to reveal himself to us in all those relations which the several Persons of the Trinity graciously sustain to the believer in the scheme of redemption.

(2.) The element, as is universally acknowledged, is water. Water is to the physical system of this earth and to the life upon its surface what the blood is in the animal organism. When water is withheld, the whole earth becomes first clouded with dust, and then parched to death, and finally

becomes a barren desert. When the water is copiously restored, the face of nature is purified, and the desert is transformed into the garden of the Lord. Water as the universal bearer of life and solvent is the natural type of spiritual regeneration and sanctification. If water, therefore, is absent, there is no baptism, because the command to baptize is the command to wash with water.

(3.) The element and the action by which it is used and applied constitute what is technically called the “matter of baptism “—that is, the thing done by time person who performs the rite. This we believe to be simply a washing with water. The whole rite is a symbol of spiritual cleansing. The thing to be done, therefore, is to wash. The manner of doing it is, therefore, necessarily accidental and outside of the command. This we fully believe—

(a) Because the Greek words used to express the command baptivzw (baptizo) and bavptw (bapto), although their root-meaning is to immerse in any liquid, have come to mean generally the producing of the effect for the sake of which the liquid is applied—for example, to wash, or to tinge, or to dye—no matter in what manner the liquid is applied to the subject operated upon. The word vivptw (vipto), to wash, and the word baptivzw (baptizo), are used interchangeably in the New Testament (Matthew 15:2; Mark 7:1-15; Luke 11:37 - Malachi See also 2 Kings 5:13-14 and Titus 3:5).

(b) These words are unquestionably used in the New Testament in a great variety of connections in which they cannot emphasize any one mode of applying the water, as the “washing of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and of tables” (Mark 7:4), and the baptizing of Moses “in the cloud and in the sea” (1 Corinthians 10:1-2). The “divers washings” of the first tabernacle (Hebrews 9:10) we know to have been effected chiefly by sprinkling and pouring (Hebrews 9:13-21; Exodus 30:17-21).

(c) In all probability, the original manner of applying the water in Christian baptism was by pouring the water out of the hollow of the hand, or out of a shell or small vessel, without any emphasis or special signification attached to the manner in which the water was applied. This we regard as probable, because the prevailing modes of purification among the Jews were the pouring of water and the sprinkling of blood or ashes (Leviticus 8:30; Leviticus 14:7, Leviticus 14:51; Hebrews 9:13-22). The personal ablutions of the priests were performed at the brazen layer, from which the water poured forth through spouts or cocks (1 Kings 7:38-39; 2 Chronicles 4:6). Pouring water out of a vessel upon the hands, feet, or head of the person has been the method of applying water for purposes of purification from the earliest age to the present time in all the Oriental world from the Ganges to the Bosphorus. The earliest rude remains of Christian art in the Catacombs represent John as baptizing on the side of a stream of water by affusion.

(d) The outstanding essential fact, about which there can be no controversy, is that baptism with water is a symbol of baptism by the Holy Ghost. The one signifies what the other effects—that is, the cleansing the soul from the guilt and pollution of sin (John 3:5; Titus 3:5; Acts 2:38; Acts 22:16; 1 Corinthians 6:11; Ephesians 5:26). It is the washing of the body corresponding to the “washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.” John and the apostles baptized, and the modern minister baptizes, with water; but Christ baptizes us with the Holy Ghost (Luke 3:16; Acts 1:5; Acts 11:16; Acts 22:16; 1 Corinthians 12:13).. The one is the shadow, the other is the substance.

(e) Everywhere in the New Testament the connection in which the baptism with water is spoken of indicates the fact that it symbolizes the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and implies spiritual purification. In John 3:22-30 the question debated between some of John's disciples and the Jews as to baptism is expressly defined to be a question concerning purification. Men were exhorted to be baptized in order to wash away their sins. It is declared that men must be born of water and of the Spirit, and that baptism as well as faith is an essential condition of salvation. The effect of baptism is declared to be purification (2 Kings 5:13-14; Jdt 12:7; Luke 11:37-39).

(f) The metaphorical representation given in Scripture of the Spirit's influence, of which baptism is the outward sign, never implies that the mode of the application is essential. The gift of the Holy Ghost was the grace signified (Acts 2:1-4; Acts 2:32-33; Acts 10:44-48; Acts 11:15-16). The fire, which did not immerse them, but appeared as cloven tongues and "sat upon each one of them," was the symbol of that grace. Jesus was himself the baptizer, who now fulfilled the prediction of John the Baptist that he should baptize with the Holy Ghost and with fire. The gift of the Holy Ghost is set forth alike in the Old and New Testaments in such terms as "came from heaven," "poured out," "shed forth," "fell on them " (Isaiah 44:3; Leviticus 1:5; Ezekiel 36:25-27; Ezekiel 36:25-27; Joel 2:28-29).

(g) The metaphorical illustrations of the effects and benefits of baptism given in the New Testament do not lay any emphasis upon nor suggest any importance as attaching to the mode of applying the water in baptism. We are said "to be born of water and of the Spirit;" to "have put on Christ" as a garment in baptism; to be "planted together or generated together;" "to be buried with him by baptism into death" (John 3:5; Galatians 3:27; Romans 6:3-5). These, none of them, represent baptism itself, but all alike refer to the spiritual effects of that grace which water-baptism symbolizes. In baptism we symbolically and professedly receive the Holy Ghost. The indwelling of the Holy Ghost unites us vitally to Christ. Union with Christ involves our being "generated or grafted together with him into one vital organism;" our putting on Christ as our righteousness; our being united with him federally, so that his death is our death and his rising to newness of life ours also; as he is a Priest, we are priests; as he is a Prophet, we are prophets; as he is a King, we are kings. All this and much more is true, but none of it even suggests the manner in which the water shall be applied in baptism.

(h) The Christian Church as a great historic body has always felt itself free in regard to this question. In the Eastern churches pouring has prevailed from immemorial times. The Greek church has always insisted on immersion. The Roman Catholic and Protestant historic churches admit both forms. During all the more modern freer and more evangelical ages the tendency toward baptizing by sprinkling has increased and become more general. The general body of Christians have always felt that as the mode of the application of the water in baptism was not of the essence of the commandment, they were free to do in the matter as convenience or local custom suggested.

(i) it is in the highest degree incongruous with the genius of the Christian religion and with the general analogy of its institutions that the mere manner of applying water as symbolical of purification should be considered of any importance. This religion is pre-eminently spiritual and reasonable, and not external or formal. It is designed for all men of all climates, ages, and conditions, and to be applied to individuals and communities under all conceivable circumstances.

The external mode of performing a rite is insisted upon in no other instance. Christ and his apostles have left no prescriptions as to the form of church government, nor as to the manner of induction into church offices. No hints even as to a liturgy or form of prayer or order of general service of the sanctuary are given in their writings. Neither posture in prayer nor form of psalmody is prescribed. The questions as to the use of instrumental music, robes, and written or extemporaneous prayers, are left absolutely indeterminate. In the case of the sister sacrament of the Lord's Supper the manner of celebrating it, by absolutely universal consent of all Christians, has been left to the free selection of each ecclesiastical community, some receiving it lying on couches, as the apostles did who received it from the hands of Christ, and some kneeling, and some standing, and some sitting; some using unleavened bread after the original example, and others insisting upon the bread of every-day life.

(j) The case standing thus, as we think, as above stated, it is evident that the only point in connection with the mode of baptism is to insist upon it that the mode is an accident of no importance at all. The only serious mistake that possibly can be made in the premises is that of insisting upon some one of the many possible modes as absolutely essential to the integrity of the rite. The essence of the thing is to wash with water as a symbol "of the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Everything other than this or more than this necessarily confuses the doctrine and obscures the impression of the truth. The simple command stands, and embraces all Christians:

"Go, wash with water into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" and "He who baptizes with the Holy Ghost and with fire will be with you alway, even to the end of the world."

[II.] Who are to be baptized?

There are two principles applying to the solution of this problem which appear to us to be very clear and unquestionable. The first of these principles is, that baptism is a sacramental action representing an inward invisible grace. Consequently, the outward action ought never consciously and intentionally to be applied where the inward invisible grace is absent. There could be no farce more profane, no empty show more ghastly, than that of sealing the form of a covenant where there was no real promise, of applying an outward symbol of spiritual life and grace where all spiritual life and grace are absent. Such mockery would transform the sacred pledges of God's truth into a lie. The second principle, which we affirm to be no less obvious and certain, is, that the baptism with water is itself an outward visible sign, to be applied by human agents who are incapable of reading the hearts of men, and who have no power of conveying, and no authority of absolutely pledging, the spiritual gifts which God retains in his own hand. It follows, consequently, that in practice, while the sign should never intentionally be applied where the grace is absent, there cannot, however, be any infallible connection between the sign and the grace. God alone reads the hearts of men and dispenses the invisible grace, and men who cannot read the heart alone dispense the outward visible signs of the sacrament. It follows that these human ministers of God's will must administer these rites upon certain presumptions—that is, they must follow certain divinely-appointed signs or indications which raise in each case the presumption that the parties concerned are either now or to be hereafter the parties to whom the invisible spiritual grace signified belongs. It is perfectly plain that every human society, whether social, political, or

religious, must necessarily be organized and administered on the same principles. Men can judge character only by external indications, and these external indications must be assumed to be presumptive evidence of the reality and genuineness of the character they indicate. And the individual officers of the society, whatever it may be, cannot be allowed to follow unrestrictedly the indications of their own variable judgments in each particular case. The society itself must, through its supreme authority, establish general rules and tests of presumptive evidence upon which its officers must act alike in the admission and in the exclusion of members.

1st. In the case of adults, or persons arrived at the condition of independent responsible agency, the presumptive ground of fitness for admission to the sealing ordinances of the Church is a competent knowledge of the plan of salvation, a credible profession of personal faith, and a walk and conversation consistent therewith. The amount of knowledge requisite must vary with the general intelligence of the subject. But it is evident that no person can be a Christian by profession who is absolutely ignorant of his own guilt and pollution and of Christ's meritorious work in our behalf. And, on the other hand, it is no less evident that multitudes of Christ's children are saved who have attained only to the vaguest and most elementary knowledge of the essentials of the gospel. A "credible profession" does not mean a profession of faith which compels credence, or which convinces the observer that it is genuine; but it is simply the opposite of the incredible—it is a confession that can be believed. Neither ministers of the gospel nor elders are able to read the secrets of the human heart, or to judge of character. Therefore, the great Head of the Church has not laid upon us the responsibility. The responsibility of professing Christ rests upon the individual professor. Every man who has the competent knowledge, and who makes a profession not incredible, and whose life is in conformity therewith, has a presumptive right to come to the sacraments. He does not need to prove his way in. If the session or pastor exclude him, they or he must show sufficient positive evidence of his not being a Christian to keep him out. This plain principle is one of great importance, the violation of which has brought great evil upon the Church. As the minister and church-session have no power of reading the heart of the applicant, so it must be a great evil if they officially form and express any judgment in the case. If they do pretend to listen to and judge of the value of the experience recited, they profanely assume to possess the prerogatives which belong to God alone, and they lead deluded souls to put an unwarrantable confidence in the worthless indorsement of the church authorities. It is by reason of this that so many are asleep in Zion. Each man ought to be thrown back upon his own unshared responsibility, and made "to examine himself, that so he may eat of this bread." On the other hand, it is the great duty of those church- officers to whom Christ has committed the keys of the visible kingdom of heaven on earth to proclaim the truths of the gospel, to impress the resulting duties upon the consciences of men, and to set forth the high conditions of Christian communion which God exacts. The Romanists baptize all children indiscriminately. All adults who render an outward adherence to the Church are baptized. The State-Church systems of Protestant Europe recognize every reputable citizen of the State as a legitimate member of the Church. The true doctrine is, that no man, whatever his external relations may be, has a right to come to the holy sacraments unless he is duly qualified; and he cannot be duly qualified unless he is a living member of Christ's mystical body, a temple of the Holy Ghost. Unless he possesses this character, his approach to the sacraments is in vain and a sin. But of this fact the man himself is always and only the one responsible judge. The officers and members of the church have no right to go behind his not incredible profession, on the presumptive evidence of which the Master requires all others to

receive him and to treat him in all things as a Christian brother.

2nd. The children of all such persons as, on the ground of their own credible profession of faith, are received as members of the visible Church are to be baptized as members of the visible Church, because, presumptively, heirs of the blessings of the covenant of grace. The divinely appointed and guaranteed presumption is, if the parents, then. the children. This is not an invariable law binding God, but it is a prevailingly probable law, basing the authorized and rational recognition and treatment of such children by the Church as heirs of the promises. The reasons for our thinking so must be condensed into the fewest words:—

(1.) This presumption is rendered exceedingly probable by the fundamental constitution of humanity as a self-. propagative race. A. moral government pure and simple presupposes only individuals, and addresses itself to the control of individuals through their reasons, consciences, and wills. But the fact which differentiates the human subjects of the divine government from an ideal realm—as that of the angels, for instance—is that we are a race in which the nature, character, and status of the parent determine those of the child by a universal and inevitable hereditary law. Thus, the apostasy of Adam gave an entirely new direction to the history of his entire race, and thus the character and destiny of families, races, and nations have been always predetermined by the deeds and experiences of their ancestors. The law of heredity is the fundamental law of animal nature, including man; and since the God of nature is identical with the God of grace, it was to be anticipated that his remedial scheme of redemption should conserve and operate through all the laws of nature, while it antagonizes only that false nature which is sin. Hugh Miller, the Christian geologist, says: “Whatever we may think of the scriptural doctrine on this special head, it is a fact broad and palpable in the economy of nature that parents do occupy a federal position, and that the lapsed progenitors, when cut. off from civilization and all external civilization of a missionary character, become the founders of a lapsed race. The iniquities of the parents are visited upon the children. In all such instances it is man left to the freedom of his own will that is the deteriorator of man. The doctrine of the Fall in its purely theologic aspect is a doctrine which must be apprehended by faith; but it is at least something to find that the analogies of science, instead of running counter to it, run in exactly the same line. It is one of the inevitable consequences of that nature of man which the Creator ‘bound fast in fate’ while he left free his will, that the free will of the parent should become the destiny of the child.”

(2.) This presumption is borne out by the analogies of the entire history of God’s providential revelations of the scheme of redemption recorded in Scripture. If the parents by an inevitable law bore their children away from God in their apostasy, it is surely to be expected that they shall bring back their children with them Godward in their regeneration. The sin of the parents immediately involved the condemnation and guilt of the family. So when God began graciously to open to men a way of escape, and set up his kingdom in the world, the family was made the first form of the Church. In the entire patriarchal age every family the heads of which professed the true religion was a visible Church. The father was the prophet, priest, and king. By him the morning and evening sacrifices were offered. Wherever Abraham and the other patriarchs went they erected the altar and called upon the name of the Lord. The whole family, including especially the little children, constituted the Church, and were trained in the knowledge and service of God. In all his covenants God explicitly included the children with their parents. The faith of the parents turned the favour of God upon their children, and the promises of the parents bound their children under

inalienable obligations. The curse denounced upon Adam and Eve has been in all its specifications inflicted on their seed throughout all generations. So when covenanting with Noah, the second father of the race, God said, “I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in all their generations;” and when making his national covenant with the Israelites, Jehovah declared this principle: “For I, Jehovah thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments.” And in the first great sermon of the New Dispensation, on the day of Pentecost, Peter, when preaching to the people that they must repent and be baptized, gives this remarkable reason for it: “For the promise [the gospel covenant] is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.”

(3.) Baptism under the New Dispensation of the covenant of grace in all respects takes the place of circumcision under the Old. It is “the circumcision of Christ” (Colossians 2:11-12). The one was a mark that was a sign of the necessity of regeneration and a pledge of its gift. In the other, water, the universal element of cosmical life, and the universal in9rument of cleansing, is applied to the person with the same significance and design. Each in its own age was the authoritatively appointed door of entrance into the fold of salvation, and the badge of citizenship in the kingdom of God. Viewed as a mere outward rite, neither circumcision nor baptism, nor their absence, avails anything, but the new creature, which both alike signify. Baptism takes the place of circumcision, the seal of the covenant which God made with Abraham: “For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. And if ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise” (Galatians 3:27, Galatians 3:28). Baptism represents the washing away of sin; circumcision did precisely the same. For God said, “I will circumcise thy heart and the heart of thy seed to love the Lord with all thy soul,” etc. Circumcision, like baptism, represents an inward spiritual grace: “For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly ; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God” (Romans 2:28-29). Circumcision as well as baptism unites us to Christ. For Paul says (Colossians 2:10-11): “In whom [that is, Christ, Head of all principality and power] 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.” Water-baptism is the precise equivalent of “the circumcision of the flesh;” and the baptism of the Holy Ghost is the precise equivalent of “the circumcision of the heart.” The apostle Paul says everything of circumcision that an evangelical pastor would now say of baptism. The condition of the circumcision of an adult under the Mosaic law was precisely the same credible profession of faith which is now demanded as a precondition of adult baptism. But all the children of believers were circumcised; therefore there is every presumption that the children of believers should be baptized.

(4.) The Church under the Old Dispensation is precisely the same Church with the Christian Church under the New. They bore the same name: the “Kahal Jehovah” and the evkklhsiva kurivou (ekklesia kuriou) alike mean the Church of the Lord. Thus, Stephen called the “congregation of the Lord” before Sinai “the Church in the wilderness.” (Compare Acts 7:38 with Exodus 32:1-35.) Their, foundation in the person and work of Christ was the same. The conditions of adult membership in each were the same profession of faith and promise of obedience. Every

true Israelite was a true believer (Galatians 3:7). All Israelites were at least credible professors of the true religion. The sacraments of this Church under its successive dispensations were of the same significance and binding force. Baptism is the “circumcision of Christ” (Colossians 2:11-12). The Passover, like the Last Supper, represented the sacrifice of Christ (1 Corinthians 5:7). The Christian converts from Judaism were not gathered into a new Church, but were daily added to the already existing Church. The Gentile branches did not constitute a new olive tree, but were grafted into the old Israelitish olive tree (Romans 11:17-24). The apostles, who entered the Church by circumcision, and who acknowledged Christ as the Messiah before the excision of the Jews in mass because of unbelief, were never baptized; while Paul and others, who belonged to the exscinded mass, were grafted back to their own olive tree through baptism. But the infant children of all the members of the Church under the Old Testament were regarded and treated as members of the Church themselves, and their membership was sealed on the eighth day by circumcision.

