THE DEFENCE

OF

PROFESSOR BRIGGS

BEFORE

THE PRESBYTERY OF NEW YORK

December 13, 14, 15, and 19, 1892

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1893

CONTENTS

V.—The Inerrancy of Holy Scripture.

VI.—The Authenticity of Holy Scripture.

VII.—Who Wrote Isaiah ?

VIII.—Progressive Sanctification after Death.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Mr. Moderator, Ministers and Elders of the Presbytery of New York.

We have at last reached the stage in this protracted process when the defence can lawfully be made. I stand before a court of the Church where the same general principles of jurisprudence govern the procedure as those which are followed in the civil courts; but where there are circumstances and usages which make the administration of justice complex and difficult. This court is not only a court, it is a Presbytery, composed of ministers and representative elders within the city of New York, of the Presbyterian faith and order. You are accustomed to sit as a deliberative body and as an executive body. You are not accustomed to sit as a judicial body. Therefore there is great danger lest you unconsciously merge your functions and duties as judges in the more comprehensive and more familiar functions and duties of Presbyters. It will be necessary for you to free your minds of every feeling of party, every prejudice of opinion, every anxiety as to supposed perils to the Church, any and every thing that might influence your decision apart from the merits of the case; and you should concentrate your attention upon the Charges which have been offered for probation, the evidence that has been adduced by the prosecution and the defence, the arguments which are made to prove and disprove the Charges, and the rulings of the court itself, and make your verdict on these grounds, and on these alone. The theory of Presbyterianism is that you are now sitting as a court of Jesus Christ, that our King Messiah is present with us by His Spirit, to guide you in your decisions. Let me beg you to open your minds and your hearts to His gracious influence, and so make an equitable decision which will voice your con-

scientious convictions, and will show to the world that the Presbyterian theory is no mere illusion and delusion, but an expression of the experience of the Church in reality and in fact. The defendant would welcome the voice of Jesus Christ even if it should condemn him and humble him to the dust, for the Master's decision could be no other than a heavenly discipline. He declines to listen to any other voice in the determination of the questions now at issue. You cannot afford to give any other decision than that which our King and Saviour gives.

Let me first call your attention to the argument of the prosecution, and remove from the case a mass of irrelevant material which has been introduced into it. We shall then be prepared to consider the real case.

Dr. Birch gave you an opening address of more than three hours' duration. I listened attentively to it, and saw that the speaker was honest, sincere, and fervent, and that he was laboring under the impression that he was doing God service. I have read it, and have found astonishing exegesis, unintelligent reading of lexicons, an amusing resort to heathen oracles, unlimited assertions of dangerous errors in the writings of Professor Briggs, but I cannot find in it any serious attempt to prove the Charges.

Mr. McCook gave you an argument of more than two hours, which was forceful, plausible, and specious, but which for the most part soared in the regions of abstract thought, far above and beyond what the prosecution, to use the language of an eminent member of the court, "were put up to do." I listened to the argument with the closest attention. Its subtle analyses of hypothetical premises, its simple-minded substitution of inferences from the language of the defendant for that language itself, its delicate balancing upon imaginary lines stretched from speculative piers, the cool assumption of its logic and the condensed heat of its rhetoric, all remind us of the intellectual processes of a scholastic theologian rather than of a lawyer or a man of affairs. This argument will receive the attention it deserves.

I. The prosecution, judging from their argument, have made a very unfortunate mistake in the selection of the Charges which they submitted for probation. They tell us of far more serious

Charges than those contained in the six Charges they were directed to prove. The Presbytery will remember, in the Preamble to the original Charges, they asserted that the teachings of the Inaugural Address "respecting miracles, the original condition of man, the nature of sin, race redemption, and Dr. Briggs' scheme of Biblical theology in general are not in harmony with the Scriptures and are calculated to weaken confidence in the Word of God and to encourage presumption on the clemency and long-suffering of God;" and they also claimed "that the erroneous and ill-advised utterances of Dr. Briggs in the Inaugural Address have seriously disturbed the peace of the Church." I objected to these statements in my Response of November 4th, 1891, as follows:

"I object (1) that, if there are any such errors contained in my Inaugural Address as the committee allege in the preamble of their Report, it was their duty to formulate them into Charges and specifications sufficient in form and in legal effect.

"(2) That, if the committee did not think best so to do, they should have refrained from alleging doctrinal errors which they did not propose to submit for probation, and which, so alleged without opportunity of refutation, seem calculated to exert prejudice against me in the minds of the members of the court.

"(3) That, if, as the Report alleges, 'the erroneous and ill-advised utterances of Dr. Briggs in the Inaugural Address have seriously disturbed the peace of the Church,' and these constitute a 'grave offence against the peace of the Church,' it was the duty of the committee to formulate this grave offence into a Charge and specification, 'sufficient in form and legal effect.'

"(4) That, if it were not deemed best so to do, the Report should have refrained from alleging a grave offence which was not proposed for probation, the allegation of which might prejudice the decision of those Charges and specifications offered for probation" ("The Case," pp. 19, 20).

In their Appeal before the last General Assembly, the prosecution objected to this Response to the Preamble, on the ground that the "so-called preamble was no part of the said Charges and specifications, and was not served upon the said Dr. Briggs as a portion of the said Charges and specifications to which he was cited to plead." The General Assembly sustained this formal objection.

And now what do we see? The prosecution have wisely

refrained from making any such statements in connection with the Amended Charges; but they renew them in a more offensive and a more extended form in their Argument. Is that fair? Is it candid? Is it honorable thus to try to prejudice the court by assertions of serious errors which they do not propose to prove? To any one who reads with attention the argument of the theologian who speaks in Mr. McCook, it will be evident that he is not so much concerned with the errors named in the Charges, as with other alleged errors of a still more serious character. It is not the Holy Scripture for which he is concerned, or the Westminster Standards; but the system of dogma of his school of theology, which he apprehends the Biblical Theology of Professor Briggs will surely destroy, unless the Presbyterian Church can be persuaded to discredit Professor Briggs. See how naïvely he assumes that I am attacking the citadel of Christianity when I said in the Inaugural:

"Criticism is at work with fire and knife. Let us cut down everything that is dead and harmful, every kind of dead orthodoxy, every species of effete ecclesiasticism, all merely formal morality, all those dry and brittle fences, that constitute denominationalism, and are the barriers of Church Unity."

Poor man! Is his life so steeped in a dogmatic faith, that he knows not the important difference between the three things, Bible, creed, and system of dogma? Are the Bible and creed summed up to him in the scholastic forms of a system of dogma? I pointed out this difference in the letter of acceptance of the Edward Robinson Chair, which I read in evidence, but he ignores it. Those things which are to me dead orthodoxy, effete ecclesiasticism, formal morality, denominationalism, are to him Presbyterianism and Christianity. He doubtless agrees with a recently uttered opinion, that "Dogma is more important than religious experience," and if he were forced to choose would deliberately choose dogma rather than Christian life.

I shall not take the time of the judicatory by calling attention to the insinuations and statements of larger errors which pervade the argument of Mr. McCook, but your attention is called to the closing section of that argument, in which an attempt is made to explain all the errors imputed to the defen-

dant by the root error of Naturalism, which it is said "in the hands of a more logical writer than Professor Briggs, would be pushed to far more radical conclusions . . . and will soon leave you about as much exclusiveness as Christians, in having the oracles of God, as Mahometans or Brahmins have" (p. 46).