(5.) Christ and his apostles, members of a Church which had always included infants, and themselves circumcised in infancy, in all respects spoke and acted as Paedobaptist ministers would in their place. Christ blessed little “children,” and declared of such is “the kingdom of heaven,” or the visible Church under the New Dispensation (Matthew 19:14; Matthew 13:47). He commissioned Peter to feed his lambs (John 21:15-17), and all the apostles to “disciple all nations” by baptizing, then teaching them (Matthew 28:19-20). The apostles were not settled pastors in an established Christian community, but itinerant missionaries in an unbelieving world, sent not to baptize, hut to preach the gospel (1 Corinthians 1:17). Hence we have in Acts and the Epistles the record of only ten separate instances of baptism. In every case, without a single recorded exception where there was a family, the family was baptized as soon as the head of the family presented a credible profession of his faith (Acts 16:15; Acts 16:32-33; Acts 18:8; 1 Corinthians 1:16). And in their Epistles they always addressed children as members of the Church (Ephesians 5:1; Ephesians 6:1-3; Colossians 3:20; 1 Corinthians 7:12-14). In the most natural manner, without the slightest hint of change, and with every incidental indication possible of the uninterrupted continuance of the historical church-membership of infants, the narratives of the New Testament church-life grow from those of the Old. The preaching of the New Testament opens with the explicit declaration, abundantly significant as coming from an apostle to a representative national audience, all of whom knew of no Church which had not always embraced children in its sacramentally-sealed membership : “The promise” —that is, the gospel covenant, of which circumcision and baptism were successively the seals— “is unto you and to your children” (Acts 2:39).

(6.) The universal consent of Christians in historical continuity with the apostles bears unbroken testimony to the immemorial right of the children of Christian professors to be recognized as members of the Church with their parents. It is noticed in the earliest records as a universal custom and as an apostolical tradition. Justin Martyr, writing A.D. 138, says that “there were among Christians of his time many persons of both sexes, some sixty and some seventy years old, who had been made disciples of Christ from their infancy.” Irenaeus, who died about A.D. 202, says: “He came to save all by himself—all, I say, who by him are born again unto God, infants, and little children, and youths.” The practice of infant baptism is acknowledged by Tertullian, born in Carthage A.D. 160. Origen, born of Christian parents in Egypt A.D. 185, says that it was “the

usage of the Church to baptize infants," and that "the Church had received the tradition from the apostles." Cyprian, bishop of Carthage from A.D. 248 to A.D. 258, together with his entire synod, decided that baptism should be administered to infants before the eighth day. St. Augustine, born A.D. 358, declared that "this doctrine is held by the whole Church, not instituted by councils, but always retained." This Pelagius himself was forced to admit, although he had visited all parts of the Church from Britain to Syria; and the point made by Augustine was fatal to the position which Pelagius occupied (Wall's History of Infant Baptism and Bingham's Christian Antiquities, bk. xi., ch. iv.). The Church split into several fragments, Roman, Greek, Arminian, Nestorian, and Abyssinian, all differing in much, but all agreeing in support of the custom of recognizing and sealing infants as church-members. At the time of the Reformation learned and holy men were raised up by God in the midst of every European nation. There were perfectly independent movements in each national centre of reform. Zwingle, the Reformer of the Swiss; Luther, the Reformer of the Germans; Calvin, the Reformer of the French, Cranmer, of the English Church, and Knox, of the Scotch, were all independent, and in some things diverse, yet they all agreed spontaneously in the recognition of the church-membership of the infant children of believers. And the great historic churches of the Reformation—the Anglican, the Lutheran, the Reformed or Presbyterian in all its varieties, the original. branch of the Independents, the world-conquering Methodists—all unite with the older churches, Eastern and Western, in maintaining this grand historic constitution of infant church-membership. Those who protest against this ancient and ecumenical consensus, however eminently respectable as we affectionately recognize them to be, are certainly a recent growth, and thus far, as compared with the mighty host, but a small minority.

[III.] What is the Use of Infant Baptism?

We freely admit that our good Baptist brethren, who refuse to recognize and treat their children as members of the Church of Christ from birth, nevertheless enjoy with us the very benefits which infant baptism asserts and seals. The mistakes of God's true children will never make him unfaithful to them, nor defeat the blessings he intends for them. Precisely the same is true of the truly Christian Quakers. They enjoy all the blessings signified and sealed by the outward sacraments, although they neglect all of them entirely. Nevertheless, our Baptist brethren being judges, the obedient use of the sacraments is the more excellent way. The use of "infant baptism" is precisely the use of any sacrament—that is, the incomparable benefit of externally signifying and sealing the benefits represented.

1st. In the baptism of every infant there are four parties present and concerned in the transaction—God, the Church, the parents, and the child. The first three are conscious and active, the fourth is for the time unconscious and passive.

2nd. In the act of baptism the use is found at the time in the benefit resulting from binding the parents and the Church to the performance of all their duties relating to the child, and from binding upon the child those special obligations and sealing to the child those special benefits which spring from the gospel covenant as it includes the children with the believing parent. The faith involved is that of the parent and of the Church, while the unconscious and passive beneficiary is the child himself.

3rd. Subsequently, when the child is taught and trained under the regimen of his baptism—taught from the first to recognize himself as a child of God, with all its privileges and duties; trained to

think, feel, and act as a child of God, to exercise filial love, to render filial obedience—the benefit to the child directly is obvious and immeasurable. He has invaluable birthright privileges, and corresponding obligations and responsibilities.

4th. It is evident that this should be supplemented by a rite of confirmation. Of course I do not here refer to the unauthorized Romish and prelatical sacrament of the laying on of the hands of one of the changed successors of the apostles. I refer simply to the historical, universally-practised Christian ordinance observed in bringing the Christianly instructed and trained children before the Church "when they come to years of discretion: if they be free from scandal, appear sober and steady, and to have sufficient knowledge to discern the Lord's body, they ought to be informed it is their duty and their privilege to come to the Lord's Supper" (Directory for Worship, ch. x., § 1). Then they who have been members of the Church from their birth are admitted to full communion, and are confirmed in their church standing, upon their voluntarily taking upon themselves the vows originally imposed upon them by their parents in baptism. This is the CONFIRMATION, separated from the abortive mask of the so-called sacrament, that John Calvin declared was an ancient and beneficial custom, which he earnestly wished might be continued in the Church (Institutes, bk. iv., ch. xix. 12, 13), and which Dr. Charles Hodge declared to be "retained in some form or other in all Protestant churches" (Princeton Review, 1855, p. 445). As far as we misunderstand or ignore this beautiful ordinance of confirmation we abandon to the mercies of our Baptist brethren the whole rational ground and reason of infant baptism.

[IV.] Mar Johanan, the Nestorian bishop, when solicited by high-churchmen to separate himself from non-prelatical Christians, exclaimed, "All who love the Lord Jesus Christ are my brethren." Above all the narrow, meagre patriotism on earth is the large, free, ecumenical patriotism of those who embrace in their love and fealty the whole body of the baptized. All who are baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, recognizing the Trinity of Persons in the Godhead, the incarnation of the Son and his priestly sacrifice, whether they be Greeks, or Arminians, or Romanists, or Lutherans, or Calvinists, or the simple souls who do not know what to call themselves, are our brethren. Baptism is our common countersign. It is the common rallying standard at the head of our several columns. It is our common battle-flag, which we carry forward across the enemy's line and nail aloft in the heights crowned with victory. We will be confined in our love and allegiance by no party lines. We follow and serve one common Lord. Hence there can be only "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," and hence only one indivisible, inalienable "sacramental host of God's elect."

Archibald Alexander Hodge was born July 18, 1823 and died November 12, 1886. He was Professor in Systematic Theology at Princeton Seminary from 1877 until his parting to be with the Lord. Due to the request of many of his students and followers, Professor Hodge gave a series of nineteen popular lectures, of which this is one, in Philadephia in the early part of 1886. The complete series of those lectures can be found in the Banner of Truth edition of Hodge's Evangelical Theology

S. Sanctification

Sanctification by A.A. Hodge; revised by B.B. Warfield The following short essay was originally published Originally published in Johnson's Cyclopaedia,1896. The electronic edition of this article was scanned and edited by Shane Rosenthal for Reformation Ink. It is in the public domain and may be freely copied and distributed.

Sanctification (from Lat. sanctificatio [deriv. of sanctificare, sanctify; sanctus, holy; facere, make], trans. of Gr. agiazein, hallow, make holy, deriv. of agioß, holy) is the work of God's grace by which those who believe in Christ are freed from sin and built up in holiness. In Protestant theology it is distinguished from justification and regeneration, both of which lie at its root, and from neither of which is it separable in fact; inasmuch as the term justification is confined to the judicial act or sentence of God, by which the sinner is declared to be entitled, in consideration of what Christ has done in his behalf, to the favor of God, and of which sanctification is the efficient execution; and the term regeneration is confined to the initial efficient act by which the new life is imparted, of which sanctification is the progressive development. Both regeneration and justification are momentary acts, and acts of God in which the sinner is passive; sanctification, on the other hand, is a progressive work of God, in which the sinner co-operates. The nature of sanctification, as well as its method and the relation of the divine and human factors in its prosecution, is differently conceived by the several types of theology.

1. The Pelagian and Rationalistic view excludes the action of the Holy Spirit altogether; and makes sanctification to be nothing more than continued right action, in the native powers of the free moral agent, by which he gradually conquers evil tendencies' and builds up a holy character.

2. The Medieval and Roman view refuses to distinguish between justification and sanctification; and makes both justification and sanctification to be the cleansing from sin, and the infusion of gracious habits by the Holy Ghost for Christ's sake by the instrument of baptism, upon which subjective change the removal of guilt and the divine favor is conditioned.1 It is therefore held to be progressive, and to be advanced by good works, which possess real merit, and deserve and secure increase of grace; 2 as well as by penances, prayers, fastings, etc., which satisfy God's justice and purify the soul. 3 If the believer dies before the process of deliverance from sin is perfected, he must complete it in purgatory, the pains of which are expiatory and purifying; and there he may be assisted by the prayers and masses and dispensing power of the Church on earth. 4 But it is possible, even before death, for a believer perfectly to conform to all the demands of God's law as graciously adjusted to this life; 5 and it is even possible, out of love, to perform supererogatory service by obedience to the councils of Christ, which are advisory but not obligatory until voluntarily undertaken. These are voluntary poverty, celibacy, and obedience to monastic rule; and they merit more than the mere salvation of the person, and contribute to the "treasury of merits" at the disposal of the Church, which is imputable at the discretion of those holding the jurisdiction to believers on earth or in purgatory not yet fully justified. 6

3. The Mystical view of sanctification, though never embodied in any church creed, has existed as a doctrine and as a tendency in all ages and among all Christian denominations. Christian mysticism more or less depreciates the dependence of the soul for light upon the objective revelation of the word of God, and the necessity of the means of grace and human effort, and emphasizes spiritual intuition, the regulative value of religious feeling, the physical communion of the soul with the substance of God, conditioned on quiet and passivity of mind. Such views gained great currency in the Church through the writings of the Pseudo- Dionysius, which were published in Greek in the sixth century, and translated into Latin by John Scotus Erigena in the ninth century. They qualified the teaching of many eminent evangelical Schoolmen, such as Bernard of Clairvaux, Hugo and Richard of St. Victor, and subsequently Thomas a Kempis. They were taught with great influence among the early Protestants by Schwenckfeld (14901561), Paracelsus (1493-1541), Weigel (1533-1588), and Jacob Bohme (1575-1620); and among the Roman Catholics by St. Francis of Sales (1567-1622), Molinos (16401697), Madame Guyon (1648-1717), and Archbishop Fenelon (1651-1715). The original Quakers held similar views, as is seen in the writings of George Fox (d. 1691), William Penn (d. 1718), and Robert Barclay (1648-1690). A mystical conception is present whenever sanctification is conceived, not as the goal of effort, but as an immediate gift to the waiting soul.

4. The evangelical doctrine of sanctification common to the Lutheran and Reformed Churches includes the following points: (1) The soul after regeneration continues dependent upon the constant gracious operations of the Holy Spirit, but is, through grace, able to co-operate with them. (2) The sanctifying operations of the Spirit are supernatural, and yet effected in connection with and through the instrumentality of means: the means of sanctification being either internal, such as faith and the co-operation of the regenerated will with grace, or external, such as the word of God, sacraments, prayer, Christian fellowship, and the providential discipline of our heavenly Father. (3) In this process the Spirit gradually completes the work of moral purification commenced in regeneration. The work has two sides: (a) the cleansing of the soul from sin and emancipation from its power, and (b) the development of the implanted principle of spiritual life and infused habits of grace, until the subject comes to the stature of perfect manhood in Christ. Its effect is spiritually and morally to transform the whole man, intellect, affections, and will, soul, and body. (4) The work proceeds with various degrees of thoroughness during life, but is never consummated in absolute moral perfection until the subject passes into glory. In opposition to this doctrine a theory of perfect sanctification in this life has been taught from several distinct points of view, e.g.:

1. According to the principles of Pelagianism, a man is perfect who obeys the laws of God to the measure of his present natural ability, since the moral law is a sliding scale, adjusting its demands to the varying ability of its subject; and this is possible to every man.

2. According to the Mystical idea, perfection consists in absorption in the divine essence, or, in a less extreme form, in the absorption of human desires and will into the divine will, in a disinterested love; and this may be attained by anyone through persistent detachment from self and meditation on God.

3. According to the Roman or Ritualistic theory, perfection consists in perfect conformity to the law of God, graciously for Christ’s sake adjusted to the capacities of the regenerated man in this life; and this perfection is attained by means of meritorious works and penances, prayers, fasts, acts of

voluntary self-denial, and ecclesiastical obedience. Not only is this within the reach of men, but so is even the rendering of supererogatory service in the way of extra-legal self-denial from a principle of evangelical love.

4. The Wesleyan theory of perfection conceives that the satisfaction and merit of Christ have made it consistent with divine justice to offer salvation to men on easier terms than the old Adamic law of absolute perfection; and that perfection is attained when these lower terms have been complied with. "Christian character is estimated by the conditions of the gospel; Christian perfection implies the perfect performance of these conditions, and nothing more."7

Notes

1. Council of Trent, sess. 6, can. 7.

2. Council of Trent, sess. 6, can. 32.

3. Council of Trent, sess. 14, ch. viii; sess. 6, cans. 29 and 30.

4. Bellarmin, Purgator., ii. 9.

5. Council of Trent, sess. 6, ch. xvi, can. 25.

6. Bellarmin, De Monachiis, chs. vi and vii.

7. Wesley's tract, Christian Perfection: Methodist Doctrinal Tracts; Dr. George Peck's Christian Doctrine of Perfection. This article was made available on the internet via REFORMATION INK (www.markers.com/ink). Refer any correspondence to Shane Rosenthal: Rosenthal2000@aol.com

S. Sola Scriptura "The Rule Of Faith And Practice"

Sola Scriptura "The Rule Of Faith And Practice" By A.A. Hodge The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, Having Been Given By Inspiration of God, Are the All-Sufficient and Only Rule of Faith and Practice, and Judge of Controversies.

1. What is meant by saying that the Scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice?

Whatever God teaches or commands is of sovereign authority. Whatever conveys to us an infallible knowledge of his teachings and commands is an infallible rule. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the only organs through which, during the present dispensation, God conveys to us a knowledge of his will about what we are to believe concerning himself, and what duties he requires of us.

2. What does the Romish Church declare to be the infallible rule of faith and practice?

The Romish theory is that the complete rule of faith and practice consists of Scripture and tradition, or the oral teaching of Christ and his apostles, handed down through the Church. Tradition they hold to be necessary, 1st, to teach additional truth not contained in the Scriptures; and, 2nd, to interpret Scripture. The Church being the divinely constituted depository and judge of both Scripture and tradition.--" Decrees of Council of Trent," Session IV, and "Dens Theo.," Tom. 2., N. 80 and 81.

3. By what arguments do they seek to establish the authority of tradition? By what criterion do they distinguish true traditions from false, and on what grounds do they base the authority of the traditions they receive?

1st. Their arguments in behalf of tradition are--(1.) Scripture authorizes it, 2 Thessalonians 2:15; 2 Thessalonians 3:6. (2.) The early fathers asserted its authority and founded their faith largely upon it. (3.) The oral teaching of Christ and his apostles, when clearly ascertained, is intrinsically of equal authority with their writings. The scriptures themselves are handed down to us by the evidence of tradition, and the stream cannot rise higher than its source. (4.) The necessity of the case. (a.) Scripture is obscure, needs tradition as its interpreter. (b.)Scripture is incomplete as a rule of faith and practice; since there are many doctrines and institutions, universally recognized, which are founded only upon tradition as a supplement to Scripture. (5.) Analogy. every state recognizes both written and unwritten, common and statute law.

2nd. The criterion by which they distinguish between true and false traditions is Catholic consent. The Anglican ritualists confine the application of the rule to the first three or four centuries. the Romanists recognize that as an authoritative consent which is constitutionally expressed by the bishops in general council, or by the Pope ex-cathedra, in any age of the church whatever.

3rd. They defend the traditions which they hold to be true. (1.) On the ground of historical testimony, tracing them up to the apostles as their source. (2.) The authority of the Church expressed by Catholic consent.

4. By what arguments may the invalidity of all ecclesiastical tradition, as a part of our rule of faith and practice, be shown?

1st. The Scriptures do not, as claimed, ascribe authority to oral tradition. Tradition, as intended by Paul in the passage cited (2 Thessalonians 2:15, and 2 Thessalonians 3:6), signifies all his instructions, oral and written, communicated to those very people themselves, not handed down. On the other hand, Christ rebuked this doctrine of the Romanists in their predecessors, the Pharisees, Matthew 15:3, Matthew 15:6; Mark 7:7.

2nd. It is improbable a priori that God would supplement Scripture with tradition as part of our rule of faith. (1.) Because Scripture, as will be shown below (questions 7-14), is certain, definite, complete, and perspicuous. (2.) Because tradition, from its very nature, is indeterminate, and liable to become adulterated with every form of error. Besides, as will be shown below (question 20), the authority of Scripture does not rest ultimately upon tradition.

3rd The whole ground upon which Romanists base the authority of their traditions (viz., history and church authority) is invalid. (1.) History utterly fails them. For more than three hundred years after the apostles they have very little, and that contradictory, evidence for any one of their traditions.

They are thus forced to the absurd assumption that what was taught in the fourth century was therefore taught in the third, and therefore in the first. (2.) The church is not infallible, as will be shown below (question 18).

4th. Their practice is inconsistent with their own principles. Many of the earliest and best attested traditions they do not receive. Many of their pretended traditions are recent inventions unknown to the ancients.

5th. Many of their traditions, such as relate to the priesthood, the sacrifice of the mass, etc., are plainly in direct opposition to Scripture. Yet the infallible church affirms the infallibility of Scripture. A house divided against itself cannot stand.

5. What is necessary to constitute a sole and infallible rule of faith?

Plenary inspiration, completeness, perspicuity or clarity, and accessibility.

6. What arguments do the Scriptures themselves afford in favor of the doctrine that they are the only infallible rule of faith?

1st. The Scriptures always speak in the name of God, and command faith and obedience.

2nd. Christ and his apostles always refer to the written Scriptures, then existing, as authority, and to no other rule of faith whatsoever.-- Luke 16:29; Luke 10:26; John 5:39; Romans 4:3; 2 Timothy 3:15.

3rd. The Bereans are commended for bringing all questions, even apostolic teaching, to this test.-- Acts 17:11; see also Isaiah 8:16.

4th. Christ rebukes the Pharisees for adding to and perverting the Scriptures.-- Matthew 15:7-9; Mark 7:5-8; see also Revelation 22:18-19, and Deuteronomy 4:2; Deuteronomy 12:32; Joshua 1:7.

7. In what sense is the completeness of Scripture as a rule of faith asserted?

It is not meant that the Scriptures contain every revelation which God has ever made to man, but that their contents are the only supernatural revelation that God does now make to man, and that this revelation is abundantly sufficient for man's guidance in all questions of faith, practice, and modes of worship, and excludes the necessity and the right of any human inventions.

8. How may this completeness be proved, from the design of scripture? The Scriptures profess to lead us to God. Whatever is necessary to that end they must teach us. If any supplementary rule, as tradition, is necessary to that end, they must refer us to it.

"Incompleteness here would be falsehood." But while one sacred writer constantly refers us to the writings of another, not one of them ever intimates to us either the necessity or the existence of any other rule.-- John 20:31; 2 Timothy 3:15-17.

9. By what other arguments may this principle be proved? As the Scriptures profess to be a rule complete for its end, so they have always been practically found to be such by the true spiritual people of God in all ages. They teach a complete and harmonious system of doctrine. They furnish all necessary principles for the government of the private lives of Christians, in every relation, for the public worship of God, and for the administration of the affairs of his kingdom; and they repel all pretended -traditions and priestly innovations.

10. In what sense do Protestants affirm and Romanists deny the perspicuity of Scripture?

Protestants do not affirm that the doctrines revealed in the Scriptures are level to man's powers of understanding. Many of them are confessedly beyond all understanding. Nor do they affirm that every part of Scripture can be certainly and perspicuously expounded, many of the prophesies being perfectly obscure until explained by the event. But they do affirm that every essential article of faith and rule of practice is clearly revealed in Scripture, or may certainly be deduced therefrom. This much the least instructed Christian may learn at once; while, on the other hand, it is true, that with the advance of historical and critical knowledge, and by means of controversies, the Christian church is constantly making progress in the accurate interpretation of Scripture, and in the comprehension in its integrity of the system therein taught.

Protestants affirm and Romanists deny that private and unlearned Christians may safely be allowed to interpret Scripture for themselves.

11. How can the perspicuity of scripture be proved from the fact that it is a law and a message?

We saw (question 8) that Scripture is either complete or false, from its own professed design. We now prove its perspicuity upon the same principle. It professes to be (1) a law to be obeyed; (2) a revelation of truth to be believed, to be received by us in both aspects upon the penalty of eternal death. To suppose it not to be perspicuous, relatively to its design of commanding and teaching is to charge God with clearing with us in a spirit at once disingenuous and cruel.

12. In what passages is their perspicuity asserted?

Psalms 19:7-8; Psalms 119:1-5, Psalms 119:130; 2 Corinthians 3:14; 2 Peter 1:18-19; Habakkuk 2:2; 2 Timothy 3:15, 2 Timothy 3:17.

13. By what other arguments may this point be established?

1st. The Scriptures are addressed immediately, either to all men indiscriminately, or else to the whole body of believers as such.-- Deuteronomy 6:4-9; Luke 1:3; Romans 1:7; 1 Corinthians 1:2; 2 Corinthians 1:1; 2 Corinthians 4:2; Galatians 1:2; Ephesians 1:1; Php 1:1; Colossians 1:2; James 1:1; 1 Peter 1:1; 2 Peter 1:1; 1 John 2:12, 1 John 2:14; Jude 1:1; Revelation 1:3-4; Revelation 2:7. The only exceptions are the epistles to Timothy and Titus.

2nd. All Christians indiscriminately are commanded to search the Scriptures.-- 2 Timothy 3:15, 2 Timothy 3:17; Acts 17:11; John 5:39.

3rd. Universal experience. We have the same evidence of the light-giving power of Scripture that we have of the same property in the sun. The argument to the contrary, is an insult to the understanding of the whole world of Bible readers.

4th. The essential unity in faith and practice, in spite of all circumstantial differences, of all Christian communities of every age and nation, who draw their religion directly from the open Scriptures.

14. What was the third quality required to constitute the scriptures the sufficient rule of faith and practice?

Accessibility. It is self-evident that this is the pre-eminent characteristic of the Scriptures, in contrast to tradition, which is in the custody of a corporation of priests, and to every other pretended rule whatsoever. The agency of the church in this matter is simply to give all currency to the word of God.

15. What is meant by saying that the Scriptures are the judge as well as the rule in questions of faith?

"A rule is a standard of judgment; a judge is the expounder and applier of that rule to the decision of particular cases." The Protestant doctrine is-- 1st. That the Scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice.

2nd. (1.) negatively. That there is no body of men who are either qualified, or authorized, to interpret the Scriptures, or apply their principles to the decision of particular questions, in a sense binding upon the faith of their fellow Christians.

(2.) Positively. That Scripture is the only infallible voice in the church, and is to be interpreted, in its own light, and with the gracious help of the Holy Ghost, who is promised to every Christian (1 John 2:20-27), by each individual for himself; with the assistance, though not by the authority, of his fellow Christians. Creeds and confessions, as to form, bind only those who voluntarily profess them, and as to matter, they bind only so far as they affirm truly what the Bible teaches, and because the Bible does so teach.

16. What is the Romish doctrine regarding the authority of the church as the infallible interpreter of the rule of faith and the authoritative judge of all controversies? The Romish doctrine is that the church is absolutely infallible in all matters of Christian faith and practice, and the divinely authorized depository and interpreter of the rule of faith. Her office is not to convey new revelations from God to man, yet her inspiration renders her infallible in disseminating and interpreting the original revelation communicated through the apostles. The church, therefore, authoritatively

determines--1st. What is Scripture. 2nd. What is genuine tradition 3rd. What is the true sense of Scripture and 'tradition', and what is the true application of that perfect rule to every particular question of belief or practice. This authority vests in the pope, when acting in his official capacity, and in the bishops as a body, as when assembled in general council, or when giving universal consent to a decree of pope or council.--"Decrees of Council of Trent," Session 4.; "Deus Theo.," N. 80, 81, 84, 93, 94, 95, 96. "Bellarmine," Lib. 3., de eccles., cap. 14., and Lib. 2., de council., cap. 2.

17. By what arguments do they seek to establish this authority?

1st. The promises of Christ, given, as they claim, to the apostles, and to their official successor, securing their infallibility, and consequent authority.-- Matthew 16:18; Matthew 18:18-20; Luke 24:47-49; John 16:13; John 20:23.

2nd. The commission given to the church as the teacher of the world.-- Matthew 28:19-20; Luke 10:16, etc.

3rd. The church is declared to be "the pillar and ground of the truth," and it is affirmed that "the gates of hell shall never prevail against her."

4th. To the church is granted power to bind and loose, and he that will not hear the church is to be treated as a heathen. Matthew 16:19; Matthew 18:15-18.

5th. The church is commanded to discriminate between truth and error, and must consequently be qualified and authorized to do so-- 2 Thessalonians 3:6; Romans 16:17; 2 John 1:10.

6th. From the necessity of the case, men need and crave an ever-living, visible, and cotemporaneous infallible Interpreter and Judge.

7th. From universal analogy every community among men has the living judge as well as the written law, and the one would be of no value without the other.

8th. This power is necessary to secure unity and universality, which all acknowledge to be essential attributes of the true church.

18. By what arguments may this claim of the Romish church be shown to be utterly baseless?

1st. A claim vesting in mortal men a power so momentous can be established only by the most clear and certain evidence, and the failure to produce such converts the claim into a treason at once against God and the human race.

2nd. Her evidence fails, because the promises of Christ to preserve his church from extinction and from error do none of them go the length of pledging infallibility. The utmost promised is, that the true people of God shall never perish entirely from the earth, or be left to apostatize from the essentials of the faith.

3rd. Her evidence fails, because these promises of Christ were addressed not to the officers of the church as such, but to the body of true believers. Compare John 20:23 with Luke 24:33, Luke 24:47-49 and 1 John 2:20, 1 John 2:27.

4th. Her evidence fails, because the church to which the precious promises of the Scriptures are pledged is not an external, visible society, the authority of which is vested in the hands of a perpetual line of apostles. For--(1.) the word church ekklhsia is a collective term, embracing the effectually called klhtoi or regenerated.-- Romans 1:7; Romans 8:28; 1 Corinthians 1:2; Jude 1:1; Revelation 17:14; also Romans 9:24; 1 Corinthians 7:18-24; Galatians 1:15; 2 Timothy 1:9; Hebrews 9:15; 1 Peter 2:9; 1 Peter 5:10; Ephesians 1:18; 2 Peter 1:10. (2.) The attributes ascribed to the church prove it to consist alone of the true, spiritual people of God as such.-- Ephesians 5:27; 1 Peter 2:5; John 10:27; Colossians 1:18, Colossians 1:24. (3.) The epistles are addressed to the church, and in their salutations explain that phrase as equivalent to "the called,""the saints,""all true worshippers of God;" witness the salutations of 1st and 2nd Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, 1st and 2nd Peter and Jude. The same attributes are ascribed to the members of the true church as such throughout the body of the Epistles.-- 1 Corinthians 1:30; 1 Corinthians 3:16; 1 Corinthians 6:11, 1 Corinthians 6:19; Ephesians 2:3-8, and Ephesians 2:19-22; 1 Thessalonians 5:4-5; 2 Thessalonians 2:13; Colossians 1:21; Colossians 2:10; 1 Peter 2:9.

5th. The inspired apostles have had no successors. (1.) There is no evidence that they had such in the New Testament. (2.) While provision was made for the regular perpetuation of the offices of presbyter and deacon (1 Timothy 3:1-13), there are no directions given for the perpetuation of the apostolate. (3.) There is perfect silence concerning the continued existence of any apostles in the church in the writings of the early centuries. Both the name and the thing ceased. (4.) No one ever claiming to be one of their successors have possessed the "signs of an apostle."-- 2 Corinthians 12:12; 1 Corinthians 9:1; Galatians 1:1, Galatians 1:12; Acts 1:21-22.

6th. This claim, as it rests upon the authority of the Pope, is utterly unscriptural, because the Pope is not known to Scripture. As it rests upon the authority of the whole body of the bishops, expressed in their general consent, it is unscriptural for the reasons above shown, and it is, moreover, impracticable, since their universal judgment never has been and never can be impartially collected and pronounced.

7th. There can be no infallibility where there is not self- consistency. But as a matter of fact the Papal church has not been self-consistent in her teaching. (1.) She has taught different doctrines in different sections and ages. (2.) She affirms the infallibility of the holy Scriptures, and at the same time teaches a system plainly and radically inconsistent with their manifest sense; witness the doctrines of the priesthood, the mass, penance, of works, and of Mary worship. Therefore the Church of Rome hides the Scriptures from the people.

8th. If this Romish system be true then genuine spiritual religion ought to flourish in her communion, and all the rest of the world ought to be a moral desert. The facts are notoriously the reverse. If; therefore, we admit that the Romish system is true, we subvert one of the principal evidences of Christianity itself; viz., the self-evidencing light and practical power of true religion, and the witness of the Holy Ghost.

19. By what direct arguments may the doctrine that the Scriptures are the final judge of controversies be established? That all Christians are to study the Scriptures for themselves, and that in all questions as to God’s revealed will the appeal is to the Scriptures alone, is proved by the following facts:

1st. Scripture is perspicuous, see above, questions 11-13.

2nd. Scripture is addressed to all Christians as such, see above, question 13.

3rd. All Christians are commanded to search the scriptures, and by them to judge all doctrines and all professed teachers.-- John 5:39; Acts 17:11; Galatians 1:8; 2 Corinthians 4:2; 1 Thessalonians 5:21; 1 John 4:1-2.

4th. The promise of the Holy Spirit, the author and interpreter of Scripture, is to all Christians as such. Compare John 20:23 with Luke 24:47-49; 1 John 2:20, 1 John 2:27; Romans 8:9; 1 Corinthians 3:16-17.

5th. Religion is essentially a personal matter. Each Christian must know and believe the truth explicitly for himself; on the direct ground of its own moral and spiritual evidence, and not on the mere ground of blind authority. Otherwise faith could not be a moral act, nor could it "purify the heart." Faith derives its sanctifying power from the truth which it immediately apprehends on its own experimental evidence.-- John 17:17, John 17:19; James 1:18; 1 Peter 1:22.

20. What is the objection which the Romanists make to this doctrine, on the ground that the church is our only authority for believing that the scriptures are the word of God? Their objection is, that as we receive the scriptures as the word of God only on the authoritative testimony of the church, our faith in the Scriptures is only another form of our faith in the church, and the authority of the church, being the foundation of that of Scripture, must of course be held paramount. This is absurd, for two reasons--

1st. The assumed fact is false. The evidence upon which we receive Scripture as the word of God is not the authority of the church, but--(1.) God did speak by the apostles and prophets, as is evident (a) from the nature of their doctrine, (b) from their miracles, (c) their prophecies, (d) our personal experience and observation of the power of the truth. (2.) These very writings which we possess were written by the apostles, etc., as is evident, (a) from internal evidence, (b) from historical testimony rendered by all competent cotemporaneous witnesses in the church or out of it.

2nd. Even if the fact assumed was true, viz., that we know the Scriptures to be from God, on the authority of the church's testimony alone, the conclusion they seek to deduce from it would be absurd. The witness who proves the identity or primogenitor of a prince does not thereby acquire a right to govern the kingdom, or even to interpret the will of the prince.

21. How is the argument for the necessity of a visible judge, derived from the diversities of sects and doctrines among Protestants, to be answered?

1st. We do not pretend that the private judgment of Protestants is infallible, but only that when exercised in a humble, believing spirit, it always leads to a competent knowledge of essential truth.

2nd. The term Protestant is simply negative, and is assumed by many infidels who protest as much against the Scriptures as they do against Rome. But Bible Protestants, among all their circumstantial differences, are, to a wonderful degree, agreed upon the essentials of faith and practice. Witness their hymns and devotional literature.

3rd. The diversity that does actually exist arises from failure in applying faithfully the Protestant principles for which we contend. Men do not simply and without prejudice take their creed from the Bible.

4th. The Catholic church, in her last and most authoritative utterance through the Council of Trent, has proved herself a most indefinite Judge. Her doctrinal decisions need an infallible interpreter infinitely more than the Scriptures.

22. How may it be shown that the Romanist theory, as well as the Protestant, necessarily throws upon the people the obligation of private judgment? Is there a God? Has he revealed himself? Has he established a church? Is that church an infallible teacher? Is private judgment a blind leader? Which of all pretended churches is the true one? Every one of these questions evidently must be settled in the Private judgment of the inquirer, before he can, rationally or irrationally, give up his private judgment to the direction of the self-asserting church. Thus of necessity Romanists appeal to the Scriptures to prove that the Scriptures cannot be understood, and address arguments to the private judgment of men to prove that private judgment is incompetent; thus basing an argument upon that which it is the object of the argument to prove is baseless.

23. How may it be proved that the people are far more competent to discover what the Bible teaches than to decide, by the marks insisted upon by the Romanists, which is the true church? The Romanists, of necessity, set forth certain marks by which the true church is to be discriminated from all counterfeits. These are (1.) Unity (through subjection to one visible head, the Pope); (2.) Holiness; (3.) Catholicity; (4.) Apostolicity, (involving an uninterrupted succession from the apostles of canonically ordained bishops.)--"Cat. of Council of Trent," Part 1., Cap. 10. Now, the comprehension and intelligent application of these marks involve a great amount of learning and intelligent capacity upon the part of the inquirer. He might as easily prove himself to be descended from Noah by an unbroken series of legitimate marriages, as establish the right of Rome to the last mark. Yet he cannot rationally give up the right of studying the Bible for himself until that point is made clear.

Surely the Scriptures, with their self-evidencing spiritual power, make less exhaustive demands upon the resources of private judgment.

ROMAN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AS TO THE PRIVATE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE, AND AS TO TRADITION, AND AS TO THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE.

1st. AS TO THE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE.--"Decrees of council of Trent," Sess. 4.--"Moreover the same sacred and holy Synod ordains and declares, that the said old and Vulgate edition, which, by the lengthened usage of so many ages, has been approved of in the Church, be in public lectures, disputations, sermons, and expositions held as authentic; and that no one is to dare or presume to reject it under any pretext whatever."

"Furthermore, in order to restrain petulant spirits, it decrees that no one, relying on his own skill shall in matters of faith and of morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine, wresting the sacred Scripture to his own senses, presume to interpret the said sacred scripture contrary to that sense which holy mother church--whose it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy scriptures--hath held and doth hold, or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers; even though such interpretations were never (intended) to be at any time published."

"Dogmatic Decrees of the Vatican council," ch. 2.--"And as the things which the holy Synod of Trent decreed for the good of souls concerning the interpretation of Divine Scripture, in order to curb rebellious spirits, have been wrongly explained by some, we, renewing the said decree, declare this to be their sense, that, in matters of faith and morals, appertaining to the building up of Christian doctrine, that is to be held as the true sense of Holy Scripture which our holy mother Church hath held and holds, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense of the Holy Scripture; and therefore that it is permitted to no one to interpret the sacred scripture contrary to this sense, nor, likewise contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. "

2nd. AS TO TRADITION.--"Prof. Fidei Tridentinoe"--(A. D. 1564) 2. and 3. "I most steadfastly admit and embrace apostolic and ecclesiastic traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church. I also admit the Holy scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother Church has held and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures, neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according, to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."

"Council of Trent," Sess. 4.--"And seeing clearly that this truth and discipline are contained in the written books, and the unwritten traditions which, received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ himself or from the apostles themselves the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us transmitted as it were from hand to hand."

3rd. AS TO THE ABSOLUTE AUTHORITY OF THE POPE.--"Dogmatic Decisions of the Vatican Council," chap. 3.--"Hence we teach and declare that by the appointment of our Lord . . . the power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff is immediate, to which all, of whatever rite and dignity, both pastors and faithful, both individually and collectively, are bound, by their duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, to submit not only in matters which belong to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world. . . . We further teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the faithful, and that in all causes, the decision of which belongs to the Church, recourse may be had to his tribunal, and that none may reopen the judgment of the Apostolic See, than whose authority there is no greater, nor can any lawfully review his judgment. Wherefore they err from the right course who assert that it is lawful to appeal from the judgments of the Roman Pontiff to an ecumenical council, as to an authority higher than that of the Roman Pontiff."

4th. CONCERNING THE ABSOLUTE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE AS THE TEACHER OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH.--"Dogmatic Decrees of the Vatican Council," Chap. 4.--"Therefore faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian people, the sacred Council approving, we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed:That the Roman Pontiff when he speaks ex cathedra, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to he held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of the infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that his Church should be endowed for defining doctrine according to faith and morals; and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the church. But if any one--which may God avert--presume to contradict this our definition:let him

be anathema."