If the prosecution are serious in this statement of the case, they are convicted out of their own mouth of gross neglect of duty. If they have here struck at the root of all the errors of Dr. Briggs, they certainly ought to have put it in a Charge. If they made a mistake in the formulation of the original Charges, why did they not confess their mistake, abandon the old case, and bring in new Charges under a new case? That would have been honest, that would have been manly, that would have been welcomed by the defendant and all honorable men. But to bring such a serious accusation into an argument to prove other Charges, which have been recognized as sufficient for probation, is to wrong the defendant and to presume upon the patience and indulgence of the court. This new charge is utterly and absolutely false. It was forged in the brain of its author. It was invented in a diseased mind. You have no right as a court to consider it. The laws of evidence in all courts, civil and ecclesiastical, require you to blot out from the argument any and every reference to other imputed errors than those alleged in the Charges. These and these alone the prosecution were entitled to prove.

II. In my Preliminary Objections I called the attention of the Presbytery to the fact that the evidences from Holy Scripture and the Standards had all been placed under the specifications and so directed against the passages cited from the Inaugural; when, by the law of the Church, they ought to have been put under the Charges and used solely and alone to prove that the doctrines claimed to be essential doctrines of the Standards and of Holy Scripture were really and truly such. You sustained this objection and directed the prosecution to transfer all their proofs from Holy Scripture and the Standards from the specifications to the Charges. The prosecution have in a most flagrant manner disobeyed your instructions. In the argument of Dr. Birch he used the passages of Holy Scripture and the Standards for the very purpose you ruled he should not

use them; for he used them to show that his interpretations of the utterances of the Inaugural were dangerous errors; but he neglected to use them for the purpose you directed him to use them, namely, to prove that there are essential doctrines of the Holy Scripture and the Standards of our Church, which the alleged errors of Dr. Briggs contravene. So far as the argument of Mr. McCook is concerned, Holy Scripture is conspicuous by its absence; and what need has speculative dogma of the Westminster Standards?

The prosecution by this procedure have put themselves in these awkward circumstances.

(1) They have used Scripture and Confession in a way it was ruled by the court they should not use it. Therefore their entire argument on Holy Scripture and all of their argument from the Standards with a very few exceptions should be ruled out of court. The argument of Dr. Birch thus shrivels up into nothingness. What he tried to prove he had no right to prove; and according to the ruling of this court you cannot consider it.

(2) By neglecting to use Scripture and Confession to prove that the doctrines alleged to be essential and necessary articles of the Confession are truly such, these essential doctrines are not proven, and if they are left destitute of proof, the essential premises of the Charges are unproven, and the prosecution have no case. You have made your ruling, and if you follow it, as you must if you do your duty as judges, you must throw all the Charges out of court as unproven in their chief premises.

(3) The prosecution are guilty of contempt of court, for disregarding the ruling of the court. The court should recognize in some proper way this offence against its dignity.

III. After listening to the Preliminary Objections of the defendant, the court directed the prosecuting committee to strike out Charges IV. and VII. Dr. Birch obeyed the direction of the Presbytery and made no argument upon these Charges. But Mr. McCook disobeyed the direction of the Presbytery and made elaborate arguments in proof of both of these Charges. This must be evident to most of those who heard the argument. I shall now try to make it evident to every member of the court.

Turn to page 27 of the Argument of Mr. McCook in the fifth line from the bottom, and you will find the beginning of the

argument on the fourth Charge which you ordered stricken out. It reads as follows:

"Professor Briggs has said: 'Kuenen has shown that if we insist upon the fulfilment of the details of the predictive prophecy of the Old Testament, many of the predictions have been reversed by history; and the great body of the Messianic prediction has not only never been fulfilled, but cannot now be fulfilled, for the reason that its own time has passed forever.'"

Thus he begins with the citation from the Inaugural, and indeed the only one given under the fourth Charge. The argument of Mr. McCook on the fourth Charge continues through pages 28 and 29 as far as the middle of page 30. On the second line from the bottom of page 28, Mr. McCook says:

"He [Professor Briggs] still holds to predictive prophecy, but he says, of Messianic prophecy, that a large part of it not only has not been fulfilled, but that from the nature of the case it can never be fulfilled."

This is a renewal of the false and slanderous imputation made in the rejected Charge IV., which I have again and again repudiated, and which you required them to strike out, in the interest of justice.

On page 30 Mr. McCook says:

"But whether it be scholastic or whether it be critical—to deny the fulfilment of the divine prediction is to deny that the prophecy is true, for it must be either true or false. To deny the fulfilment of prophecy is to deny that God is faithful to His promises or His declarations of judgment. It is to deny that God is a God of Truth."

Here Mr. McCook shows that he is endeavoring to bring the teaching falsely attributed to me into conflict with the truthfulness of God, the very contradiction which is stated in the rejected Charge IV. and which does not appear in Charge III., or in any other of the Charges approved by the Presbytery as sufficient.

On page 28 Mr. McCook says:

"Here once more we are forced into the apparently illogical position of using Scripture as an argument against one who denies the inerrancy of Scripture. But as it is the principle of our Church, that the Holy Scriptures are infallible, the argument must appeal to all those who have not lost their confidence in the Word of God."

But "once more" has no propriety in this place. There is nothing in the previous context to which it can refer. It refers back to two statements on page 32, the last of which begins with the sentence, "But of what use is such an argument to those who, like Professor Briggs, deny the inerrancy of the Scripture?" which thus appears to have originally preceded page 28. This shows that the entire section relating to prediction has been transferred from its original position in the argument after page 33 to its present position, pp. 27–30.

Turn again to page 27 and you will see that the argument upon inerrancy fortified by the illustrations from the cracked mirror and the spot on the Parthenon come to a sudden and unexpected close with the sentence:

"When I say that a document is infallible, I mean that it is without error, so that if I claim that I have found an error, unless I can give up the error, I must in so far give up the infallibility of the document. That is very different from saying that the whole of the document is untrue."

The reference to predictive prophecy which follows, pp. 27–30, breaks into the argument abruptly. You will find its original continuation, if I mistake not, on page 30, where the argument on inerrancy is resumed:

"Well, then, suppose we admit that the inspiration extends to, and the inerrancy covers, only that part of the teaching which has to do with faith, and practice," and so on.

It is plain that the argument on the fourth Charge has been transposed from its original position in the paper and inserted in the midst of the argument on the third Charge.

An argument on the seventh Charge has also been made by Mr. McCook. Turn to page 38 and you will see that the argument from page 38 through the ninth line of page 42 is on the seventh Charge, which you required the prosecution to throw out of their Charges. The only changes which have been made so far as I have observed are that the introductory reference to the old eighth Charge has been transposed and placed before the argument on the rejected seventh Charge, and the connection has been made by the insertion of a sentence which by some act of carelessness seems to be in the wrong

place; for it is manifest that no writer with a logical mind or a rhetorical experience could ever write:

"Professor Briggs affirms that the word 'redemption' includes the 'whole process of grace.' It comprehends regeneration, justification, repentance, faith, sanctification and glorification;"

and then go on to say:

"Now, the real meaning of the doctrine of progressive sanctification cannot be fully understood without taking into consideration Professor Briggs' doctrine of redemption, of which sanctification is a part."

If these sentences had been written in connection, at the same time, by any respectable writer, they would have been transposed. The three words, "To do this," at the beginning of the next sentence, put in apparently in order to make a connection with the previous clause, do not conceal the original connection of this sentence with the clause before the last.

If it were necessary I could show you traces of the use of the rejected Charges IV. and VII. at several points in the subsequent argument. But it is sufficient. Mr. McCook has argued elaborately upon the rejected Charges IV. and VII. which you directed the prosecution to remove from the Amended Charges. He has not introduced these arguments in an ingenious or an ingenuous way. It looks like a hasty use of scissors and paste and a determination to get in this argument on the Charges that were thrown out, in spite of the Presbytery. Your attention was called to this violation of your ruling during the delivery of the argument of Mr. McCook. It was detected by the defendant so soon as he began it. But the defendant decided to do no more at that time than object to it. Mr. McCook has succeeded. His argument on the rejected Charges IV. and VII. is all in. It goes up on the records to the higher courts, to strengthen his exception against your decision to rule them out. The defendant, in his Preliminary Objections, called your attention to the errors in law and equity in allowing the prosecution to make such Charges and press them for probation. You recognized his objection as valid, and you put your shield over him to protect him from this unkind and discourteous action of the prosecution. But your shield has

been pushed aside. Your protection has been scorned. Your ruling has been trampled under foot. The defendant has been again attacked in your presence with these slanderous accusations; and Mr. McCook is triumphant.

IV. The prosecution seem very zealous for the Standards of the Presbyterian Church. We shall show further on that their zeal is "without knowledge." But at the present time I desire to call your attention to the fact that their zeal is not "the fire of the sanctuary." There are many references to the Standards of our Church under the printed specifications. These were, by your order, transferred from the specifications to the Charges, and the prosecution were directed to prove by them that the doctrines asserted to be essential doctrines of the Westminster Standards were indeed and in truth such essential doctrines. But every attentive hearer or reader of the argument of the prosecution must have observed how lightly they tripped over the proofs from the Standards.

Let me call the attention of the court to the fact that the prosecution have made no attempt to prove these so-called essential doctrines of our Standards. They use the adjective "essential" in the printed Charges, but, judging from the argument, this adjective is a mere appendage, without meaning to them and without use to them. Dr. Birch in his argument made no use of any of the passages from the Larger and Shorter Catechisms given under the Charges. He made no use of Chapter I., sections 5, 6, and 10, under the first Charge, and no use whatever of any passages from the Standards under Charges IV., V., and VI. I therefore ask the court to note the omissions of proof under Charge I. and to strike out Charges IV., V., and VI., altogether, as entirely destitute of evidence that any essential doctrine of our Standards is contravened.

But some of you may ask, Did not the ingenious Mr. McCook notice this serious gap in the argument and fill it up? It is possibly surprising to some of you. But in fact he did not. No use of passages from the Standards was made in his brief argument under Charges IV. and V., and under the last Charge, the only use of the Standards was this assertion entirely destitute of proof: "On this point the Standards of the Church teach a directly contradictory doctrine, the Shorter

Catechism being especially strong (Ques. 37), using first the expression 'at' their death, and second, the word 'immediately' "(p. 42).

Under such circumstances there is only one thing for this court to do. The prosecution have made no case against me under Charges IV., V., and VI., and you should rule them out of court. In any civil court this would be the procedure. In an ecclesiastical court, which should follow law and equity, such a course becomes imperative.

V. In the argument of Mr. McCook the changes were rung upon "contradictory statements," "flat contradictions," "retraction," and the like. These phrases have become familiar to us during the past months, through reading of the New York "Observer." Whether propositions are contradictory or not depends somewhat upon the angles of vision. Two parts of a straight line may be in opposition to some diseased eyes. If from any given point on a straight line slight deviations are made to the right and the left, these deviations at once become opposites. A logician balancing upon an imaginary line, looking now on the right hand and then on the left, will see flat contradictions. An author and a teacher has the right to explain himself, and he is not to be regarded as contradictory or as inconsistent simply because an enemy says so.

Mr. McCook calls your attention to the fact that I have not "retracted" any statement in the Inaugural Address. But why should I do so? No one has yet been able to show that any statement made in the Address is erroneous. When it is clear that I was wrong, I will confess it and retract—not before.

I put in evidence extracts from my writings beginning with my first Inaugural Address in 1876, and closing with my lectures on "The Bible, the Church, and the Reason," in 1891. It is not necessary to read this evidence again. You have heard it or you have read it, and you will again have an opportunity to read it in the printed form. It was presented in order to show you what my views have really been during the whole period of my teaching in the Union Theological Seminary. In the first Inaugural, the platform of my teaching was laid, upon which I have stood through all these years. My views of the Bible, of Biblical Theology, and of the Higher Criticism have

remained unchanged in essence. They have become more mature. That is all. The opinions assailed in the Charges III., IV., and V. were repeatedly expressed in the "Presbyterian Review" during the ten years in which I acted as its editor in association with Drs. A. A. Hodge and F. L. Patton. The views assailed in Charge VI. had been before the public for some time as I have shown by extracts from "Whither?" and the article "Redemption after Death." The only Charges with regard to which it can be said with any propriety that they charge me with doctrines which I had not taught prior to the delivery of the Inaugural, are those respecting the two great fountains of divine authority in religion—the Church and the Reason; and yet I have shown you by extracts from "Biblical Study" and from "Whither?" that these were also before the public in those earlier publications in a less mature form but no less truly in substance. The Inaugural Address was simply a concentration of opinions expressed more at length in other places and under other circumstances. The defendant is altogether unconscious of any substantial change of opinion on the subject-matters of the Charges for many years.

There are several statements in the conclusion of Mr. McCook's argument which are some of them gratuitous assumptions, others of them almost ludicrous.

What members of this court can be misled by the statement that "you do approve of" the defendant's teaching "if you vote for an acquittal?" That is not the question before you. The question is, whether the Charges are true or false, whether the defendant has taught the doctrines alleged in the Charges, and whether, if he has, these doctrines conflict with the essential doctrines of the Standards named in the Charges. You may disapprove of his teaching altogether, and yet you can do no other than pronounce him innocent so far as any case that the prosecution has made against him.

It is intimated that my teaching is beyond the limits of toleration. It will be time enough for the prosecution to talk about toleration after they have proved their Charges. The defendant has not asked for toleration. He claims his rights under the constitution of his Church to teach anything and everything that he has ever taught. Mr. McCook uses an

ambiguous expression when he says "that men should be required either to abide by our doctrines or else submit to the decisions of our courts." "Our doctrines" are not the tests of orthodoxy if this means what I take it to mean, the doctrines of the school of theology to which the prosecution belong. The Westminster Standards and Holy Scripture give the doctrines by which I am required to abide and by which I shall abide so long as I remain a minister of the Presbyterian Church. The defendant asks no favors of the court. He asks that they try him strictly by the Standards and the Constitution of the Church.

What shall we say of these prosecutors who, to say the least, are no friends of Union Theological Seminary, taking upon their lips the names of my revered teachers and friends, Edward Robinson, Henry B. Smith, and William Adams? It is one of the mysteries of human life that some minds may come in contact with the masters of Christian thought without understanding them or learning from them. The best explanation of it that I know of is given in the words of an ancient Hindu poet:

> "The mind alike
> Vigorous or weak is capable of culture,
> But still bears fruit according to its nature.
> 'Tis not the teacher's skill that rears the scholar.
> The sparkling gem gives back the glorious radiance
> It drinks from other light, but the dull earth
> Absorbs the blaze and yields no gleam again."
>
> (Professor Wilson—Hindu Theatre, Bhavabhuti.)

I have stripped from the argument of the prosecution its irrelevant material. And what is left? Nothing substantial! If this were a civil court I would now ask you to dismiss the case, because it has not been shown that there is a case. But as I understand our Book of Discipline, we cannot take this action in the present stage of the process. If this were a court of last resort and your decision could be final, I would submit the case to you without further argument, in the conviction that this intelligent court could not vote me guilty on the evidence adduced or the arguments made by the prosecution. But it must be plain to you all that the prosecution have no such idea.