Cardinal Manning in his "Vatican Council" says, "In this definition there are six points to be noted:"

"1st. It defines the meaning of the well-known phrase loquens ex cathedra ; that is, speaking from the Seat, or place, or with the authority of the supreme teacher of all Christians, and binding the assent of the universal Church."

"2nd. The subject matter of the infallible teaching, namely, the doctrine of faith and morals."

"3rd. The efficient cause of infallibility, that is, the divine assistance promised to Peter, and in Peter to his successors."

"4th. The act to which this divine assistance is attached, the defining of doctrines of faith and morals."

"5th. The extension of this infallible authority to the limits of the doctrinal office of the Church."

"6th. The dogmatic value of the definitions ex cathedra, namely that they are in themselves irreformable, because in themselves infallible, and not because the Church, or any part or member of the Church, should assent to them."

"Dogmatic Decrees of Vatican Council" Ch. 4.--"For the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter, that by his revelation they might make known new doctrine; but that by his assistance they might inviolably keep and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered through the Apostles."

S. THE ORDO SALUTIS

THE ORDO SALUTIS OR, RELATION IN THE ORDER OF NATURE OF HOLY CHARACTER AND DIVINE FAVOR by A.A. Hodge

Natural religion in all its forms presupposes holy character and conduct as the essential antecedent condition of God's favor. Christianity in all its genuine forms presupposed the favor of God as the essential antecedent condition of holy character and conduct.

We propose to discuss the following specific problem, involving the general principle just stated. In the application of redemption to the individual sinner, which, in the order of nature, precedes and condions the other-justification or regeneration?

I. All forms of Christianity necessarily recognize the fact that in general the propitiatory work of Christ precedes and conditions our salvation. The merits of Christ, on the ground of which God pardons our sins and effectively delivers us from their pollution and power, are equally presupposed in sanctification and in justification. All Christians alike admit in general, that as the moral and spiritual condition of the creature depends necessarily upon the communion of the Spirit of God, and this communion depends upon his favor, the favor of God, the absence of judicial condemnation, and hence forgiveness of sins, must ideally precede spiritual quickening in all its stages. The execution of penalty and the communication of gracious influences cannot proceed at the same time with respect to the same persons; hence it follows that a state of condemnation must cease before a state of grace can be instituted.

Nevertheless the Mediæval and the Protestant forms of the doctrine of redemption appear alike, although in very different degrees, to condition the complete forgiveness of sins and the remission of condemnation upon a work of grace antecedently wrought out in the subject. This, in the Mediæval system, is regarded as a meritorious use of prevenient grace, leading to the desert of more grace, and a divine judgment of legal standing conformed to and grounded upon the degree of actual subjective righteousness attained at any moment by the subject. In the theology of the Reformed and Lutheran churches, justification, or God's sentence pronouncing the sinner released from condemnation, and entitled to the rewards promised to the obedient, is conditioned upon self-appropriating faith; and such faith is of course consequent only to spiritual regeneration. The ordo salutis, therefore, according to the Catholic system, is, (1) Baptism; (2) The cleansing away of pollution of sin; (3) The infusion of gracious habits; (4) The exercise of these gracious habits in the doing of good works, which merit the favor of God, increase of grace, and finally eternal life; (5) The sacrament of penance in this life, and after death purgatory, by the pains of which the penalties incurred by our sins and the imperfections of our obedience are liquidated, and our guilt expiated, and the legal accounts of our souls finally adjusted. The order observed in the application of redemption in the theology of the Reformers is, (1) Regeneration; (2) Faith; (3) Justification. The regeneration and faith upon which justification is conditioned begin in no sense causes, either meritorious or efficient, of the remission of sins and imputation of righteousness which ensue, but only conditions sine qua non, to which God has been graciously pleased to

promise that remission and that imputation, and upon which he has been sovereignly pleased to make them depend.

II. The problem as it stands according to the Mediæval and Romish system. In fact, according to the Mediæval system, this problem, in the terms of its statement, can have no existence, since they regard justification as a real subjective change of moral character, and since they hold that full remission of the penalty of sin and complete acceptance into divine favor are the result of subsequent penitential expiations and meritorious acts of obedience.

1. They define justification as “not remission of sin merely, but also the sanctification and renewal of the inward man, through the voluntary reception of grace, and of the gifts whereby man of unjust becomes just, and of an enemy a friend.” “Of this justification, (1) The final cause is the glory of God and of Jesus Christ, and eternal life; (2) The efficient cause is a merciful God; (3) The meritorious cause is his most-beloved and only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, who, when we were enemies, merited justification for us by his most holy passion on the wood of the cross, and made satisfaction for us unto God the Father; (4) The instrumental cause is baptism; (5) The formal cause is the righteousness of God - not that whereby he himself is just, but that whereby he makest us just; that, to wit, with which we, being endowed by him, are renewed in the spirit of our mind, and we are not only reputed, but are truly called, and are just, receiving justice within us, each one according to his own measure, and according to each one’s proper disposition and co-operation. For although no one can be just but he to whom the merits of the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ are communicated, yet this is done in the said justification of the impious, when by the merit of that same most holy passion the charity of God is poured forth by the Holy Spirit in the hearts of those that are justified, and s inherent therein; whence man, through Jesus Christ, in whom he is grafted, receives in said justification, together with the remission of sins, all those gifts infused at once - faith, hope, and charity.” (Conc. Trent., Sess. 6, ch. 7.)

Hence justification, (1) Necessarily presupposes the satisfaction rendered by Christ for human guilt; (2) It presupposes the merit of Christ’s obedience and suffering meriting for his people grace and all things necessary for salvation; (3) Its essential nature is (a) the cleansing from pollution, (b) the infusion of grace; (4) It exists in various degrees; (5) Its reception depends upon and its degrees vary with each one’s own proper disposition and co-operation.

2. The work of Christ is the necessary presupposition of justification in the Mediæval and Catholic view of it, as well as in that of Protestant. In consequence of Adam’s sin, the whole human race is held under a sentence of forfeiture and of condemnation before God. Thomas Aquinas (“Summa Theologia,” Pars III., Qu. 48, Arts. i.-iv.; and Qu. 47, Art. 23) distinguished, in the bearing of Christ’s work upon the just and holy God, between its value as satisfaction and its value as merit: (1) As satisfaction, it expiates the guilt of sin and atones for sin as a wrong done the infinite God; (2) As merit, it deserves the favor and gracious help of God in behalf of those for whom it was wrought out. In both elements it is necessarily presupposed by God as the judicial ground of all his gracious dealings with the human race, and with each individual thereof. As satisfaction it removes the sentence pronounced against the sinner which would otherwise necessitate the expression of wrath, and prevent the exercise of grace. As merit it deserves the communication of initial grace to each designated beneficiary, which is effected in baptism, whereby the soul is cleansed from sin and habits of grace are infused; and, further, it deserves the co-operation of additional grace with

the obedient will rightly using prevenient grace; and it is the ultimate and absolute meritorious basis upon which the good works of believers secondarily merit increase of grace ultimately eternal life. Aquinas himself affirms that the satisfaction and merit of Christ necessarily antecede and constitute the foundation of any merit subsequently acquired by the believer. Hence that which is ultimately founded upon grace is all of grace, and si gratia consideratur secundum rationem gratuiti doni, omne meritum repugnat gratia (Qu. 113, Art.5); and hence absolutely forgiveness of sins precedes and conditions infusion of grace. And yet, with palpable inconsistency, Thomas, and after him the who Romish Church, actually reverse this fundamental order when they proceed to elucidate the actual realization of redemption by the individual believer (Qu. 113, Arts. 2-8): “Therefore the remission of sins cannot be rationally believed unless there be present (first) infusion of grace.” “In justification (in the Romish sense) therefore four points are involved: (a) The infusion of grace; (b) The movement of the free will toward God through the awakening of faith; (c) The movement of the free will against sin; (d) The remission of guilt as the completion of justification.” (Ritschl., “Hist. Ch. Doc. of Reconciliation,” p. 79.)

3. In the actual realization of justification by the individual, according to the Romish scheme, a distinction must be carefully observed between (a) that which in the case of an adult sinner prepares for it, (b) the realization of justification in the first instance, and (c) its subsequent progressive realization in the advance of the gracious soul toward perfection; (d) that which is necessary for the restoration to grace of the baptized Christian after backsliding into sin.

(1) The preparation of the adult sinner for justification proceeds from the prevenient grace of God, without any merit on the part of the subject. This grace conceiving faith through hearing, brings him (a) to know himself to be a sinner and to apprehend the divine justice, and (b) to consider the mercy of God, and to trust that God will be merciful to him for Christ’s sakes; and hence (c) disposes him to co-operate with that grace which inclines him to love God, and moves him to that detestation of sin and penitence which must be experienced before baptism, and finally (d) leads him to determine to receive baptism and to lead a new life. (Con. Trent., Sess. 6, chaps. 5 and 6.)

(2) The justification of the sinner according to the Romish system, as above shown, is the infusion of gracious habits, the pollution of sin having been washed away by the power of God, on account of the merits of Christ, through the instrumentality of baptism, which operates its effects by an effective energy made inherent in it by the institution of God. After this, inherent in it by the institution of God. After this, inherent sin being removed, remission of guilt follows necessarily as its immediate effect. Guilt is the relation which sin sustains to the justice of God. The thing being removed, the relation ceases ipso facto. (Bellarmin, “De Amissione gratia et statu peccati.”)

(3) Having been thus justified and made a friend of God, he advances from virtue to virtue, and is renewed from day to day, through the observance of the commandments of God and of the church, faith co-operating with good works, which truly merit and receive as a just reward increase of grace, and more and more perfect justification. His first justification was for Christ’s sake, without any co-operation of his own merit, but by consent of his own will. His continued and increasing justification is for Christ’s sake, through and in proportion to his own merit, which deserves increase of grace and acceptance in proportion (a) to his personal holiness and (b) to his obedience to ecclesiastical rules. (Conc. Trent., Sess. 6, chap. 10, and can. 32.)

(4) In the case of those who, having been justified, have sinned, the grace lost is restored, for the merits of Christ, through the sacrament of penance, which is provided as a second plank to rescue those who by sin have shipwrecked grace. the penance includes (a) sorrow for sin; (b) confession of all known sins - at least the desire to do so - to a priest having jurisdiction; (c) sacerdotal absolution; (d) satisfaction by alms, fasts, prayers, etc., and finally by purgatorial fires - which all avail for the avenging and punishing of past sins, as well as for the discipleship of the new life, and are meritorious satisfactions to divine justice, canceling the temporal punishments involved in the guilt of the sins for which they are undergone, the eternal punishment whereof having been freely and at once remitted, either by the sacrament itself, or by the honest desire for it. (Conc. Trent., Sess. 6, chaps. 14 and 16, and can. 30, Sess. 14, chaps 1 - 1 Samuel) This system, involving the logical contradiction already pointed out, we acknowledge to be Christian (generically), because it builds ultimately upon the satisfaction and merits of Christ, which alone it regards as absolute. But we unhesitatingly pronounce it at the same time to be anti-Christian - i.e., a system which substitutes that which is not Christ in his place and stead, inasmuch as it, (1) After building upon, overlays out of sight the true foundation with human merits and penances, without authority, destitute of all meritorious desert. (2) Because it interposes between the soul of the repentant sinner and Christ many false mediators, as Mary, the saints, and priests. (3) Inasmuch as it teaches that divine grace operates magically, through sacraments, ex opere operato; and not, as is the fact, ethically through the truth revealed in the inspired Word, apprehended through spiritual through spiritual illumination, and received by faith, and loved and obeyed in the heart and life.

III. The problem considered in the form it has assumed in the Reformation Theology.

1. Observe the distinctive principle of the Theology of the Reformers.

(1) The movement of Luther and Calvin, and even of Zwingli, was one primarily of inward practical personal religious experience, and not of systematic theological thinking. The phrase “justification by faith,” therefore, in the first instance expressed a religious conviction corresponding to a felt religious necessity of baptized Christian men, already within the church and diligently serving God, who had been brought to estimate their own religious works at their true value - as imperfect, and utterly inadequate. The holiness of God condemns as worthy of reprobation the least imperfection. The whole heart and all the works of the most earnest Christian are imperfect, and worthy of condemnation. There is consequently no ground of confidence for an sinner, no matter what be the character or stage of his religious experience, but the righteousness of Christ, imputed by God and appropriated by faith. (Ritschl., “Hist. Ch. Doc. Reconciliation,” chap. iv.)

(2) In connection with this personal experience of faith appropriating the righteousness of Christ, the moral and Christian sense of the Reformers was outraged by the then prevalent abuses of papal indulgences - a corollary of the doctrine of penance, which we have shown above to be an essential element in the Mediæval and Romish doctrine of justification. The horrible immoralities inseparable from the system enabled the Reformers to estimate more adequately its essentially irreligious character. The fact that all these ecclesiastical penances are inadequate, and therefore ineffectual, led them to see more clearly that they are unauthorized, and unnecessary because anticipated by the perfect work of Christ.

Hence, from this practical ground, there was subsequently elaborated the Reformation doctrine of justification by faith, which was afterwards adjusted into its systematic relations with the scriptural

teaching as to the satisfaction of Christ, Predestination, Vocation, Faith, Adoption, and Sanctification by the great systematic divines of the seventeenth century. The two principles which give character to Protestant soteriology, and distinguish it generically from Romish soteriology on the one hand, and from that of the Socinians and Rationalists on the other, are:

(1) The clear distinction emphasized between the change of relation to the law, signalized by the word justification; and the real subjective change of personal character, signalized by the words regeneration and sanctification. With the Protestants, justification is a forensic act of God, declaring that the law as a covenant of life is satisfied, and that the subject is no longer subject to its penalty, but entitled henceforth to the rewards conditioned upon obedience. Regeneration, on the other hand, is a subjective change in the moral character of the subject, the gracious commencement of his complete restoration to the moral image of God, effected by the Holy Spirit in progressive sanctification.

(2) The second characteristic mark of Protestant soteriology is the principle that the change of relation to the law signalized by the term justification, involving remission of penalty and restoration to favor, necessarily precedes and renders possible the real moral change of character signalized by the terms regeneration and sanctification. The continuance of judicial condemnation excludes the exercise of grace in the heart. Remission of punishment must be preceded by remission of guilt, and must itself precede the work of the Holy Spirit in the heart. Hence it must be entirely unconditioned upon any legal standing, or moral or gracious condition of the subject. We are pardoned in order that we may be good, never made good in order that we may be pardoned. We are freely made co-heirs with Christ in order that we may become willing co-workers with him, but we are never made co-workers in order that we may become co-heirs.

These principles are of the very essence of Protestant soteriology. To modify, and much more, of course, to ignore or to deny them, destroys absolutely the thing known as Protestantism, and ought to incur the forfeiture of all recognized right to wear the name.

2. The application of redemption to the individual beneficiary is variously conceived of by Arminian and Calvinistic Protestants.

(1) According to Arminians, Christ satisfied divine justice in behalf of all men, the fallen race in mass, so as to place all individuals whatsoever in a salvable state, and to impetrate sufficient grace, forgiveness of sins, renewal of nature, and the adoption of sons and all the means thereto for all men, subject to the use which each man makes of the “gracious ability” thus redemptively secured for him. The order, therefore, stands thus: (a) The satisfaction and merit of Christ; (b) Sufficient grace conferred upon all for Christ’s sake, and endowing each man, at least at some point of his life, with “gracious ability;” (c) The voluntary use of the gracious ability thus secured issuing in (d) regeneration, and hence (e) in faith, and hence in (f) justification and sanctification.

(2) According to Calvinists, Christ obeyed and suffered in the stead of, and in behalf of his elect, according to the terms of a covenant engagement formed in eternity between his Father and himself. He impetrated for his people individually complete salvation and all the means thereof, to be applied to them severally at such times and under such providential and gracious conditions as were determined in the covenant.

Hence the application of redemption to each beneficiary proceeds on the presupposition of a merit and right previously impetrated by Christ and conceded by the Father. Every element of God's gracious dealings with the elect, from their birth to their glorification, is exercised toward them in Christ as their head, is on account of Christ as the one procuring it by his merit, and through Christ as the one efficaciously applying it. Hence the application of redemption is the designed end and effect of the impetration of it by Christ. The parts of the application are two: (a) Union with Christ, and (b) communion in the benefits secured by his obedience and suffering. This "union" is effected by the Holy Ghost in effectual calling. Of this "calling" the parts are two: (a) The offering of Christ to the sinner, externally by the Gospel, and internally by the illumination of the Holy Ghost; (b) The reception of Christ, which on our part is both passive and active. The passive reception is that whereby a spiritual principle is ingenerated into the human will, whence issues the active reception, which is an act of faith with which repentance is always conjoined. The "communion" of benefits which results from this union involves (a) a change of state or relation, called justification; and (b) a change of subjective moral character, commenced in regeneration and completed through sanctification.

Justification is by all Calvinists defined a gracious sentence pronounced by God, whereby he pardoneth the sins of the believer and receives him as righteous in his sight only for the sake of the righteousness of Christ imputed to him as a believer. ("Medulla Amesii," chap. 26, De Vocatione.)

3. Hence the apparent circle in the reasoning involved in the evangelical or Protestant soteriology, and the interest thence arising in the problem proposed in this article.

(1) Christ satisfies divine justice and merits grace and salvation for his elect by his sufferings on the cross.

(2) In consideration of this meritorious work of Christ, and in execution of the grace therein impetrated, God deals with the elect sinner from his birth in a method of forbearance and special providential discipline, and at the predetermined time he regenerates him as still a sinner for Christ's sake antecedent to faith.

(3) In consideration of the same meritorious work of Christ and the grace thereby impetrated, God graciously declares the relation of the now regenerated believer to the law to be changed, and the righteousness of Christ to be credited to him, for the sake of Christ, now apprehended by faith.

Thus it follows that the satisfaction and merit of Christ are the antecedent cause of regeneration; and yet, nevertheless, the participation of the believer in the satisfaction and merit of Christ (i.e., his justification) is conditioned upon his faith, which in turn is conditioned upon his regeneration. He must have part in Christ so far forth as to be regenerated in order to have part in him so far forth as to be justified. This question is obviously one as to order, not of time, but of cause and effect. All admit, (1) That the satisfaction and merit of Christ are the necessary precondition of regeneration and faith as directly as of justification; (2) That regeneration and justification are both gracious acts of God; (3) That they take place at the same moment of time. The only question is, What is the true order of causation? Is the righteousness of Christ imputed to us that we may believe, or is it imputed to us because we believe? Is justification and analytic judgment, to the effect that this man, though a sinner, yet being a believer, is justified? Or is it a synthetic judgment,

to the effect that this sinner is justified for Christ's sake (Ritschl., chap. 6, §42). Our catechism suggests the latter by the order of its phrases. God justifies us, "only for the righteousness of Christ, imputed to us, and received by faith alone." The same seems to be included in the very act of justifying faith itself, which is the trustful recognition and embrace of Christ, who had previously "loved me, and given himself for me" (Galatians 2:20). The biblical phrase, "justified by faith," applies strictly, of course, to our relations to God as these are realized in the sphere of human consciousness. Faith is at once the act whereby we apprehend Christ, and the effect of our being antecedently apprehended of him. The act of faith is the one thing we do, but it is preceded in the order of causation (a) by the impetration of salvation by Christ, and (b) by the first stages of the work of the Holy Spirit in applying it. Faith is the organ whereby we recognize Christ as meriting our salvation, an the Father as reconciled for Christ's sake; but, of course, the salvation was merited and the Father was reconciled, and both were long since engaged with the Holy Spirit in carrying on the work of the personal application of grace, or we could not recognize them as so doing.