They claim to represent the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. The whole procedure in this court shows that they are making up a case for a higher court. Therefore it is necessary for me to make my argument upon the merits of the case.

THE DEFENCE OF PROFESSOR BRIGGS BEFORE THE PRESBYTERY OF NEW YORK.

I

THE RULE OF FAITH

Mr. Moderator, Ministers, and Elders of the Presbytery of New York:

I SHALL endeavor to make my defence against the Charges alleged against me; but it is first necessary to consider several preliminary principles which regulate all trials for heresy in the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, which have been entirely disregarded by the prosecution in their arguments upon the Amended Charges and specifications.

Presbyterian law requires that the Charges should set forth that certain teachings are in irreconcilable conflict with certain doctrines which are essential and necessary to the Westminster Standards and Holy Scripture.

It is not sufficient for the prosecution to assert that a doctrine is an essential doctrine of Holy Scripture and the Confession of Faith. They are required to prove their statement by passages from Holy Scripture and the Confession of Faith, interpreted by strict historical and grammatical exegesis. They have to convince you, and every other court to which the case may be appealed, by argument which cannot be gainsayed, that these doctrines are essential to the Westminster system.

I.—Dangerous Errors

It is not sufficient to maintain and try to prove that Dr. Briggs teaches dangerous errors. It is conceivable that a man

might hold dangerous errors, and that this could be proven by conclusive arguments, and yet such errors might not be an offence to be condemned by a Presbytery.

E.g. (a) One of our ministers might hold that our republican form of government is radically inconsistent with the Biblical doctrine of the divine right of kings. He might make himself very offensive to his people and to us by teaching this Tory doctrine of the eighteenth century, and yet we could not prove that he was guilty of heresy or immorality under the constitution of the Presbyterian Church for teaching this doctrine, because you could not put in a definite charge any essential doctrine of the Westminster Confession with which this opinion is in conflict.

(b) An elder might maintain, as it used to be maintained by many in the northern Presbyterian Church and as it is at present maintained by some in the southern Presbyterian Church, that slavery is a divine institution. Such a doctrine would be very offensive in this community. But could you convict an elder for holding it and teaching it? Could you frame a definite charge and assert an essential doctrine of the Confession with which this doctrine would be in conflict?

There are many new questions in religion, doctrine, and morals which the Church has not defined and where the guidance of Holy Scripture is as yet not altogether clear, about which men in our time differ widely, differ seriously, differ in some cases in passion and bitterness. But these questions cannot lawfully come under the forms of ecclesiastical process in our courts, because our constitution has not yet determined them. It may be that the Presbyterian Church will have to define some of these questions, and it may be necessary to divide the denominations of Christians now existing and to organize new denominations distinguished by their attitudes toward these questions. But the Presbyterian Church cannot by a majority vote in Presbytery, Synod, or General Assembly determine any such questions except in the forms of our constitution, by a revision of the Confession after full deliberation, by the vote of two-thirds of the Presbyteries. The Inaugural Address may contain ten or twenty dangerous errors in the opinion of some of you, but that is not the question which as jurors you have to

decide. If such dangerous errors are not in irreconcilable conflict with essential and necessary articles of the Westminster Confession, you have no constitutional right to deal with them in this Presbytery in the forms of ecclesiastical process. The only thing you can do lawfully is to overture the General Assembly to amend the Confession of Faith so as to exclude the dangerous opinions of Dr. Briggs. If you should succeed in such revision and bring about such a decision in a legal manner, he would use his right of protest and then retire from the Presbytery and not wait for a judicial decision of his case. This principle is of vast importance. But it has been entirely disregarded by the prosecution in the Amended Charges and in their argument upon them. Even if it be true that my teachings contravene the seven doctrines of the Confession specified in the Amended Charges, of not more than *one* of them could it be said that they are dangerous errors in the sense that they contravene essential doctrines of our Standards.

II.—Double Rule of Faith

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America has a double standard, a double rule of faith. It affirms that Holy Scripture is the only infallible rule of faith and practice. But it also declares that the Westminster Confession and Catechisms constitute the official rule of faith in the Presbyterian Church. At our ordination we say yes, to the question "Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith of this Church, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures?" From this double rule of faith these consequences necessarily spring.

(1) The ecclesiastical rule of faith, the Confession, and the Catechisms must yield to the divine rule of faith, Holy Scripture. (a) If, therefore, the ecclesiastical rule make any statement that is not in harmony with the Holy Scripture, such statement cannot be binding; *e.g.*, "Tolerating a false religion" is represented to be a sin forbidden in the second commandment, according to the original edition of the Larger Catechism. This statement was stricken out by the men of the American revolution as unscriptural. But before it was stricken

out it was not regarded as binding because it was always recognized by the American fathers of the eighteenth century as not in harmony with Holy Scripture. There are other clauses remaining in the Confession and Catechisms of a similar character, some of which the revision movement now in progress is aiming to remove. (b) If the ecclesiastical rule make any statement which cannot be sustained by evidence from Holy Scripture, it is not valid in law, because the Westminster standards profess to set forth doctrines which are given in Holy Scripture and those doctrines alone. It is not sufficient, therefore, to show that a doctrine is in opposition to a statement of the Confession and Catechisms. It is also necessary to show that it is against Holy Scripture; *e.g.*, the statement in the Confession XXV., 6:

> "Nor can the pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof, but is that antichrist, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the church against Christ and all that is called God."

This cannot be regarded as a binding statement because it is evident from the consensus of exegetical scholars that it rests upon a misinterpretation of Holy Scripture; and therefore every true Presbyterian is bound by his vows of subscription to eliminate this statement from his creed, and to follow Holy Scripture rather than the Confession. There arise many cases of difficulty under this head, but these may all be solved in a constitutional manner by the forms of law in the Presbyterian Church. It is undoubtedly true that in most instances of heresy the heretics will claim that they have the Scriptures as their authority over against the Confession of Faith. But every case will have to be decided on its merits, and the principle is a plain one. If a man differ from the Confession in an unessential matter, and claim that the Scripture sustains him against the Confession, he is within his rights if he maintain his position in the Church without making an issue. If, however, he differ from the Confession in an essential and necessary article and claim that the Scripture sustains him, he is bound to call the attention of the Presbytery to this difference and ask their decision. The Presbytery in every case, when its attention is called to the difference, has the right of decision subject

to appeal. But the decision by the Presbytery must rest upon this principle, that nothing shall be demanded of any one as an article of faith which cannot be proven in the express language of Holy Scripture. This is the law of an offence on the positive and negative sides.

"An offence is anything, in the doctrine, principles, or practice of a church member, officer, or judicatory, which is contrary to the Word of God; or which, if it be not in its own nature sinful, may tempt others to sin, or mar their spiritual edification (3).

"Nothing shall, therefore, be the object of judicial process, which cannot be proven to be contrary to the Holy Scriptures, or to the regulations and practice of the Church founded thereon; nor anything which does not involve those evils which Discipline is intended to prevent" (4).

Holy Scripture is the infallible test of every statement in the Westminster standards, and no man can be proved guilty of heresy or sin who is not in conflict with Holy Scripture.

It must be shown that the doctrine against which the charge is made is "*contrary to the Holy Scripture or to the regulations and practice of the Church founded thereon.*" There are many regulations and practices of the Presbyterian Church which are founded neither on Confession or Holy Scripture, but which are mere traditions of doctrine and practice. I shall show you at the proper time that the contradiction charged against my doctrines is chiefly of this character of contradiction —not with Bible or Confession, but with *traditional dogma.* The prosecutors have not been able to show that there is contradiction of "regulations and practice founded on *the Confession,*" still less that there is contradiction of "regulations and practice founded on *Holy Scripture.*"

(2) The Westminster Confession, the ecclesiastical rule of faith, gives an official statement of the doctrines which the Presbyterian Church finds in Holy Scripture. There are many statements of Holy Scripture which are not comprehended in the statements of the Westminster standards. Such statements of Holy Scripture have not yet been taken up by the Church into its system of doctrine and are not therefore to be regarded as a part of the rule of faith of the denomination.

E.g. There is a doctrine of the millennium given in Rev. xx., but there is no doctrine of the millennium given in the West-

minster standards. There are differences of opinion in the Church on this doctrine of the millennium. There are some who think that it is an exact period of a thousand years to be expected in the future. Others think that the millennium has already passed. Still others think that the millennium is only a great symbol; again others think that it is the complete period of the kingdom of Christ on earth. If now the great majority of this Presbytery were convinced that the scriptural doctrine of the millennium made it a period of a thousand years of blessedness in the future, and one member of the Presbytery held the older view that the millennium is long past, could you try him for heresy because he interpreted Holy Scripture differently from his Presbytery in this regard? The Church has not yet officially determined its interpretation of the scriptural doctrine of the millennium, and no Presbytery has the right by a majority vote to determine any doctrine of the millennium whatever. If any Presbytery should attempt to use such passages of Holy Scripture to define dogma not already defined in the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, it would add new dogma to the official doctrine of the Church. The only way in which new dogmatic statements may be added to the rule of faith of the Church, is by overtures in the form of revision of the Confession of Faith, adopted by two-thirds of the Presbyteries, in the method provided by the form of government.

A court cannot consider any passages of Holy Scripture in proof of any doctrines not defined in the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, nor any passages of Holy Scripture which are not essential to the rule of faith and life. This principle rules out of court all the proof texts under Charges IV. and V. and a great majority of all those under the other specifications. It also rules from Charges IV. and V. the statement "which is contrary to direct statements of Holy Scripture."

It is the law of the Presbyterian Church, therefore, that this double rule of faith, the divine rule, Holy Scripture, and the ecclesiastical rule, the Westminster Confession, should coincide in statement before that statement can be regarded as authoritative and binding.

This double standard has its disadvantages as the double monetary standard in gold and silver has its disadvantages.

As silver must always yield to gold, so the Confession must always yield to Holy Scripture. It would be an ideal way to have one gold standard in commerce and one Biblical standard in theology. But there are theologians as well as merchants who prefer the lower standard. So long as the double standard exists in the constitution of the Presbyterian Church, we must submit to it with all its inconveniences. It was necessary for the prosecution to show (1) that the doctrines with which, as they allege, my declarations are in irreconcilable conflict, are really *essential* doctrinal statements of the Westminster symbols, and then, (2) that they are also doctrinal statements of Holy Scripture. This they have not done. This they cannot do.

III.—The System of Doctrine

The Presbyterian Church has a formula of subscription which defines the sense in which office bearers in the Presbyterian Church are bound to the ecclesiastical rule of faith:

"Do you sincerely receive and adopt the Confession of Faith of this Church, as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures?"

This subscription does not bind us to every statement of the Confession of Faith; but only to the system of doctrine contained therein. This system of doctrine in the formula of subscription is based upon the terms of the Adopting Act of 1729, the Plan of Union of 1758, and the decision of the supreme court in the Harker case in 1765. The Adopting Act of 1729 adopted the Confession of Faith and the two Catechisms "as being in all *the essential and necessary articles* good forms of sound words and *systems* of Christian doctrine." The Scotch Adopting Act of 1690 uses the phrase "as containing *the sum and substance of the doctrine of the Reformed Churches.*" The Irish Pacific Act contains the clause "*as being a good abridgment of the Christian doctrines contained in the Holy Scriptures.*" The American Adopting Act, based on all these earlier Presbyterian documents, gives the phrase, "*as being in all the essential and necessary articles, good forms*

of sound words and systems of Christian doctrine." The American expression has two sides. The latter, "*good forms of sound words and systems of Christian doctrine,*" is of the same essential character as the Irish and Scotch Acts. There is an important difference, however. The Scotch Act refers to the *doctrine of the Reformed Churches*, the Irish Act to *Christian doctrine*, and our American Act agrees with the latter and not the former. The American Act, however, gives a still further qualification in the direction of breadth and liberty. The Confession does not say "good forms of sound words and systems of Christian doctrine" in *all* its articles, but only in "*all the essential and necessary articles.*" The subscription is limited to *essential* and *necessary* articles.

Different theories of discipline and subscription prevailed in the contests between the old side and the new side in the eighteenth century, but the Plan of Union of 1758 reaffirmed the principles of the Adopting Act as follows:

"That when any matter is determined by a major vote, every member shall either actively concur with, or passively submit to, such determination; or if his conscience permit him to do neither, he shall, after sufficient liberty modestly to reason and remonstrate, peaceably withdraw from our communion without attempting to make any schism. Provided always, that this shall be understood to extend only to such determinations as the body shall judge indispensable in doctrine and Presbyterian government."

We see in the phrase "*indispensable in doctrine and Presbyterian government*" only a synonym of the "*essential and necessary articles*" and "*agreeable in substance to the Word of God*" of the Adopting Act of 1729.

The difference as to subscription was harmonized in the declaration of this same Plan of Union:

"Both Synods having always approved and received the Westminster Confession of Faith and Larger and Shorter Catechisms as an orthodox and excellent system of Christian doctrine, founded on the Word of God, we do still receive the same as the confession of our faith, and also adhere to the plan of worship, government, and discipline contained in the Westminster Directory, strictly enjoining it on all our members and probationers for the ministry, that they preach and teach according to the form of sound words in said Confession and Catechisms, and avoid and oppose all errors contrary thereto."

The phrase "*orthodox and excellent system of Christian doctrine*" is substantially the same as the phrase of the Adopting Act of 1729, "*as being in all the essential and necessary articles good forms of sound words and systems of Christian doctrine*," in slightly different language. The system of Christian doctrine contained in the Westminster Standards was what was adopted by the Reunited Church in 1729, and this embraced only that which was "*indispensable in doctrine or Presbyterian government*," that which was "*essential and necessary*" to the Westminster system.

The Synod of New York and Philadelphia fell back upon the Adopting Act of 1729, and declined to follow the strict views of subscription of the Synod of Philadelphia as expressed in the Declaratory Act of 1736.

The position of the Synod of New York was well expressed in their ultimatum in 1753:

"That difference in judgment should not oblige a dissenting member to withdraw from our communion, unless the matter were judged by the body to be essential in doctrine and discipline. And this, we must own, is an important article with us, which we cannot any way dispense with, and it appears to us to be strictly Christian and Scriptural, as well as Presbyterian; otherwise we must make everything that appears plain duty to us a term of communion, which we apprehend the Scripture prohibits. And it appears plain to us that there may be many opinions relating to the great truths of religion that are not great themselves, nor of sufficient importance to be made terms of communion. Nor can these sentiments 'open a door to an unjustifiable latitude in principles and practices,' any more than the apostolic prohibition of receiving those that are weak to doubtful disputations. What is plain sin and plain duty in one's account is not so in another's; and the Synod has still in their power to judge what is essential and what is not. In order to prevent an unjustifiable latitude, we must not make terms of communion which Christ has not made, and we are convinced that He hath not made every truth and every duty a term" (Records, p. 254).