4. The analogy of the imputation of Adam's sin to us and of our sins to Christ must be borne in mind when reflecting on the conditions of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to us.

However much various schools of theologians may differ as to the grounds and nature of our union with Adam, and hence as to the reason in law of our responsibility for his apostatizing act, the whole Church has always maintained that the depravity of moral nature innate in his posterity is the penal consequence of his first sin. Beza on Rom. v. expresses the faith of the whole church when he says: "As Adam, by the commission of sin, first was made guilty of the wrath of God" (i.e., righteously exposed to that wrath), "then as being guilty underwent as the punishment of his sin the corruption of soul and body, so also he transmitted to his posterity a nature in the first place guilty, and next corrupted." The imputation of the guilt (just liability to punishment) of Adam's apostatizing act to his whole race in common leads judicially to the spiritual desertion of each new-born soul in particular, and spiritual desertion involves inherent depravity as a necessary and universal consequence. In like manner the imputation of our sins in common to Christ lead to his spiritual desertion (Matthew 27:46), but his temporary desertion as a man by the Holy Ghost lead in his case to no tendency however remote to inherent or actual sin, because he was the God-man. By consequence, the imputation of Christ's righteous to us is the necessary precondition of the restoration to us of the influences of the Holy Ghost, and that restoration leads by necessary consequence to our regeneration and sanctification. The notion that the necessary precondition of the imputation to us of Christ's righteousness is our own faith, of which the necessary precondition is regeneration, is analogous to the rejected theory that the inherent personal moral corruption of each of Adam's descendants is the necessary precondition of the imputation of his guilt to them. On the contrary, if the imputation of guilt is the causal antecedent of inherent depravity, in like manner the imputation of righteousness must be the causal antecedent of regeneration and faith. This is obviously true in the case of a person regenerated in infancy, as must be true of all who dies in infancy, and of many others whose early regeneration is attested by their subsequent life. In their case the unquestionable order was as follows: The guilt of Adam was imputed at birth, and they at once lost original righteousness and became spiritually dead. Then the righteousness of Christ was imputed, and they were regenerated and in due course sanctified by the Holy Ghost. In the justification, therefore, of that majority of the elect which dies in infancy

personal faith does not mediate. It cannot, therefore, ever mediate in the justification of any of the elect as an element absolutely necessary to the thing itself. In the case of the adult, faith is the first and invariable exercise of the regenerate and justified soul, whereby the righteousness of Christ imputed and the justification it effect are consciously received and appropriated, and the organ through which the Holy Spirit subsequently acts upon the soul, now spiritually alive, in, promoting its progressive sanctification.

Dr. Dorner ("Hist. of Protest. Theo.," vol. ii., pp. 156, 160) says, "It is evident that God must himself already have been secretly favorable and gracious to a man, and must already have pardoned him in foro divino, for the sake of Christ and his relation to human nature, in order to be able to bestow upon him the grace of regeneration." "In fact, viewed as an actus Dei forensis, there is a necessity that it should be regarded as existing prior to man's consciousness thereof - nay, prior to faith. For faith is nothing more than the commencement of such consciousness, and could not arise at all unless preceded objectively by justification before God - in other words, by a divine and gracious purpose, special with regard to the individual sinner, existing on God's part as an accomplished act of pardon, and then applying to man by the exhibition and offer of the benefits of redemption. The vocation of the individual to salvation could not result unless God had already, in preventing love, previously pardoned the sinner for Christ's sake, i.e., for the sake of that fellowship of Christ with the sinner which the latter had not yet rejected. It is only when Justificatio forensis maintains its Reformation position at the head of the process of salvation that it has any firm or secure standing at all. If removed from this, it is gradually driven to a greater and greater distance, till at last, as in Storr's divinity, it takes its place at the end."

5. The solution of this problem is to be found in the fact, above mentioned, that Christ by his obedience and suffering impetrated for his own people, not only the possibility of salvation, but salvation itself and all it includes, and the certainty and means of its application also. This he did in the execution of the provisions of a covenant engagement with his Father, which provides for the application of the purchased redemption to specific persons at certain times, and under certain conditions, all which conditions are impetrated by Christ, as well as definitely determined by the covenant. The relation of a new-born elect child to Adam, and his participation in the consequences of Adam's apostasy, are the same as that of any other of his co-descendants. But his relation to the satisfaction and merits of Christ is analogous to that of a minor heir under human law to his inheritance secured to him by his father's will. As long as he is under age the will secures the inchoate rights of the heir de jure. It provides for his education and maintenance at the expense of the estate in preparation for his inheritance. It determines the previous installments of his patrimony to be given him by his trustee. It predetermines the precise time and conditions of his being inducted into absolute possession. His title rests from first to last upon his father's will. He possesses certain rights and enjoys certain benefits from the first. But he has absolute rights and powers of ownership only when he reaches the period and meets the conditions prescribed for that purpose by the will. The force of this analogy is not weakened, but rather augmented by the fact that the peculiarity in the case of the elect heir of Christ's redemption is that all the conditions of full possession are themselves free gifts, equally with the possession secure by the will, and parts of the inheritance itself. Hence the satisfaction and merit of Christ are imputed to the elect man from his birth, so far as they form the basis of the gracious dealing provided for him in preparation for his full possession. When that time has come, they are imputed to him

unconditionally to that end, the consequence being that the Spirit, who had previously striven with him, and finally convinced him of sin, now renews his will, and works in him to act faith, whereby he appropriates the offered righteousness of Christ, and actually and consciously is received into the number, and is openly recognized and treated as one entitled to all the privileges, of the children of God. To this consummating and self-prevailing act of God theologians have assigned the title “Justification” in its specific sense. It is a pronounced judgment of God, raising the subject into the realization of a new relation, yet one long purposed and prepared for. From the first, God had regarded and treated him as an heir of Christ’s righteousness. Now he regards and treats him as in the actual possession, and if an adult, he by the gift of faith brings him into conscious possession. The imputation to him as an heir and the imputation to him as in actual possession do not differ so much on God’s side as it differs in its effects and consequences in the actual relations and experiences of the subject.

“This gracious sentence was (1) in the mind of God, as a concept, in his purpose to justify (Galatians 3:8). (2) It was pronounced in Christ our Head when he rose from the dead (2 Corinthians 5:19): ‘God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.’ (3) It is virtually pronounced in that first relation which arises from the generation in us of faith (Romans 8:1). (4) It is expressly pronounced through the Spirit of God witnessing with our spirits our reconciliation to God.” (“Medulla Amesii,” chap. 27. §9.)

“It is moreover to be observed that justification, if we take it whatever can be comprised under that name, consists of various articles or periods. And first, God’s sentence of absolution regards (1) either all the elect in general collected into one mystical body, or (2) relates to each person in particular.”

“I observe two articles of that general sentence, the first of which commenced immediately upon the fall, when Christ, having entered into suretyship engagements for elect sinners, obtained . . . that Satan should be condemned in the serpent, etc. The second article of this general justification relates to the time when God declares that full satisfaction had been made to his justice by the dying Christ (2 Corinthians 5:19).”

“The other justification, applied to every beliver in particular, has its distinct articles. The first is when the elect person, who is redeemed, regenerated, and united to Christ by a living faith, is declared to have now actually passed from a state of condemnation and wrath to a state of grace and favor.”

“The second is when this sentence is intimated and insinuated to the conscience by the Holy Ghost. The third is when the sinner, being actively and passively justified, is admitted to familiar intercourse with God. The fourth is immediately after death. The fifth and last is on the day of judgment, when the elect shall be publicly justified.” (Witsius, “Economy of the Covenants,” book 3, chapter 8, §§ 57 - 2 John)

IV. There is an unhappily significant tendency observable among many modern preachers and writers to ignore, if not positively to deny, the absolute necessity of a gratuitous justification as and essential precondition of the very beginnings of all moral reformation. As in past times, many have made shipwreck of the faith by refusing to see that the only worthy end and complement of forgiveness of sins and divine acceptance is the actual restoration of the moral image of God, so

now many make a shipwreck equally disastrous on the opposite side by refusing to acknowledge that even the first and least improvement in character and life must be preceded by atonement and reconciliation. The prime need for expiation and reconciliation is retired into the shade, ignored, or denied. The cultivation of benevolent and honorable sentiments, and the diligent performance of all the actions to which such sentiments prompt, are insisted upon as the first and last duty and interest of men. It is affirmed that as God will condemn men in proportion to their want of moral excellence, so he will extend to them his favor in proportion as each one strives with all his ability, under present conditions, to be and to do the best that is for him possible, irrespective of his past recored, or the constitutional moral defects of character thence entailed. Concerning this deplorable characteristic of some modern teaching and preaching we have space only to indicate the following unquestionable facts:

1. This characteristic is in marked contrast and in radical opposition to the preaching of the inspired and authoritative representatives of Christianity, as it was promulgated by the immediate disciples of its Founder. It is unquestionable that not the form only, but the entire logic and spirit and practical power of their preaching, was truly represented by their own frequent assertions that they preached, and that they preached only, “Christ,” “the cross,” “Christ crucified,” and “the resurrection of Christ” after his crucifixion. Consciousness of guilt and alienation, and the glorious fact of expiation and gratuitous reconciliation already effected, were the immediate practical impressions made on all their hearers, the realization of which was the moral power on which they relied to revolutionize character and make holy living possible.

2. As shown above, this modern tendency is in no less obvious contrast and radical opposition to all the forms which Christianity has assumed in the great historical churches. Whatever the men who thus ignore the cross may call themselves, it is clear that they differ far more radically and upon question of more instant practical importance alike from all legitimate schools of Protestants and Catholics, like Catholics and Protestants differ from each other. If the schism effected at the Reformation was justified by the character of popish errors, or by the extent of the soul-destructive mischief they effected, a more urgent demand for an equally radical purgation of so-called Protestant pulpits appeals to us now.

3. It is evident that the modern rationalistic moral legalism, just as much as the ancient Jewish ceremonial legalism, and on similar principles, makes the cross of Christ of none effect by their traditions. It is evident, also, that the same influences and the same principles which lead to the diminished emphasis or to the virtual ignoring of the great doctrine of the cross, will inevitably result soon in its open and absolute denial. Thus heresy, like sin, “when it is finished, bringeth forth death.”

4. The pretence that the modern tendency alluded to is prompted by a higher moral standard or by a superior sense of the essential importance of personal character than that which prompted the preaching of the apostles, and the creeds, hymns, and liturgies of all churches, is precisely the reverse of the truth. The genuine appreciation of the excellence of moral goodness is essentially inseparable from a corresponding appreciation of the abomination and ill-desert of moral evil. A deep sense of sin is in actual sinner the absolutely essential precondition of the first beginnings of moral improvement. A due sense of sin involves essentially a profound personal recognition of its pollution, its guilt, and its power. A man truly loving holiness and hating sin, himself a redeemed

sinner preaching to his fellow-sinners, cannot stultify himself and mock them by telling them to be good as they can with all their might, and God will bless them. He must either preach despair, or an adequate expiation and gracious reconciliation as the basis of all real reform. The opposite method, unhappily becoming less infrequent than hitherto, is an evident symptom of a miserably low moral standard. The age-spirit which doubts about the reality and eternity of future punishment naturally ceases to emphasize justification on the basis of vicarious expiation, and to postpone it as the consequent of regeneration, sanctification, and the life work which follows. The end is evident and inevitable. Without antecedent reconciliation men cannot be truly sanctified. So the same low sense of sin which leads to the ignoring of justification, or to its removal from its position as the beginning and fountain of all practical grace, will necessarily lead to the denial of the soul's need to any grace, and of its obligation to any law. Legalism makes fair professions; but, beginning with the denial of innate sinfulness and moral impotency, it proceeds logically to ignore the abomination of sin and the excellence of virtue, and ends in an abyss of license which confounds all moral distinctions.

S. The Holy Scriptures - The Canon and Inspiration

The Holy Scriptures - The Canon and Inspiration by A. A. Hodge

Part I

LET us now consider the Bible, its genesis and its inspiration. The word "Bible" means book; the word "Scripture" means writing; and it is by the common consent of men that these words are applied to this one subject, because it is a book of books, and because, beyond all comparison, it is the Writing of writings. It is the most important of all books, because, as a matter of historical fact, this book, more than any other force, has molded the character of the great nations of the world and given birth to what we call the modern or Western civilization; because all historic Churches, with one accord, declare it to be the foundation of their creeds - declare that this book is the Word of God; because, in spite of all our divisions, the whole Church really accepts this book as the only infallible and divinely authoritative rule of our faith and practice; and because it is, between all Christians, the standard of appeal on all subjects of debate, the only common ground upon which we stand, the only court of last resort.

II. On what presuppositions does our doctrine rest? In every problem there are two elements - the a priori element of principle and the a posteriori element of fact. To this there is no exception in any of the problems of philosophy or of science or of theology. The a priori question of principle must be taken first, and will condition the whole argument. We must, before we take up the subject of the Bible, first take up the questions: Is there a God? Does he exist? What relation does he sustain to the universe? Can he reveal himself to man? Has he made a revelation of himself to man? Are men capable of receiving a divine revelation through the means of a book?

Now, it is held, on the basis of all the presuppositions of atheism, of materialism, of agnosticism, and even of the old deism, that it is absolutely absurd to talk of any supernatural revelation of God, or of any Bible as either containing or being the Word of God. I want, however, to assure the laymen who have not investigated these questions, that nine-tenths of all the objections which men are making now to the Scriptures, in which they claim that the progress of knowledge, the progress of civilization, the progress of science, the progress of critical investigation, the vast aggregate of historical knowledge, all are sweeping away the foundations of our ancient faith in the Bible - I wish to assure them that these objections are totally untrue. Those that are made are not founded upon facts, but simply upon a priori philosophical principles. Neither science nor history nor criticism bears any testimony against the divine origin of the Bible. I appeal with confidence to the a priori principles of a contrary philosophy. We must meet them on their own ground, and appeal from the postulates of a false philosophy to the postulates of a true. We have as much right to believe our philosophy as they have to believe theirs. Renan, for instance, begins his discussion upon the Epistles with this assumption: "The supernatural is impossible;" therefore the supernatural is unhistorical, and therefore any piece of literature that claims to convey to us supernatural information must so far forth be incorrect and be the subject of correction by critical hands.

You see that this is a mere assumption, and the whole principle on which it rests is that which underlies the philosophy, atheistic, materialistic, agnostic, or deistic, of these errorists; and if this be swept away, not only all the foundations for such a claim, but all color of presumption on which it rests, is swept away at once. Doubtless there are very many men of great ability who are perfectly honest who hold to this belief. They are thoroughly convinced of the principles of their a priori philosophy, and these principles are evidently inconsistent with the truths of Christianity. But if we discard the unproved assumptions, we invalidate their conclusions. There are others who ought to be treated kindly: they are thoroughly convinced, but they are half-educated, timid souls who are confused in this babel of tongues, and who do not know the deceitfulness of materialistic belief - who are inclined to believe in the ancient faith, but are also under pressure from the arrogant claims of philosophy. For such we must have great consideration, and instead of repelling them by words, draw them to us by the spirit of Christ, and by showing that we not only believe intellectually, but that we have a ground of assurance in our inward experience, in the testimony of the Holy Ghost, which must excite respect and confidence in them.

Now, in beginning this argument, I wish to claim, first, the truth of all I have said in the three preceding lectures. You see, therefore, the logical reason for the order I adopted. I claim, as preliminary to the discussion of the doctrine of Holy Scripture, the truths of the principles already established: to wit, there is a God; this God possesses the attributes of omnipresence, omnipotence, infinitude, etc.; he is everywhere present; immanent in all things at all times; working continuously and universally through all things from within. He is also transcendent and extramundane, acting upon the world from without on such points and at such times as he wills. The whole order of providence and of moral government, whether natural, supernatural, or gracious, is presupposed in this argument.

If a man does not believe in God as omnipresent and as active in all his creatures, if he does not believe that man is a free moral agent under the moral government of God, who is a holy, just, and benevolent Ruler, then this lecture is not intended for him. But if a man does so believe, we challenge him to present objections to the catholic doctrine of the Word of God which will be at the same time rational and consistent with Christian Theism.

III. How do we ascertain the Constituent, Parts of Scripture? - that is, how do we (1) ascertain the several books which make up the canon? and (2) how do we ascertain the words which make up the correct text of those books? I can of course attempt only a very bare sketch of what should be the full and critically-learned answer to these questions. You all fully understand that they fall outside of the particular department of study to which my life has been devoted. The amount of the highest talent and learning consecrated within the Christian Church to the defense and elucidation of the sacred Scriptures would infinitely surprise the shallow critics who are vociferously claiming that its pretensions have been disproved. They should remember that a few frogs in a swamp make incomparably more noise than all the herds of cattle browsing upon a hundred hills. Yet none are deceived, except the frogs themselves. In Princeton Theological Seminary the study of the subjects embraced within this single lecture consumes the larger part of three years of study, and the entire attention of four learned and able professors.

(A) 1. How do we ascertain what Books constitute the Canon of the Old Testament? The New Testament came into existence in an age in which a contemporaneous literature existed,

thoroughly illuminated by the light of history. But the Old Testament contains the very oldest extant literature of the world. It inaugurates human history, and therefore cannot, in its earliest contents, be verified by contemporaneous testimonies. It is only in its later periods that it receives confirmation unquestionable from the monuments of Egypt and the cylinders of Assyria.

Nevertheless, we are certain that we have the very same canon which Christ recognized when he said to his disciples and through them to us, "Search the Scriptures: .....they are they which testify of me." The very books which we have now are the very books to which Christ appealed. He cited them (1) by their classes, as "the Law," "the Law and the Prophets;" and (2) he quoted the writings severally, and attributed them to their respective authors - as to Moses, to David, and to Esaias. The same was done by the inspired writers of the New Testament. That the canon endorsed by Christ is the very canon we now possess we know to an absolute certainty - by the Septuagint translation, made nearly three hundred years before Christ; by the Hebrew Bible, jealously guarded by the Jews from the earliest ages to the present time; from the testimony of Philo and of Josephus, the great Jewish writers of the first Christian century; and from the earliest Latin and Syriac translations. As to this point, indeed, there is no controversy. The simple question remains, which to real Christians is no question, whether the testimony of Christ our Lord is sufficient to establish the fact.

2. How do we ascertain the True Text of the Several Books which constitute this Canon? Our reliance here also is upon the guarantee of Christ. We are sure that we possess the Masoretic text which was collected and recorded by the Masorets from the fifth century onward. These were great Jewish scholars, who searched all manuscripts open to them, not to form a new text, but to ascertain the true text in the material that had descended to them. The Targums and the Talmud also make it certain that the text we now have is essentially the identical text which Christ had, and which he virtually guarantees to us. The same fact is proved to us by the Septuagint Greek Version before referred to, and by the Peshito, the old Syriac Version, made at the end of the second century. The Septuagint, the Hebrew Bible, the Syriac Version, the Vulgate, the Masoretic notes must embody the text as it existed in the time of Christ. The agreement of all the various sources of information is so close that the greatest differences they suggest would not change a single doctrine nor cast doubt upon a single historic fact of any importance. I am justified, therefore, in affirming that we stand possessed today of the very same Old Testament Scriptures to which Christ appealed, and to which his authority binds our obedience and our faith. In these days you hear much of the ravages which a learned criticism has made in the integrity of our traditional Scriptures, and thus in the historical foundations of our faith. Ordinary historical criticism is a perfectly legitimate and necessary process by which all the light, external and internal, afforded by history, literature, and the intrinsic characteristics of the books or texts in question is collected, and we judge by means of all the best evidence we have what conclusions we have to draw in reference to their genuineness and their integrity, or the reverse. But there is an arrogant phase of the "higher criticism" that is far more ambitious, and attempts to correct, or even to reconstruct, the existing text by wide inductions from the history of the times, from the other writings, and from the known or supposed character, knowledge, style, situation, or subject of the writer. The whole historical situation is vividly conceived by the critic of this school, and he proceeds to infer therefrom what the writer must have said or could not have said. It is admitted that in some cases and within narrow limits such a process may be legitimate. When there is

conflict or indefiniteness in the evidence afforded by direct explicit historical data of manuscript or version, it may be well to go further afield for collateral or for inferential evidence. But it is very plain that this process of "higher criticism" is liable to be colored, and even wholly controlled, by the subjective conditions of the critic - by his sympathies, by his historical and philosophical and religious theories, and by his a priori judgments as to what the sacred writer ought to say. It is also very plain that the conclusions of this Criticism are of no value whatever when opposed to clearly ascertained historical facts or documentary evidence. In the case of "criticism" applied to the Old or New Testament Scriptures in a spirit hostile to the long-received faith of the Christian Church, it is notorious that it is the outgrowth of a false philosophy, of naturalistic views of God's relation to the world, and of a priori theories of evolution applied to history. When we remember, therefore, what can be clearly proved by historic fact and document, that Christ endorsed as the Word of God the very Old Testament Scriptures, book and text, which we now possess, when we remember that all the evidence attainable from Egyptian monuments and Assyrian cylinders corroborates the claims of this Hebrew Bible in all its parts, it is very evident that the claims of this "criticism" are groundless.

(B) 1. How do we ascertain what Books of right belong to the New Testament Canon? Here the case is different. Christ did not present us the collected books of the New Testament and guarantee their integrity. On the other hand, these books were written in the full light of an historically illuminated age, and come to us supported by a contemporaneous literature and followed by a copious consequent literature of their own creating. The rule by which the canonicity of any New Testament book is determined is: any book written by an apostle, or received generally as canonical by the Church during the age in which it was presided over and instructed by the apostles, is to be regarded as canonical. Take, for instance, the Epistle to the Hebrews. If written by Paul, then it would have a right to a place in the canon for that reason. But if not written by Paul, if it was received generally as canonical by the Church during the lives of Paul and John, then its right must be admitted on that ground. Of course, the facts in question must be determined by an examination of two classes of evidence - (1) the internal character of the writing; (2) the external historical evidence of its genuineness and of its recognition as canonical by the Church of the first century. No external evidence can prove a book to have come from God if its contents are morally bad or intellectually contemptible. Nevertheless, no matter what the contents of a book may be, we cannot admit that it belongs to the New Testament canon except on the ground of explicit and sufficient historical proof. The kind of evidence by which we establish the canonicity of each of the books of the New Testament is precisely the same as that by which we prove the authenticity and genuineness of any ancient classic. The only difference is that in behalf of the books of the New Testament the evidence is incomparably more abundant. This evidence may be distributed under the following heads, each head representing copious literatures critically sifted and logically arranged - (1) quotations and references to these books found in the writings of early Christians; (2.) early catalogues of the sacred books; (3) early translations; (4) general verdict of the Church; (5) internal characteristics.

You hear a great deal today about the "Christian consciousness." The new critics, having destroyed the ancient historical foundations of our Scriptures and of our faith, wish now to build them up again upon a basis of Christian consciousness. Every book and every specific reading is to be received which is approved by the subjective tests, literary, scientific, aesthetic, religious,

and fantastic, of self-appointed Scripture-tasters in the nineteenth century. We also believe in a Christian consciousness - that is, in a human consciousness modified by religious experience and the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. But the mouthpiece of that consciousness is no self-appointed, self-conscious group of cultured moderns. It is voiced only by the consensus of all Christians of all nations, all ecclesiastical folds and ages. These very critics deny the growth of the whole Church since St. Augustine, because its uniform testimonies rebuke them. We, on the contrary, appeal from the self-elected representatives of "Christian consciousness" to the thing itself - to the consensus of the whole Church, ancient, mediaeval, and modern, Greek, Roman, Lutheran, and Reformed. We appeal to the historic and abiding creeds, confessions, hymns, and liturgies of all Christians. We appeal to the testimony of the Holy Ghost, to the witness of all saints and martyrs, to all reformations, revivals, and missions since Pentecost. The progress of this controversy has been one unbroken march of triumph for the integrity of our traditional canon. The first destructive "critics" denied the authenticity and historic validity of the fourth Gospel, and the originality and accuracy of the synoptic Gospels; and they admitted the genuineness of only four books - Romans, First and Second Corinthians, and Galatians. These are admitted to have been the genuine writings of the apostle Paul by the general consent of the most destructive critics, and of all branches and ages of the Christian Church. This admission alone defeats the enemy, and establishes upon this rock of unquestionable historic fact the whole gospel system. The entire body of Christian doctrine can be shown to be taught in these four admitted original Christian documents - the entire person, office, and work of Christ; the entire salvation, temporal and eternal, of his believing followers. Since that time the originality and validity of the synoptical Gospels have been fully vindicated, and the genuineness of the fourth Gospel has been established beyond reasonable question, as is nobly admitted and maintained by the late Dr. Ezra Abbot, one of the most learned Unitarians America has ever produced.

2. How do we ascertain the True text of the Several Books of the New Testament? You can easily understand that through the process of multiplying manuscripts by hand, which is laborious and involves an infinitude of independent details, an untold number of variations would creep into the text. The textus receptus was formed in the age of the Reformation by a hasty and uncritical gathering and comparison of the manuscripts which were found lying ready to hand, without respect to their various age or authority. Cardinal Ximenes, in Complutum, Spain, printed the first edition, A.D. 1514, which, however, was not published till 1520 or 1521. The next edition was issued by Erasmus from Bale, 1516, with succeeding editions of 1519, 1522, 1527, 1535; then that of Stephanus from Paris, 1546; then that of Beza from Geneva, 1565. Finally, the second Elzevir edition of 1633, Leyden, which claimed to give the textus receptus, was generally so received, and gave currency to that title. The text thus formed was the basis of the English version of King James and of all the New Testaments of all languages in modern times. But during the present century the text of the New Testament has been carefully studied, a far wider collection of manuscripts has been gathered, the more ancient and valuable manuscripts have been made the basis of a corrected text, and a text nearly approximating to the original autographs of the sacred writers has been arrived at by a process of critical comparison and judgment of the immense material collected. This is gathered - (1.) From ancient manuscripts: for example, the Codex Alexandrinus in the British Museum, dating from the beginning of the fifth century from 400 to 450, after the birth of Christ; the Cortex Vaticanus, dating from some time in the fourth century; the Codex Sinaiticus, believed by Tischendorf to be one of the fifty copies prepared by the order of

Constantine by Eusebius, A.D. 381. (2.) From the numerous quotations from the New Testament writings found in the works of the early Fathers. (3.) From the early translations, such as the Peshito, or early Syriac, latter part of the second century; the Latin Vulgate of Jerome, A.D. 385; the Coptic, from the third century. From all these sources the new critical-editions of the New Testament Greek text have been derived. The best of these in their order have been those of Griesbach, who died 1812; Lachuiann, who died 1851; Tischendorf, who died 1874; andl of Westcott and Hort, which was made the basis of the New Revision in 1880. This much has been settled upon definite and sufficient historical evidence critically sifted. The testimony establishes the fact that these New Testament books constitute the second division of God's Word, and that the text in our possession is incomparably more accurate and more certain than that which is possessed of any other ancient book in the world. God has taken such care of his own Word that the differences which you may observe between the Revised Version and the Old Version of the Scriptures are such as do not involve the stability of a single important historic fact, or of a single article of faith. We are brought by this process not only to the substance, but to the form and shading, of the truth as it came from the original organs of revelation. We can almost recognize the tone and inflection of the voice of Christ himself. The Holy Scriptures - The Canon and Inspiration by A. A. Hodge

Part II

IV. Our fourth question is, How was the Bible, this Book of books, produced? What was the true genesis of these Scriptures? Written evidently by men, how did they become the Word of God?

There are three distinct ways in which we can conceive that God might produce a book to be read by man - (1.) He could have produced it by his own immediate energy, acting directly and alone, as he did when he wrote the Ten Commandments with his own finger on tables of stone. (2.) He might have used men as his amanuenses, not as conscious and free penmen, but mechanically as his instruments of writing in simple obedience to his verbal dictation. (3.) The third way is the infinitely better one which God has chosen. It is the God-like way, which is in analogy with all his methods. He first created man, and endowed him constitutionally with all his rational, emotional, aesthetic, moral, and volitional powers. He then brought certain individual men into existence with the specific qualifications necessary for writing certain parts of Scripture, and placed them under their specific historical conditions, and in their specific positions in the succession of sacred writers, and gave them the precise degree and quality of religious experience, of natural providential guidance, of supernatural revelation and inspiration, necessary to stimulate their free activity and to determine the result as he would have it. I. In the first place, the Bible is as intensely and thoroughly a human book as ever existed. As Christ was a true man, tempted in all points as we are, yet without sin, because also divine, so the Bible is thoroughly human, yet without error, because also divine. God is infinite; yet his word, the Bible, is finite - that is, God's thought is expressed under all the limits of human thought and language, so that man may receive and profit by it. God is omniscient; but his word, the Bible, is not omniscient. It is narrowly limited in its range as a human book, produced by the instrumentality of human minds, and addressed to human minds of all classes; but within that range it is infallible, without any error. It has its limitations, as every human work has. It is based on human intuitions; it proceeds through the lines of human logic; it implies human feelings, tastes, and experiences. Every separate book is a spontaneous work of human genius, and bears the marks of all the personal idiosyncrasies and of the historic

situation of its author. The individuality of Peter, Paul, John, David, Isaiah, and Moses is as fully expressed in their writings as that of Shakespeare or of Milton in theirs. Each biblical writer wrote as freely and as spontaneously as any other. Each of these books was also a book of its time - bore the marks of its age, and was specifically adapted to accomplish its immediate end among its contemporaries. The provincialisms of thought and idiom proper to the situation of their writers are found in these books. They make no claim to eminent purity of language, or to high literary merit either in substance or form. Yet all these writings, severally and collectively, are books of all times, adapted perfectly to the edification and instruction of the Church of every age - of Moses, of David, of the prophets, of the time of Christ, of the ancient, medieval, Reformation, and modern Church. Of all books, it is the most comprehensively human. Of all God's works, it is the most characteristically divine. It is, in one view, an entire national literature; in another view, it is two distinct volumes; in another view, it is one single work, with one Author, subject, method, and end.

2. In the second place, the Bible is a divine book, bearing the attributes of its Author, God. All along the line of human authorship through which this wonderful book grew to be, during at least sixteen hundred years, God provided each specifically endowed and conditioned prophet for his appointed place in the succession, a place prepared for him by all who had preceded; and on this foundation, already provided, he proceeds to build up in organic continuity, and in symmetrical proportion, the system already inaugurated. To each prophet God has communicated his specific item of revelation and his specific impulse and direction through inspiration.

3. The result is that the whole is an organism, a whole consisting of many parts exquisitely correlated and vitally independent. In this respect you may compare the Koran of Mohammed with the Christian Bible. In the great debate between the missionary Henry Martyn and the Persian moulvies, the latter showed a great superiority of logical and rhetorical power. They proved that the Koran was written by a great genius; that it was an epoch-making book, giving law to a language pre-eminent for elegance, inexhaustible fullness, and precision, revolutionizing kingdoms, forming empires, and molding civilization. Nevertheless, it was a single work, within the grasp of one great man. But Henry Martyn proved that the Bible is one single book, one single, intricate, organic whole, produced by more than forty different writers of every variety of culture and condition through sixteen centuries of time - that is, through about fifty successive generations of mankind. As a great cathedral, erected by many hands through many years, is born of one conceiving mind, and has had but one author, so only God can be the one Author of the whole Bible, for only he has been contemporaneous with all stages of its genesis; he only has been able to control and co-ordinate all the agents concerned in its production, so as to conceive and realize the incomparable result.

4. This book, whatever we may think of the propriety of it, unquestionably claims to be the Word of God. At the opening of the book it demands the implicit credence and obedience of every reader. Its instant order to every reader is, "Believe, on peril of your soul's life!" It does not point to evidence, nor plead before the bar of human reason. But it utters the voice of God and speaks by authority. What other book does this? And this claim has been abundantly vindicated through the ages in the opinion of the wisest and best of mankind - (1) by its demonstrations of supernatural knowledge, (2) of supernatural works, (3) of supernatural power over the hearts and consciences of men; (4) by the accompanying witness of the Holy Ghost; (5) by its omnipresent beneficent influence through all Christian lands and ages.

What would you think if today at high noon the existence and the light and heat and life-giving radiance of the sun were brought into question? How would you answer the skeptical denial of that self-evident fact by a blind man! To all the living the sun is its own witness. So all who question the divinity of the Bible only condemn themselves. What a sorry appearance the grotesque herd make even now!

V. What is God's part in bringing this Book of books into existence? This falls under several heads - namely, providence; the gracious work of his Spirit on the heart; revelation; inspiration.

1. Providence. In a previous lecture I showed that God is to be conceived of as an infinite Spirit, presiding over all creatures and acting upon them from without at his will, but also as omnipresent, at every moment immanent in every ultimate element of every creature, and acting in and through all things from within. Thus God's activities are everywhere confluent with our own spontaneities. All creatures live and move and have their being in him. He works in us to will as well as to do - that is, as free agents, though willing to do according to his good pleasure. A great musician elicits his most perfect music out of instruments and under conditions made for him beforehand by other men. How much more completely would the artist be the sole creator of his work if he could at will first create his material with the very qualities he needs, then build and attune his instruments for his own purposes, and then bring out from them, thus prepared and adjusted, the very music in its fullness which his soul has designed from the first. So God from the first designed and adapted every human writer employed in the genesis of Scripture. Paul, John, Peter, David, Isaiah, have been made precisely what they were, and placed and conditioned precisely as they were, and then moved to write, and directed in writing precisely what they wrote. The revelation was in a large measure through an historical series of events, led along by a providential guidance largely natural, but surcharged, as a cloud with electricity, with supernatural elements all along its line. Thus, under God's providence, the Scriptures grew to be, all the conspiring forces which contributed to their formation acting under the providential control of the ever-present, ever-acting, immanent God.

2. Spiritual Illumination. This includes the whole sum of God's gracious dealing with the soul of his prophet, qualifying him to be the fit organ for the communication of religious truth. In order to exhibit truth in its comprehensive logical relations, God employed the logical and scholastically trained mind of Paul. In all his writing this natural and acquired faculty of Paul acted under God's guidance as spontaneously and naturally as the same faculty ever wrought in the case of any other writer. But in relation to spiritual truth the natural mind of man is blind and without feeling. Spiritual illumination by the Holy Ghost, a personal religious experience, was as necessary in the case of such writers as David, John, and Paul as esthetic taste and genius are in the case of a poet or an artist. The spiritual intuition of John, the spiritualized understanding of Paul, the personal religious experience of David, have, by the superadded gift of inspiration, been rendered permanently typical and normal to the Church in all ages.

3. Revelation. Spiritual illumination opens the organ of spiritual vision, and clarifies it. Revelation, on the other hand, gives the additional light which nature does not supply. In every instance where supernatural knowledge of God, his attributes, his purposes, of the secrets of his grace or of the future of the Church in this world, of the life of body or of soul after death, came to be needed by a sacred writer, God immediately gave it to him by revelation. This was done in various ways, as by

visions, dreams, direct mental suggestion, verbal dictation, and the like; but whatever the method of communication, it was perfectly adequate to the occasion and congruous to the nature of the person to whom it was made. This, of course, was never furnished except on the occasions when it was needed: it appears more frequently in some portions of Scripture than in others; but however frequent, it was an occasional and not a constant element of the Bible.

4. Inspiration. This was the absolutely constant attribute of every portion and of every element of the Scriptures, and that attribute which renders them infallible in every utterance, and which thus constitutes their grand distinguishing trait, separating them by the whole heavens from all other books. Revelation supernaturally communicated to the sacred writer the truth which he needed, and which he did not possess, and could not attain by any natural means. Inspiration, on the other hand, is that influence of the immanent Holy Ghost which accompanied every thought, and feeling, and impulse, and action of the sacred writer involved in the function of writing the word, and which guided him in the selection and utterance of truth - that is, in its conception and in its verbal expression - so that the very mind of God in the premises was expressed with infallible accuracy. This influence was exerted frown within the writer, not upon him from without. It in no degree constrains or forces; it directs through the writer's own spontaneity. It modifies action only so far as action would be otherwise divergent from the purpose of God or inadequate. It is like the directive agency of the plastic soul of the tree, which so directs the physical forces engaged in its erection that they spontaneously combine to form its intricate and voluminous organism. Or it is like the touch of the charioteer upon the reins which guide the courses of the racing steeds. Or it is like the touch of the hand of the steerer upon the rudder of the boat carried gently down the meandering stream by the currents of the air and water. These currents symbolize the natural powers and knowledge of the sacred writer, reinforced by revelation and by grace. The hand on the rudder symbolizes inspiration. It secures the fact that all things go right according to the will of the steersman. But it interferes only by gentle and alternate pressure, and thus only when otherwise the currents, if left to themselves, would not fulfill his will.