The Synod of New York insisted upon these judicious views, until at last they were incorporated in the Declaration of Reunion, in the terms, "*orthodox and excellent systems of Christian doctrine*," and "*only such determinations as the body shall judge indispensable in doctrine or Presbyterian government.*"

There was a heresy trial in the Synod of New York which

was not completed until after the reunion. Samuel Harker was finally in 1763 declared disqualified to exercise the ministerial office:

"As he has departed from the truth and opposed this Church in some important articles, and misrepresented the Church of Scotland, his doctrine and practice have a schismatical tendency" (Records, p. 330).

Mr. Harker made a written "Appeal to the Christian World" against the Synod. John Blair, who had been familiar with the case from the beginning in the New Side Presbytery of New Brunswick, published a reply, giving a "New Side" view of the Adopting Act of 1729, which was regarded as still in force:

"He [Mr. Harker] would have it believed to be a violation of an Act of Synod, A.D. 1729, which he calls one of the great Articles of their Union, and which he thought sufficiently secured the right of private judgment, wherein it is provided that a minister or candidate shall be admitted notwithstanding scruples respecting article or articles the Synod or Presbytery shall judge not essential or necessary in Doctrine, Worship, and Government. But in order to improve this to his purpose, he takes the words essential or necessary in a sense in which it is plain from the Act itself the Synod never intended they should be taken. He would have them to signify what is essential to 'Communion with Jesus Christ,' or the Being of Grace in the heart, and accordingly supposes that no error can be essential which is not of such malignity as to exclude the advocate or maintainer of it from communion with Christ. But the Synod say essential in Doctrine, Worship, and Government—*i.e.*, essential to the system of doctrine contained in our Westminster Confession of Faith considered as a system, and to the mode of worship and plan of government contained in our Directory" ("The Synod of New York and Philadelphia Vindicated," Philadelphia, 1765, pp. 10, 11).

There can be no doubt that John Blair correctly interprets the Adopting Act of 1729, and also the views of the Reunion Synod of 1763:

"That, therefore, is an essential error in the Synod's sense, which is of such malignity as to subvert or greatly injure the *system of doctrine* and mode of worship and government contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith and Directory."

The terms of subscription of 1788 adopted in connection with the whole constitution of our Church were based upon the

Adopting Act, the Plan of Union, and the decision in the Harker case.

In these ordination vows are wrapped up all the principles for which American Presbyterians had been contending from the beginning—liberal subscription to the *system of doctrine*, a general *approval* of the Presbyterian mode of government and discipline, and the necessity of piety and religious experience in the ministry.

That the Synod was a broad and tolerant body is clear from this fact. The Presbytery of Suffolk was offended at some proposed modifications in the Form of Government, in the direction of strictness. The Synod replied to their overture in 1787 requesting a separation, with the desire that their request should be reconsidered, representing:

"We have always supposed that you, as brethren with us, believed in the same general system of doctrine, discipline, worship, and Church government, as the same is contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith, Catechisms and Directory. . . . We are Presbyterians, and we firmly believe the Presbyterian system of doctrine, discipline, and Church government to be nearer to the Word of God than that of any other sect or denomination of Christians. Shall all other sects and parties be united among themselves for their support and increase, and Presbyterians divided and subdivided, so as to be the scorn of some and the prey of others?" (Records, p. 532).

This letter, and the able committee appointed by Synod to "remove difficulties," gave satisfaction to the Presbytery of Suffolk, and it continued cordially with the Synod, and united in the adoption of the Constitution. It was the "*general system* of doctrine, discipline, worship, and Church government," which was adopted in the Constitution, and matters not essential and necessary to this "general system" were in 1789, as in 1729 and 1758, not binding.*

The Presbyterian Church during the past one hundred years has adhered to this position. There have been great ecclesiastical and doctrinal controversies. The separation of old side and new side in 1741 was repeated in the separation of old school and new school in 1837. The Reunion of 1758 was repeated in the Reunion of 1870. There has ever been contention

*See Briggs' "American Presbyterianism," pp. 371, 372.

between stricter views of discipline and subscription and milder views; but the Church through all its history has adhered to its historic position and has never repealed its official declarations in the colonial period, and has never changed its formula.

It is plain, therefore, that system of doctrine in our terms of subscription means the system of doctrine contained in the Westminster Confession, and that system is composed of the *essential and necessary articles*—that is, those articles which are *essential and necessary to the system.* The Church reserves the right to define what these essential and necessary articles are; but it must, when it makes such a decision, definitely and distinctly determine that they are necessary and essential articles of the Westminster Confession.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America has never attempted to set forth what are the essential and necessary articles of the Westminster Confession, and therefore there is room for considerable difference of opinion with reference to any doctrine which may be in debate. But there are certain historical and exegetical principles which guide to a right decision in most cases.

(*a*) The Presbyterian Church has three ecclesiastical rules of faith, three doctrinal standards, the Confession, the Larger Catechism, and the Shorter Catechism. The Adopting Act adopts them as three distinct systems. The term of subscription now in use refers to the system contained in the Confession alone, but there can be no doubt that the two Catechisms were adopted in 1788 and are constituent parts of the Constitution. Here then we have three parallel systems of doctrine. The Shorter Catechism is a compendium of the Larger Catechism. The Larger Catechism was made subsequently to the Confession by the same Westminster Assembly, and simply put in a catechetical form the doctrinal statements of the Confession of Faith. The only difference is that several of the chapters of the Confession cover ground that was not deemed appropriate to Catechisms, and therefore have their parallels in the Form of Government, Directory of Worship, and Book of Discipline.

But with regard to the strictly doctrinal chapters, those which alone are in dispute in this case, there can be no doubt that the three systems cover the same ground. From this it appears

that nothing should be regarded as essential and necessary to the system which is not contained in the three systems. The Westminster divines could not, and they did not, omit from their Catechisms anything that was essential and necessary to their Confession. No statement of the Confession should be regarded as an essential and necessary statement which has not in the doctrinal parts its parallel statement in the Larger and Shorter Catechisms; or in the ecclesiastical parts in the Form of Government and Directory for Worship.

This principle rules out of the Amended Charges all but two of the *seven* doctrines stated as essential doctrines.

The reverse of this proposition is equally true. No statement of Larger or Shorter Catechism can be regarded as binding which cannot be found in the Confession of Faith likewise. And where the same doctrine is found in the three systems in different terms, the terms of the one system are not to be preferred to the terms of the other systems. That only is the doctrine which may be expressed equally well in the terms of the three systems. Nothing is essential to the doctrine which is not common to the terminology of the Confession and of the Larger and the Shorter Catechisms. It is sufficient here to call your attention to one example. In the statement of the original condition of our race prior to the Fall, the Confession of Faith uses the term "original righteousness" (VI. 2), the Larger Catechism uses the term "estate of innocency" (21). No such stress can be lawfully laid upon the term "righteousness" as to exclude "innocency." It is as lawful to use the one phrase as the other. The doctrine of our standards must be consistent with the use of both of these terms.

(*b*) Inasmuch as the formula of subscription binds us to the essential and necessary articles and to those alone, no word or sentence or section of a chapter can be regarded as essential which may be removed without impairing the Westminster system. The distinction between essential and necessary on the one hand, and unessential and unnecessary on the other, must be made in a consistent manner. The question to be determined is not what a majority of a Presbytery may regard as an essential and necessary article of faith at the present time. You have to determine what is an essential and necessary arti-

cle in the Westminster Confession, what the Westminster divines regarded as an essential and necessary article of faith, and which they made an essential and necessary article when they constructed the Westminster system. An article might be regarded as essential and necessary to the system of theology of certain honored teachers now in use, and so to the systems in the minds of their pupils, which was yet unessential and unnecessary in the minds of the Westminster divines. Many such instances might be cited. There are many things essential to the scholastic Calvinism of some of our schools of theology which are unimportant in the Confession or omitted altogether from the Westminster system. *E.g.*, the doctrine of Repentance unto Life is an essential and necessary doctrine of the Westminster Confession. It is strongly and fully stated in the Confession and in both Catechisms, and yet it is omitted from that system of theology which is in greatest use in the Presbyterian theological schools in this country at the present time. The doctrine of Forgiveness of Sin is an essential and necessary article of the Westminster system, and yet one looks for it in vain in two of the systems of theology which are claimed to be standards of orthodoxy. On the other hand, the doctrine of Regeneration is regarded as an essential and necessary article in modern Presbyterian theology since the rise of Methodism, and yet the term Regeneration is only used incidentally in the Confession of Faith. The broader and deeper doctrine of Effectual Calling occupies the place of regeneration in the Confession of Faith and in the older theologians. Baptismal Regeneration is regarded by most modern Presbyterians as a dangerous error, and yet Cornelius Burgess wrote a book entitled "*Baptismal Regeneration of Elect Infants*," and he was subsequently made assessor of the Westminster Assembly, and was one of the most honored and influential members of that Assembly during its long sessions. Through the influence of Bishop Butler the doctrine of Probation entered into and warped the theology of the Presbyterian churches, and this doctrine is regarded by many as essential and necessary to a true moral system. But the doctrine of probation is unknown to the Westminster divines. It had indeed an Arminian origin through Daniel Whitby and is essentially contrary to the Cal-

vinistic scheme of grace. Great changes take place in the history of theology. Doctrines arise and decline in importance. Old doctrines go into the background, new doctrines emerge. The Westminster standards stereotyped the doctrines of the Westminster divines of the seventeenth century. We have subscribed to their system and to the essential and necessary articles of their Confession. But we have not subscribed to any other dogmatic systems or to the essential and necessary articles in any other systems, whether these are stated in printed books or are bubbling up in speculative minds. It is necessary for the Presbytery to consider that they have no authority to determine what is essential and necessary according to their views of what is essential and necessary in the present state of theology; but they must determine what is essential and necessary according to the Westminster Confession of Faith. The Westminster system is the rule of judgment, not any other system of theology which may possibly rule your faith and life.

IV.—The Constitution a Compact

The Presbyterian Church is a church with a Constitution. This Constitution is a compact between the ministers who constitute the Church. It restricts the minister who subscribes to it. He must hold to the essential and necessary articles of that Constitution, or he has no lawful place in the Church. But the Constitution also restricts the Church and protects the minister. The Church cannot change its Constitution except in a constitutional way, giving an opportunity to all who dissent from the change to withdraw. The Church cannot impose upon its ministry anything that is unconstitutional, or anything to which he did not agree on his entrance upon the ministry, or in a subsequent revision of the Constitution. The ordination of a Presbyterian minister is of the nature of a compact which binds both parties. Neither party can violate that compact without wrong-doing. If the minister violate the compact he can be tried and, if found guilty, expelled from the Church. But what if the Church should violate the compact and thereby damage the reputation and usefulness of the minister? In such a case

the minister can seek redress in the higher ecclesiastical courts, and if these fail him and persist in their violation of compact and do him any wrong which the civil courts can recognize, he may resort to the civil court, and the civil court may compel the Presbyterian Church to adhere to its part of the compact and stay it from damaging the reputation and standing of its ministers by unconstitutional action.

The history of subscription is instructive here. The Westminster divines were opposed to subscription. They would never have composed such elaborate systems if they had supposed they would ever be imposed upon the ministry of the Church of God. Anthony Tuckney, the chairman of the committee which framed the Shorter Catechism, tells us:

"In the Assemblie, I gave my vote with others that the Confession of Faith, put outt by Autheritie should not bee eyther required to bee sworn or subscribed too; wee having bin burnt in the hand in that kind before, but so as not to be publickly preached or written against" (Eight Letters of Anthony Tuckney and Benjamin Whichcote, London, 1753, p. 76).

Internal evidence makes it plain that the Westminster divines had no intention of making the Confession of Faith a rule of faith. The Larger Catechism says:

"The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the Word of God, the only rule of faith and obedience" (3).

The Shorter Catechism says:

"The word of God, which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him" (2).

Furthermore, the Confession represents that we must distinguish in Scripture itself between the essential and non-essential, between those things which constitute the rule of faith and life; and those things which are not constituent parts of the rule of faith and life.

"All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all; 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" (I. 7).

This statement of our Confession is of vast importance. The prosecution have overlooked it in their use of citations from the Confession. They disregard it throughout their charges. This section teaches that Holy Scripture is for all alike, rich and poor, wise and ignorant, and that all may attain such sufficient understanding of it as is necessary unto salvation. Therefore a dogmatic faith is unnecessary unto salvation. It is not necessary that any one should accept or hold any confession of faith, or any catechism, or any creed, or any of the dogmatic utterances of the Church in order to salvation. They may one and all be unknown to the reader of the Scriptures, and yet he may gain from Scripture itself "sufficient understanding of those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed for salvation." Scripture needs no fences to inclose it, no breastworks to defend it, no champion to espouse its cause, no dogma to bar it in. It is entirely sufficient of itself alone to convince, persuade, enlighten, and save mankind.

The Westminster divines had suffered from the imposition of dogma and ritual, ceremonies and ecclesiastical regulations which pinched their consciences and forced them into nonconformity. They saw and they stated the true Biblical principle. They were not altogether faultless in their own practice. They constructed an elaborate system of doctrine, many statements of which cannot be said to be "clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or other." But we are to follow their teaching rather than their practice. In this teaching they rebuke themselves in a measure. But later divines in still greater measure are rebuked for the elaborate systems of dogma which they have imposed upon the ministry in our schools of theology as tests of orthodoxy. Ministers are contending hotly for dogma which not only is not "clearly propounded and opened in Holy Scripture," but which is not to be found in Holy Scripture at all, and which is not even stated in the Westminster standards. It is the achievement in part of the modern discipline of Biblical theology that it presents the teachings of Holy Scripture in their Biblical proportions, thus showing the exaggerations of the traditional dogma, its insertions of unscriptural dogma in its systems, its neglect of important scriptural doctrine, and its depression of essential

doctrine of Holy Scripture. There is thus a conflict of Bible with tradition which must go on in a life-and-death struggle until tradition is once more defeated and destroyed. The modern Discipline of Symbolics shows the origin of the Westminster symbols, traces the historic formation of its doctrine and their expression in the three standards, interprets them by the writings of their authors and the history of opinion in their time, and thus exposes the counterfeit theology which has been palmed off upon modern Presbyterians by those who claim to be Puritans but are none; who claim to be sound in the faith, when they have abandoned the Westminster faith for another faith; and who are simply and alone scholastic Calvinists of the school of Francis Turretine of Geneva, with a streak of modern evangelicalism. It is clear that the Westminster Confession binds us only to the Bible as a rule of faith and practice, and only to those things in the Bible which are essential parts of that rule of faith and practice.

The Confession says:

"God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to his word, or beside it, in matters of faith or worship" (XX. 2).

And again:

"All which are given by inspiration of God, to be the rule of faith and life" (I. 2).