VI. What is the doctrine of the Christian Church as to the extent to which the Scriptures are inspired ? The two opinions which individual Christian men have severally maintained on this subject are represented respectively by the two alternative phrases, "The Scriptures contain the word of God," "The Scriptures are the Word of God." The first is the loose formula of those who hold a low doctrine of inspiration. A river in India, "rolling down its golden sands," may be truly said to contain gold. But in that case we are left in doubt as to the relative proportion between the sand and the gold, and to our own resources to discriminate and separate the two. If the Bible only "contains the Word of God," it evidently can be no infallible rule of faith and practice, because we are confessedly left to the two very human and fallible instruments (1) of "higher criticism," and (2) of the "Christian consciousness," to determine what elements of the Scriptures are the very "word of God," and what elements are only the word of man. A law can have no infallibility beyond that of the court which interprets it. So in this view of the case the Bible has no infallibility beyond that of the criticism and consciousness of our self-appointed, self-complacent guides. But the Church has always held that "the Scriptures we the Word of God." This means that, however these books may have been produced through human agency, God has (1) so controlled the process of their genesis, and (2) he so absolutely endorses the result, that the Bible in every book and every word, both in matter and in form, is the very Word of God uttered to us. The phrase "verbal inspiration"

applied to the Scriptures does not mean that the sacred writers were inspired or directed in their work by words dictated or suggested. But it means that the divine influence which we call inspiration, and which accompanied them throughout their entire work, extended to the verbal expression of every thought as well as to the thoughts themselves. This inspiration has extended equally to every part of Scripture, matter and form, thought and words, and renders the whole and every part inerrant.

Calvin, in the sixth, seventh, and eighth chapters of his Institutes, continually uses the phrases "Scripture," "the Scriptures," "the sacred volume," and "the Word of God" as synonymous. The first Reformed Confession of national authority, the First Helvetic, says, Art. i.: "Canonical Scripture is the Word of God." The Second Helvetic Confession was the most widely recognized of all the Reformed Confessions in Switzerland, France, Hungary, Poland, Scotland, and highly honoured in England and Holland. It says: "We believe and confess that the canonical Scriptures of the holy prophets and apostles of both Testaments are the Word of God, and have plenary authority of themselves and not from men." Every Presbyterian minister and elder in England, Scotland, Ireland, Canada, and the United States, North and South, believes this, or he has forsworn himself. Each one has at his ordination solemnly declared, before God and man, that he believes these Scriptures "to be the Word of God " (Confession of Faith, Presbyterian Board of Publication, pp. 429, 434, 441). Thomas Cartwright, the father of English Presbyterianism, in his Treatise of the Christian Religione; or, The Whole Body and Substance of Divinity (London, A.D. 1616), has written his twelfth chapter "On the Word of God." This he identifies with the collection of canonical books, and accounts for their authority by saying, "for God is the Author of them." This is the doctrine of the whole historical Church of God. The Roman Catholic Church declares it de fide to believe that God is the Author of every part of both Testaments (Can. Council of Trent, sec. 4; Dog. Decrees of Vatican,Council, 1870, sec. 3, chap. 2). Also every branch of the Reformed Church - for example, Belgic Confession, Art. 3; Second Helvetic Confession, chap. 1; Westminster

Confession, chap. l. In this respect the late Professor Henry B. Smith, the noble representative of the theology of the New School Branch of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, precisely agrees with the late Professor Charles Hodge, who equally represented the theology of the Old School branch. In his sermon on The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, delivered be fore the Synod of New York and New Jersey, October 17, 1855, Dr. Smith said: -"All the divine revelations which are here recorded are also inspired, but all that is the subject of inspiration need not be conceived of as distinctly revealed. Inspiration designates that divine influence under which prophets or apostles spake or wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Christ is the great Revealer, the Holy Spirit inspires. "Its function is to convey unto the world, through divinely commissioned prophets and apostles, either orally or by writing, under the specific influence of the Holy Spirit, whatever has been thus revealed. Its object is the communication of truth in an infallible manner, so that when rightfully interpreted no error is conveyed. "It comprises both the matter and the form of the Bible - the matter in the form in which it is conveyed and set forth. It extends even to the language - not in the mechanical sense that each word is dictated by the Holy Spirit, but in the sense that under divine guidance each writer spake in his own language according to the measure of his knowledge, acquired by personal experience, the testimony of others, or by immediate divine revelation.

"So wonderfully do the divine and human elements commingle in the Scriptures, as do the first and second causes also in the realm of providence, that it is vain to limit. inspiration to doctrine and truth, excluding history frown its sphere. The attempt is as unphilosophical as it is unscriptural. No analysis can detect such a line of separation. It is both invisible and not to be spiritually discerned.

"The theory of plenary inspiration, as we have already given it, comprises whatever is true in all these views, subordinate to the prime position that the Bible not only contains, but is, the Word of God."

Dr. H. B. Smith's Introduction to Christian Theology: "Inspiration gives us a book, properly called the Word of God, inspired in all its parts. The inspiration is plenary in the sense of extending to all the parts and of extending also to the words."

VII. What is to be said as to alleged discrepancies? The above statement unquestionably truly represents the ancient and catholic faith of the historic Church of Christ. The hostile critics and theorists object that the Scriptures are full of inaccuracies and discrepancies of statement - (1) as between the statements of Scripture and modern science or undoubted history; (2) as between one statement or quotation of Scripture and another. In answer to this we have space to say only -

1st. We freely admit that many errors have crept into the sacred text as it exists at present; although none of these errors, nor all of them together, obscure one Christian doctrine or important fact. In order to make good the objection of the critics, it is necessary that they show that the discrepancy exists when the clearly ascertained original text of Scripture is in question.

2nd. The Scriptures were not written from the scientific point of view, nor intended to anticipate science. A distinction should be clearly drawn and strongly held between the speculations of science and its ascertained facts. The speculations of science are like the changing currents of the sea, while the Scriptures have breasted them like the rocks for two thousand years. The Scriptures speak of nature as it presents itself phenomenally. When this is remembered, the Bible contradicts no fact of science. On the contrary, the entire view of the genesis and order of the physical world presented by the Bible, in contrast with all the other ancient books whatsoever, is in correspondence with that presented by modern science to a degree perfectly miraculous. The men who press this objection are ignorant either of science or of the Bible, or, more probably, of both.

3rd. As to the alleged discrepancies with history, it must be remembered (a) that the most modern discoveries (from Egypt and Assyria) most wonderfully confirm the historical accuracy of Scripture; (b) that when only a part of an ancient situation is historically illuminated, different accounts may appear inconsistent which are really complementary to each other and mutually supporting.

4th. As to the discrepancies alleged to exist in certain passages between the Scriptures themselves, it is evident that the question is one of fact, which can be settled only by a thorough, learned, intelligent, and impartial investigation. Very few men are qualified to give an opinion. There is no possibility of commencing even an investigation in a popular lecture. It is sufficient for me that men like my learned colleagues in Princeton Seminary, who spend their lives in the special study of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, assure me that one single instance of such discrepancy has ever been proved.

Scanned and Edited by Michael Bremmer

S. The Inspiration of The Bible

The Inspiration of The Bible by A.A. Hodge

1. What are the necessary presuppositions, as to principles, and matters of fact, which must be admitted before the possibility of inspiration, or the inspiration of any particular book can be affirmed?

1st. The existence of a personal God, possessing the attributes of power, intelligence, and moral excellence in absolute perfection.

2nd. That in his relation to the universe he is at once immanent and transcendent. Above all, and freely acting upon all from without. Within all, and acting through the whole and every part from within in the exercise of all his perfections, and according to the laws and modes of action he has established for his creatures, sustaining and governing them, and all their actions.

3rd. His moral government over mankind and other intelligent creatures, whereby he governs them by truth and motives addressed to their reason and will, rewards and punishes them according to their moral characters and actions, and benevolently educates them for their high destiny in his communion and service.

4th. The fact that mankind instead of advancing along a line of natural development from a lower to a higher moral condition, have fallen from their original state and relation, and are now lost in a condition involving corruption and guilt, and incapable of recovery without supernatural intervention.

5th. The historical integrity of the Christian Scriptures, their veracity as history, and the genuineness and authenticity of the several books.

6th. The truth of Christianity in the sense in which it is set forth in the sacred record.

All of these necessary presuppositions, the truth of which is involved in the doctrine that the Scriptures are inspired, fall under one of two classes--

(1.) Those which rest upon intuition and the moral spiritual evidences of divine truth, such as the being and attributes of God, and his relations to world and to mankind, such as the testimony of conscience and the moral consciousness of men as sinners justly condemned, and impotent.

(2.) Those which rest upon matters of fact, depending upon historical and critical evidence as to the true origin and contents of the sacred books.

If any of these principles or facts is doubted, the evidence substantiating them should be sought in their appropriate sources, e. g., the department of Apologetics--the Theistic argument and Natural Theology, the evidences of Christianity, the Historic Origin of the Scriptures, the Canon, and Criticism and Exegesis of the Sacred Text.

STATEMENT OF THE CHURCH DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION.

2. In what sense and to what extent has the Church universally held the Bible to be inspired? That the sacred writers were so influenced by the Holy spirit that their writings are, as a whole and in every part, God's word to us--an authoritative revelation to us from God, endorsed by him, and sent to us as a rule of faith and practice, the original autographs of which are absolutely infallible when interpreted in the sense intended, and hence are clothed with absolute divine authority.

3. What is meant by "plenary inspiration"? A divine influence full and sufficient to secure its end. The end in this case secured is the perfect infallibility of the Scriptures in every part, as a record of fact and doctrine both in thought and verbal expression. So that although they come to us through the instrumentality of the minds, hearts, imaginations, consciences, and wills of men, they are nevertheless in the strictest sense the word of God.

4. What is meant by the phrase "verbal inspiration," and how can it be proved that the words of the Bible were inspired?

It is meant that the divine influence, of whatever kind it may have been, which accompanied the sacred writers in what they wrote, extends to their expression of their thoughts in language, as well as to the thoughts themselves. The effect being that in the original autograph copies the language expresses the thought God intended to convey with infallible accuracy, so that the words as well as the thoughts are God's revelation to us. That this influence did extend to the words appears--1st, from the very design of inspiration, which is, not to secure the infallible correctness of the opinions of the inspired men themselves (Paul and Peter differed, Galatians 2:11, and sometimes the prophet knew not what he wrote), but to secure an infallible record of the truth. But a record consists of language.

2nd. Men think in words, and the more definitely they think the more are their thoughts immediately associated with an exactly appropriate verbal expression. Infallibility of thought cannot be secured or preserved independently of an infallible verbal rendering.

3rd. The Scriptures affirm this fact, 1 Corinthians 2:13; 1 Thessalonians 2:13.

4th. The New Testament writers, while quoting from the Old Testament for purposes of argument, often base their argument upon the very words used, thus ascribing authority to the word as well as the thought.-- Matthew 22:32, and Exodus 3:6, Exodus 3:16; Matthew 22:45, and Psalms 110:1; Galatians 3:16, and Genesis 17:7.

5. By what means does the Church hold that God has effected the result above defined? The Church doctrine recognizes the fact that every part of Scripture is at once a product of God's and of man's agency. The human writers have produced each his part in the free and natural exercise of his personal faculties under his historical conditions. God has also so acted concurrently in and through them that the whole organism of Scripture and every part thereof is his word to us, infallibly true in the sense intended and absolutely authoritative God's agency includes the three following elements:

1st. His PROVIDENTIAL agency in producing the Scriptures. The whole course of redemption, of which revelation and inspiration are special functions, was a special providence directing the evolution of a specially providential history. Here the natural and the supernatural continually

interpenetrate. But as is of necessity the case, the natural was always the rule and the supernatural the exception; yet as little subject to accident, and as much the subject of rational design as the natural itself. Thus God providentially produced the very man for the precise occasion, with the faculties, qualities, education, and gracious experience needed for the production of the intended writing, Moses, David, Isaiah, Paul, or John, genius and character, nature and grace, peasant, philosopher, or prince, the man, and with him each subtle personal accident, was providentially prepared at the proper moment as the necessary instrumental precondition of the work to be done.

2nd. REVELATION of truth not otherwise attainable. Whenever the writer was not possessed, or could not naturally become possessed, of the knowledge God intended to communicate, it was supernaturally revealed to him by vision or language. This revelation was supernatural, objective to the recipient, and assured to him to be truth of divine origin by appropriate evidence. This direct revelation applies to a large element of the sacred Scriptures, such as prophecies of future events, the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, the promises and threatenings of God's word, etc., but it applies by no means to all the contents of Scripture.

3rd. INSPIRATION. The writers were the subjects of a plenary divine influence called inspiration, which acted upon and through their natural faculties in all they wrote directing them in the choice of subject and the whole course of thought and verbal expression, so as while not interfering with the natural exercise of their faculties, they freely and spontaneously, produced the very writing which God designed, and which thus possesses the attributes of infallibility and authority as above defined. This inspiration differs, therefore, from revelation--(1.) In that it was a constant experience of the sacred writers in all they wrote and it affects the equal infallibility of all the elements of the writings they produced, while, as before said, revelation was supernaturally vouchsafed only when it was needed. (2.) In that revelation communicated objectively to the mind of the writer truth otherwise unknown. While inspiration was a divine influence flowing into the sacred writer subjectively, communicating nothing, but guiding their faculties in their natural exercise to the producing an infallible record of the matters of history, doctrine, prophecy, etc., which God designed to send through them to his Church.

It differs from spiritual illumination, in that spiritual illumination 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.

Inspiration is a special influence of the Holy Spirit peculiar to the prophets and apostles, and attending them only in the exercise of their functions as accredited teachers. Most of them were the subjects both of inspiration and spiritual illumination. Some, as Balaam, being unregenerate were inspired, though destitute of spiritual illumination. THE PROOF OF THE CHURCH DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION.

6. From what sources of evidence is the question as to the nature and extent of the Inspiration of the Scriptures to be determined?

1st. From the statements of the Scriptures themselves.

2nd. From the phenomena of Scripture when critically examined. THE STATEMENTS OF THE SCRIPTURES AS TO THE MATTER OF THEIR OWN INSPIRATION.

7. How can the propriety of proving the Inspiration of the Scriptures from their own assertions be vindicated?

We do not reason in a circle when we rest the truth of the inspiration of the Scriptures on their own assertions. We come to this question already believing in their credibility as histories, and in that of their writers as witnesses of facts, and in the truth of Christianity and in the divinity of Christ. Whatever Christ affirms of the Old Testament, and whatever he promises to the Apostles, and whatever they assert as to the divine influence acting in and through themselves, or as to the infallibility and authority of their writings, must be true. Especially as all their claims were endorsed by God working with them by signs and wonders and gifts of the Holy Ghost. It is evident that if their claims to inspiration and to the infallibility and authority of their writings are denied, they are consequently charged with fanatical presumption and gross misrepresentation, and the validity of their testimony on all points is denied. When plenary inspiration is denied all Christian faith is undermined.

8. How may the inspiration of the apostles be fairly inferred from the fact that they wrought miracles? A miracle is a divine sign (saymeion) accrediting the person to whom the power is delegated as a divinely commissioned agent, Matthew 16:1, Matthew 6:4; Acts 14:3; Hebrews 2:4. This divine testimony not only encourages, but absolutely renders belief obligatory. Where the sign is, God commands us to believe. But he could not unconditionally command us to believe any other than unmixed truth infallibly conveyed.

9. How may it be shown that the gift of Inspiration was promised to the apostles?

Matthew 10:19; Luke 12:12; John 14:26; John 15:26-27; John 16:13; Matthew 28:19-20; John 13:20.

10. In what several ways did they claim to have possession of the Spirit?

They claimed--

1st. To have the Spirit in fulfillment of the promise of Christ. Acts 2:33; Acts 4:8; Acts 13:2-4; Acts 15:28; Acts 21:11; 1 Thessalonians 4:8.

2nd. To speak as the prophets of God.-- 1 Corinthians 4:1; 1 Corinthians 9:17; 2 Corinthians 5:19; 1 Thessalonians 4:8.

3rd. To speak with plenary authority.-- 1 Corinthians 2:13; 1 Thessalonians 2:13; 1 John 4:6; Galatians 1:8-9; 2 Corinthians 13:2-4. They class their writings on a level with the Old Testament Scriptures.-- 2 Peter 3:16; 1 Thessalonians 5:27; Colossians 4:16; Revelation 2:7.--Dr. Hodge.

11. How was their claim confirmed?

1st. By their holy, simple, temperate, yet heroic lives.

2nd. By the holiness of the doctrine they taught, and its spiritual power, as attested by its effect upon communities and individuals.

3rd. By the miracles they wrought.-- Hebrews 2:4; Acts 14:3; Mark 16:20.

4th. All these testimonies are accredited to us not only by their own writings, but also by the uniform testimony of the early Christians, their contemporaries, and their immediate successors.

12. Show that the writers of the Old Testament claim to be inspired.

1st. Moses claimed that he wrote a part at least of the Pentateuch by divine command.-- Deuteronomy 31:19-22; Deuteronomy 34:10; Numbers 16:28-29. David claimed it.-- 2 Samuel 23:2.

2nd. As a characteristic fact, the Old Testament writers speak not in their own name, but preface their messages with, "Thus saith the Lord," "The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it," etc.-- Jeremiah 9:12; Jeremiah 13:13; Jeremiah 30:4; Isaiah 8:1; Isaiah 33:10; Micah 4:4; Amos 3:1; Deuteronomy 18:21-22; 1 Kings 21:28; 1 Chronicles 17:3.--Dr. Hodge.

13. How was their claim confirmed?

1st. Their claim was confirmed to their contemporaries by the miracles they wrought by the fulfillment of many of their predictions (Numbers 16:28-29), by the holiness of their lives. the moral and spiritual perfection of their doctrine, and the practical adaptation of the religious system they revealed to the urgent wants of men.

2nd. Their claim is confirmed to us principally--(1.) By the remarkable fulfillment, in far subsequent ages, of many of their prophecies. (2.) By the evident relation of the symbolical religion which they promulgated to the facts and doctrines of Christianity, proving a divine preadjustment of the type to the antitype. (3.) By the endorsement of Christ and his apostles.

14. What are the formulas by which quotations from the Old Testament are introduced into the New, and how do these forms of expression prove the inspiration of the ancient Scriptures?

"The Holy Ghost saith,"Hebrews 3:7. "The Holy Ghost this signifying,"Hebrews 9:8. "God saith,"Acts 2:17, and Isaiah 44:3; 1 Corinthians 9:9-10, and Deuteronomy 25:4. "The Scriptures saith.,"Romans 4:3; Galatians 4:30. "It is written,"Luke 18:31; Luke 21:22; John 2:17; John 20:31. "The Lord by the mouth of his servant David says,"Acts 4:25, and Psalms 2:1-2. "The Lord limiteth in David a certain day, saying,"Hebrews 4:7; Psalms 95:7. "David in spirit says,"Matthew 22:43, and Psalms 110:1.

Thus these Old Testament writings are what God saith, what God saith by David, etc., and are quoted as the authoritative basis for conclusive argumentation; therefore they must have been inspired.

15. How may the Inspiration of the Old Testament writers be proved by the express declarations of the New Testament?

Luke 1:70; Hebrews 1:1; 2 Timothy 3:16;1 Peter 1:10-12; 2 Peter 1:21.

16. What is the argument on this subject drawn from the manner in which Christ and his apostles argue from the Old Testament as of final authority?

Christ constantly quotes the Old Testament, Matthew 21:13; Matthew 22:43. He declares that it cannot be falsified, John 7:23; John 10:35; that the whole law must be fulfilled, Matthew 5:18; and all things also foretold concerning himself "in Moses, the prophets, and the Psalms,"Luke 24:44. The apostles habitually quote the Old Testament in the same manner, "That it might be fulfilled which was written," is with them a characteristic formula, Matthew 1:22; Matthew 2:15, Matthew 2:17, Matthew 2:23; John 12:38; John 15:25; etc. They all appeal to the words of Scripture as of final authority. This certainly proves infallibility. THE PHENOMENA OF SCRIPTURE CONSIDERED AS EVIDENCE OF THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF ITS INSPIRATION.

17. What evidence do the Phenomena of the Scriptures afford as to nature and extent of the human causes conspiring to produce them?

Every part of Scripture alike bears evidence of a human origin. the writers of all the books were men, and the process of composition through which they originated was characteristically human. The personal characteristics of thought and feeling of these writers have acted spontaneously in their literary activity, and have given character to their writings in a manner precisely similar to the effect of character upon writing in the case of other men. They wrote from human impulses, on special occasions, with definite design. Each views his subject from an individual standpoint. They gather their material from all sources--personal experience and observation, ancient documents, and contemporary testimony. They arrange their material with reference to their special purpose, and draw inferences from principles and facts according to the more or less logical habits of their own minds. Their emotions and imaginations are spontaneously exercised, and follow as co-factors with their reasoning into their compositions. The limitations of their personal knowledge and general mental condition, and the defects of their habits of thought and style, are as obvious in their writings as any other personal characteristics. They use the language and idiom proper to their nation and class. They adopt the usus loquendi of terms current among their people, without committing themselves to the philosophical ideas in which the usage originated. Their mental habits and methods were those of their nation and generation. They were for the most part Orientals, and hence their writings abound with metaphor and symbol; and although always reliable in statement as far as required for their purpose they never aimed at the definiteness of enumeration, or chronological or circumstantial narration, which characterizes the statistics of modern western nations. Like all purely literary men of every age, they describe the order and the facts of nature according to their appearances, and not as related to their abstract law or cause.

Some of these facts have, by many careless thinkers, been supposed to be inconsistent with the asserted fact of divine guidance. But it is evident, upon reflection, that if God is to reveal himself at all, it must be under all the limits of human modes of thought and speech. And if he inspires human agents to communicate his revelation in writing, he must use them in a manner consistent with their nature as rational and spontaneous agents. And it is evident that all the distinctions between the different degrees of perfection in human knowledge, and elegance in human dialect and style, are nothing when viewed in the light of the common relations of man to God. He obviously could as well reveal himself through a peasant as through a philosopher; and all the better when the personal characteristics of the peasant were providentially and graciously preadjusted to the special end designed.

18. What evidence do the Phenomena of the Scriptures afford as to the nature and extent of the divine agency exercised in their production?

1st. Every part of Scripture affords moral and spiritual evidence of its divine origin. This is, of course, more conspicuous in some portions than in others. There are transcendent truths revealed, a perfect morality, an unveiling of the absolute perfections of the Godhead, a foresight of future events, a heart searching and rein-trying knowledge of the secrets of the human soul, a light informing the reason and an authority binding the conscience, a practical grasp of all the springs of human experience and life, all of which can only have originated in a divine source. These are characteristics of a large portion of the Scriptures, and of the Scriptures alone in all literature, and together with the accompanying witness of the Holy Ghost, these are practically the evidences upon which the faith of a majority of believers rests.

2nd. But another characteristic of the Scriptures, taken in connection with the foregoing, proves incontestably their divine origin as a whole and in every part. The sacred Scriptures are an organism, that is a whole composed of many parts, the parts all differing in matter, form, and structure from each other, like the several members of the human body, yet each adjusted to each other and to the whole, through the most intricate and delicate correlations mediating a common end. Scripture is the record and interpretation of redemption. Redemption is a work which God has prepared and wrought out by many actions in succession through an historical process occupying centuries. A supernatural providence has flowed forward evolving a system of divine interventions, accompanied and interpreted by a supernaturally informed and guided order of prophets. Each writer has his own special and temporary occasion, theme, and audience. And yet each contributed to build up the common organism, as the providential history has advanced, each special writing beyond its temporary purpose taking permanent place as a member of the whole, the gospel fulfilling the law, antitype has answered to type and fulfillment to prophecy, history has been interpreted by doctrine, and doctrine has given law to duty and to life. The more minutely the contents of each book are studied in the light of its special purpose, the more wonderfully various and exact will its articulations in the general system and ordered structure of the whole be discovered to be. This is the highest conceivable evidence of design, which in the present case is the proof of a divine supernatural influence comprehending the whole, and reaching to every part, through sixteen centuries, sixty-six distinct writings, and about forty cooperating human agents. Thus the divine agency in the genesis of every part of Scripture is as clearly and certainly determined as it is in the older genesis of the heavens and the earth.

19. What is the objection to this doctrine drawn from the free manner in which the New Testament writers quote those of the Old Testament, and the answer to that objection? In a majority of instances the New Testament writers quote those of the Old Testament with perfect verbal accuracy. Sometimes they quote the Septuagint version, when it conforms to the Hebrew; at others they substitute a new version; and at other times again they adhere to the Septuagint, when it differs from the Hebrew. In a number of instances, which however are comparatively few, their quotations from the Old Testament are made very freely, and in apparent accommodation of the literal sense.

Rationalistic interpreters have argued from this last class of quotations that it is impossible that both the Old Testament writer quoted from, and the New Testament writer quoting, could have

been the subjects of plenary inspiration, because, say they, if the ipsissima verba were infallible in the first instance, an infallible writer would have transferred them unchanged. But surely if a human author may quote himself freely, changing the expression, and giving a new turn to his thought in order to adapt it the more perspicuously to his present purpose, the Holy Spirit may take the same liberty with his own. The same Spirit that rendered the Old Testament writers infallible in writing only pure truth, in the very form that suited his purpose then, has rendered the New Testament writers infallible in so using the old materials, that while they elicit a new sense, they teach only the truth, the very truth moreover contemplated in the mind of God from the beginning, and they teach it with divine authority.--See Fairbairn's "Herm. Manual," Part 3. Each instance of such quotation should be examined in detail, as Dr. Fairbairn has done.

20. What objection to the doctrine of Plenary Inspiration is drawn from the alleged fact that "Discrepancies" exist in the Scriptural Text? and how is this objection to be answered?

It is objected that the sacred text contains numerous statements which are inconsistent with other statements made in some part of Scripture itself, or with some certainly ascertained facts of history or of science.

It is obvious that such a state of facts, even if it could be proved to exist, would not, in opposition to the abundant positive evidence above adduced, avail to disprove the claim that the Scriptures are to some extent and in some degree the product of divine inspiration. The force of the objection would depend essentially upon the number and character of the instances of discrepancy actually proved to exist, and would bear not upon the fact of Inspiration, but upon its nature and degree and extent. The fact of the actual existence of any such "discrepancies," it is evident, can be determined only by the careful examination of each alleged case separately. This examination belongs to the departments of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis. The following considerations, however, are evidently well-grounded, and sufficient to allay all apprehension on the subject.

1st. The Church has never held the verbal infallibility of our translations, nor the perfect accuracy of the copies of the original Hebrew and Greek Scriptures now possessed by us. These copies confessedly contain many "discrepancies" resulting from frequent transcription. It is, nevertheless, the unanimous testimony of Christian scholars, that while these variations embarrass the interpretation of many details, they neither involve the loss nor abate the evidence of a single essential fact or doctrine of Christianity. And it is moreover reassuring to know that believing criticism, by the discovery and collation of more ancient and accurate copies, is constantly advancing the Church to the possession of a more perfect text of the original Scriptures than she has enjoyed since the apostolic age.

2nd. The Church has asserted absolute infallibility only of the original autograph copies of the Scriptures as they came from the hands of their inspired writers. And even of these she has not asserted infinite knowledge, but only absolute infallibility in stating the matters designed to be asserted. A "discrepancy," therefore, in the sense in which the new critics affirm and the Church denies its existence, is a form of statement existing in the original text of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures evidently designed to assert as true that which is in plain irreconcilable contradiction to other statements existing in some other portions of the same original text of Scripture, or to some other certainly ascertained element of human knowledge. A "discrepancy" fulfilling in every particular this definition must be proved to exist, or the Church's doctrine of plenary verbal

inspiration remains unaffected.

3rd. It is beyond question, that, in the light of all that the Scriptures themselves assert or disclose as to the nature and the extent of the divine influence controlling their genesis, and as to their authority over man's conscience and life as the voice of God, the existence of any such "discrepancies" as above defined is a violent improbability. Those who assert the existence of one or more of them must bring them out, and prove to the community of competent judges, that all the elements of the above definition meet in each alleged instance, not merely probably, but beyond the possibility of doubt. The burden of proof rests exclusively on them.

4th. But observe that this is for them a very difficult task to perform, one in any instance indeed hardly possible. For to make good their point against the vast presumptions opposed to it, they must prove over and over again in the case of each alleged discrepancy each of the following points:(1.) That the alleged discrepant statement certainly occurred in the veritable autograph copy of the inspired writing containing it. (2.) That their interpretation of the statement, which occasions the discrepancy, is the only possible one, the one it was certainly intended to bear. The difficulty of this will be apprehended when we estimate the inherent obscurity of ancient narratives, unchronological, and fragmentary, with a background and surroundings of almost unrelieved darkness. This condition of things which so often puzzles the interpreter, and prevents the apologist from proving the harmony of the narrative, with equal force baffles all the ingenious efforts of the rationalistic critic to demonstrate the "discrepancy." Yet this he must do, or the presumption will remain that it does not exist. (3.) He must also prove that the facts of science or of history, or the Scriptural statements, with which the statement in question is asserted to be inconsistent, are real fact or real parts of the autograph text of canonical Scripture, and that the sense in which they are found to be inconsistent with the statement in question is the only sense they can rationally bear. (4.) When the reality of the opposing facts or statements is determined, and their true interpretation is ascertained, then it must, in conclusion, be shown not only that they appear inconsistent, nor merely that their reconciliation is impossible in our present state of knowledge, but that they are in themselves essentially incapable of being reconciled.

5th. Finally it is sufficient for the present purpose, to point to the fact that no single case of "discrepancy," as above defined, has been so proved to exist as to secure the recognition of the community of believing scholars. Difficulties in interpretation and apparently irreconcilable statements exist, but no "discrepancy" has been proved. Advancing knowledge removes some difficulties and discovers others. It is in the highest degree probable that perfect knowledge would remove all.

21. Explain the meaning of such passages as 1 Corinthians 7:6 and 1 Corinthians 7:12 and 1 Corinthians 7:40, Romans 3:5 and Romans 6:19, and Galatians 3:15, and show their perfect consistency with the fact of the plenary inspiration of the whole Bible.

"I speak as a man," is a phrase occurring frequently, and its sense is determined by the context. In Romans 3:5, it signifies that Paul was, for argument's sake, using the language common to men; it was the Jews' opinion, not his own. In Romans 6:19, it signifies "in a manner adapted to human comprehension," and in Galatians 3:15, it signifies, "I use an illustration drawn from human affairs," etc.

"I speak this by permission, not of commandment."--1 Corinthians 7:6, refers to 1 Corinthians 7:2. Marriage was always permitted, but under certain circumstances inexpedient.

"And unto the married I command, yet not I but the Lord.""But to the rest speak:I, not the Lord."-- 1 Corinthians 7:10 and 1 Corinthians 7:12. Reference is here made to what the "Lord," that is Christ, taught in person while on earth. The distinction is made between what Christ taught while on earth, and what Paul teaches. As Paul puts his word here on an equal basis of authority with Christ's word, it of course implies that Paul claims an inspiration which makes his word equal to that of Christ in infallibility and authority.

"And I think also that I have the Spirit of God."-- 1 Corinthians 7:40. "I think (dokw) I have, is only, agreeably to Greek usage, an urbane way of saying, I have (cf. Galatians 2:6, 1 Corinthians 12:22). Paul was in no doubt of his being an organ of the Holy Ghost." Hodge, "Comm. on First Corinthians."

DEFECTIVE STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE.

22. State what is meant by theological writers by the inspiration "of superintendence,""of elevation,""of direction," and "of suggestion."

Certain writers on this subject, confounding the distinction between inspiration and revelation, and using the former term to express the whole divine influence of which the sacred writers were the subjects, first, in knowing the truth, second, in writing it, necessarily distinguish between different degrees of inspiration in order to accommodate their theory to the facts of the case. Because, first, some of the contents of Scripture evidently might be known without supernatural aid, while much more as evidently could not; second, the different writers exercised their natural faculties, and carried their individual peculiarities of thought, feeling, and manner into their writings. By the "inspiration of superintendence," these writers meant precisely what we have above given as the definition of inspiration. By the "inspiration of elevation," they meant that divine influence which exalted their natural faculties to a degree of energy otherwise unattainable. By the "inspiration of direction," they meant that divine influence which guided the writers in the selection and disposition of their material. By the "inspiration of suggestion," they meant that divine influence which directly suggested to their minds new and otherwise unattainable truth.

23. What objections may be fairly made to these distinctions?

1st. These distinctions spring from a prior failure to distinguish between revelation the frequent, and inspiration the constant, phenomenon presented by Scripture; the one furnishing the material when not otherwise attainable, the other guiding the writer at every point, (1) in securing the infallible truth of all he writes; and (2) in the selection and distribution of his material.

2nd. It is injurious to distinguish between different degrees of inspiration, as if the several portions of the Scriptures were in different degrees God's word, while in truth the whole is equally and absolutely so.

FALSE DOCTRINES OF INSPIRATION.

24. What Principles necessarily lead to the denial of any super- Inspiration?

All philosophical principles or tendencies of thought which exclude the distinction between the natural and the supernatural necessarily lead to the denial of Inspiration in the sense affirmed by the Church. These are, for example, all Pantheistic, Materialistic, and Naturalistic principles, and of course Rationalistic principles in all their forms.

25. In what several forms has the doctrine of a Partial Inspiration of the Scriptures been held?

1st. It has been maintained that certain books were the subjects of plenary inspiration, while others were produced with only a natural providential and gracious assistance of God. S. T. Coleridge admitted the plenary inspiration of "the law and the prophets, no jot or tittle of which can pass unfulfilled," while he denied it of the rest of the canon.

2nd. Many have admitted that the moral and spiritual elements of the Scriptures, and their doctrines as far as these relate to the nature and purposes of God not otherwise ascertainable, are products of inspiration, but deny it of the historical and biographical elements, and of all its allusions to scientific facts or laws.

3rd. Others admit that the inspiration of the writers controlled their thoughts, but deny that it extended to its verbal expression. In one, or in all of these senses, different men have held that the Scriptures are only "partially" inspired. All such deny that they "ARE the word of God," as affirmed by the Scriptures themselves and by all the historical Churches, and admit merely that they "contain the word of God."

26. State the doctrine of Gracious Inspiration.

Coleridge, in his "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit," Letter 7., holds that the Scriptures, except the Law and the Prophets, were produced by their writers assisted by "the highest degree of that grace and communion with the Spirit which the Church under all circumstances, and every regenerate member of the Church of Christ, is permitted to hope and instructed to pray for." This is the doctrine of Maurice ("Theological Essays," p. 339) and virtually that of Morell ("Philosophy of Religion," p. 186) and of the Quakers. These admit an objective supernatural revelation, and that this is contained in the Scriptures, which are highly useful, and in such a sense an authoritative standard of faith and practice; that no pretended revelation which is inconsistent with Scripture can be true, and that they are a judge in all controversies between Christians. Nevertheless they hold that the Scriptures are only "a secondary rule, subordinate to the Spirit from whom they have all their excellency," which Spirit illumines every man in the world, and reveals to him either with, or without the Scriptures, if they are unknown, all the knowledge of God and of his will which are necessary for his salvation and guidance, on condition of his rendering a constant obedience to that light as thus graciously communicated to him and to all men. "Barclay's Apology, Theses Theological," Propositions 1., 2., and 3.

AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS.

ROMAN CATHOLIC.--"Decrees of Council of Trent," Sess. 4. "Which gospel . . . our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, first promulgated with his own mouth, and then commanded to be preached by his apostles to every creature, . . . and seeing clearly that this truth and discipline are contained in the written books, and the unwritten tradition, which received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or from the apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come

down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand:the Synod following the example of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament--seeing God is the author of both--as also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated, either by Christ's own word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession."

"Dogmatic Decrees of the Vatican Council," 1870, Sess. 3., Ch. 2. "Further this supernatural revelation, according to the universal belief of the Church, declared by the sacred Synod of Trent, is contained in the written books and unwritten traditions which have come down to us, having been received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or from the apostles themselves, by the dictation of the Holy Spirit, have been transmitted as it were from hand to hand. And these books of the Old and New Testament are to be received as sacred and canonical, in their integrity, with all their parts as they are enumerated in the decree of the said Council, and are contained in the ancient Edition of the Vulgate. These the Church holds to be sacred and canonical, not because having been carefully composed by mere human industry, they were afterwards approved by her authority, nor merely because they contain revelation with no admixture of error, but because, having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their author, and have been delivered as such to the Church herself."

LUTHERAN.--"Formula Concordia Epitome." 1. "We believe, confess, and teach that the only rule and norm, according to which all dogmas and all doctors ought to be esteemed and judged, is no other whatever than the prophetic and apostolic writings of the Old and New Testament, as it is written, Psalms 119:105, and Galatians 1:8."

REFORMED.--"Second Helvetic Confession," Ch. 1. Concerning Holy Scripture, "We believe and confess, that the canonical Scriptures of the holy prophets and apostles of each Testament are the true word of God, and that they possess sufficient authority from themselves alone and not from man. For God himself spoke to the fathers, to the prophets and to the apostles, and continues to speak to us through the Holy Scriptures."

"The Belgic Confession," Art. 3. "We confess that this word of God was not sent nor delivered by the will of man, but that holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, as the apostle Peter saith. And that afterwards God, from a special care which he has for us and our salvation, commanded his servants, the prophets and apostles, to commit his revealed word to writing, and he himself wrote with his own finger the two tables of the law. Therefore we call such writings holy and divine Scriptures."

"Westminster Confession of Faith," Chap. 1. "Therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times and in divers manners, to reveal himself and to declare his will unto his Church; and afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the Church against the Corruption of the flesh and the malice of Satan and of the world, to commit the same wholly unto writing.""The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God (who is truth itself) the Author thereof; and therefore it is to be received because it is the word of God."

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