It is evident, therefore, that the Westminster Confession makes Holy Scripture the only rule of faith, obedience, and worship, and that anything besides it as well as anything contrary to it is a violation of liberty of conscience which should not be tolerated. It is doubtful, therefore, whether subscription to the Westminster Confession in any form is allowed by the Confession itself; and it may be argued with plausibility that subscription is against the doctrine of the three standards. So thought the English Presbyterians in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and subscription was never imposed upon the ministry by the old English Presbyterians. Subscription did not originate in the Church of Scotland. It was imposed upon the Church of Scotland by the Parliament of Scotland, not so much to bind the ministry as to bind the Church. Its histori-

cal design was to protect all ministers of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, who after the Revolution were willing to conform to the Presbyterian Church of Scotland and prevent those retaliatory measures which the more rigid Presbyterians were desirous of carrying out against their former persecutors. Subscription bound the Presbyteries and stayed them from casting out of their parishes any Episcopal ministers who were willing to subscribe.

The historic origin of subscription in the Presbyterian Church illustrates what has ever been the legal obligations of terms of subscription. They bind the minister and they protect him from further impositions by unreasonable majorities. They protect the Presbytery from heretics within the limits assigned —but they stay the Presbytery from pronouncing any minister a heretic who is faithful to his subscription vow.

Considerable time has been taken to set clearly before you the ecclesiastical and civil issues which may be wrapped up in this case, because it is important that you should confront all the consequences that may be involved in a trial upon unlawful charges. It will be necessary for the prosecution to show that my teachings are in conflict with essential and necessary articles of the Westminster Confession and Holy Scripture, or you cannot condemn me without a violation of the Constitution of the Church. If you should violate the Constitution of the Church and break the compact made with me and others at our ordination, we would seek relief in the Synod and General Assembly, and if the General Assembly sustain the violation of that compact with me and those who agree with me, and do any wrong which the civil courts can lawfully recognize, we might be compelled to seek relief in the civil courts of our country.

Explanations

It is a remarkable feature of this trial, that from the first initiation of the process until the present time, attention has been directed to the Inaugural Address on the Authority of Holy Scripture. If the Inaugural Address contain heresy, exactly the same heresies were before the public in my printed books for months previous to the delivery of the Address, *e.g.*:

The question of the inerrancy of Holy Scripture was discussed in my "Biblical Study," published in 1883, and in my "Whither?" published in 1889. The question of the authorship of the Pentateuch was discussed in the "Presbyterian Review," January, 1883. The question of Sanctification after Death is set forth in "Whither?" 1889, and in an article entitled "Redemption after Death" in the "Magazine of Christian Literature," December, 1890. What was stated more fully in these writings was given in a condensed and rhetorical form in the Inaugural Address. I know of no precedent in the history of ecclesiastical process, where prosecutors subjected themselves to such limitations as these prosecutors when they confine themselves to the Inaugural, and shut their eyes against all the previous writings of the defendant. If my Inaugural be heretical, all those other writings are still more heretical.

Another remarkable feature of this case is that the prosecution have objected to any statements of explanations that I have made since the publication of the Inaugural. They seem desirous to convict the Inaugural of heresy rather than to convict its author of heresy. But it is my right to set the Inaugural Address in the light of its history, to point you to the previous writings of the author in which his doctrines are more fully set forth, to ask you to consider that he was speaking to his own students and friends who knew of his writings and his teachings; that the Address was academic in character, delivered in the chapel of Union Theological Seminary, and necessarily terse and compact in utterance; that it is in the nature of an outline of a great subject, and that the author is entitled to fill up that outline and to explain anything in it in his own way. It is not sufficient for the prosecution to prove that the Address is heretical as they interpret it. It is necessary that they should convince you that the author of the Address holds and teaches heretical opinions, or else you cannot convict him.

It is the law and usage of the Presbyterian Church that the accused should be entitled to explain his own words. You cannot convict me on the interpretation of the prosecution; you are obliged in law to accept my explanations.

Once more let me call your attention to the decision of the supreme court in the Craighead case, 1824:

"That a man cannot fairly be convicted of heresy, for using expressions that may be so interpreted as to involve heretical doctrines, if they may also admit of a more favorable construction: because, no one can tell in what sense an ambiguous expression is used, but the speaker or writer, and he has a right to explain himself; and in such cases, candor requires that a court should favor the accused, by putting on his words the more favorable, rather than the less favorable construction. Another principle is, that no man can rightly be convicted of heresy by inference or implication; that is, we must not charge an accused person with holding those consequences which may legitimately flow from his assertions. Many men are grossly inconsistent with themselves; and while it is right, in argument, to overthrow false opinions, by tracing them in their connections and consequences, it is not right to charge any man with an opinion which he disavows" (Craighead Case: "Minutes of the General Assembly," 1824, p. 122).

It is necessary for me to say again what I have said before the Presbytery and also before the General Assembly, that the process against me was instituted without giving me any opportunity to make such explanations as might have rendered a process unnecessary. The process began with a violation of law. I was entitled to make those explanations before process was begun. You ought to have given me the privilege. It was my right under Presbyterian law and ecclesiastical practice. You did me a great wrong then; you cannot deprive me of my legal right to make these explanations now. You are jurors, under your solemn obligation in a court of Jesus Christ, and in the Divine Presence you must give heed to my explanations and judge according to them. You cannot find me guilty unless you find that the explanations I shall give of my statements are contrary to essential and necessary articles of the Westminster Confession and of Holy Scripture.

II

THE BIBLE THE ONLY FOUNTAIN OF DIVINE AUTHORITY

In order to save valuable time, I shall venture to consider Charges I. and II. together. This may be done with propriety for several reasons: (1) They both relate to the same general subject, namely, "*fountains of divine authority.*" (2) They

both assert the same essential doctrines of Holy Scripture and the Standards to which my teachings are alleged to be contrary. (3) They both cite the same passages from Holy Scripture and from the Standards of the Church in evidence.

The charges differ in two respects: (1) in several citations from the Inaugural Address; (2) in the statements of doctrines taught by me. I shall therefore consider first of all that which is common to the two charges, and afterward what is special under each of them.

The charges have three parts: (1) the doctrines stated as the essential doctrine of the Holy Scriptures and the Standards of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; (2) the doctrines attributed to me; and (3) the charge that the doctrines attributed to me "are contrary to the said essential doctrines."

Let us test these three parts in their order.

(1) The essential doctrine of our standards is said to be "that the Holy Scripture is most necessary, and the rule of faith and practice."

It is plain that two doctrines are here stated. The two doctrines are (1) "that the Holy Scripture is most necessary," and (2) "the rule of faith and practice." These two doctrines might have been embraced under a more general statement of doctrine if the prosecution had chosen to do so. But in fact they state them as two different doctrines. You have decided to try them together, but to vote on each charge separately.

I admit that the doctrine, "that Holy Scripture is the rule of faith and practice," is an essential doctrine of our Standards and of Holy Scripture. There is no evidence required to prove that proposition in the Charge. I admit that the doctrine that "Holy Scripture is most necessary" is a doctrine of the Westminster Confession. I am not prepared to admit that the statement of that doctrine in the Westminster Confession is essential in the form of its expression. But whether it be essential or not, is immaterial. I do not care to argue that question, for the reason that I firmly believe that "Holy Scripture is most necessary" in that exposition of the phrase which the context and the language demand. I subscribe to both of these doctrines entirely, sincerely, and without any reservation whatever. But

it is evident that there is a difference of interpretation of these two doctrines between the prosecution and the defendant. They have the right to prove that their interpretation is the necessary interpretation, and that my interpretation is the incorrect interpretation. They have given you no such proof; I have now the right to give you the correct interpretation of these phrases. I shall consider the evidence offered from Holy Scripture at this stage, the evidence from our Standards later on. The question to be determined in our study of these passages of Scripture is simply this. Do they show that Holy Scripture is the rule of faith and practice, or that Holy Scripture is most necessary, and in what sense?

(1) Is. viii. 20 was shown to be irrelevant in my Response last year. I renew my objection to it as follows:

The passage is incorrectly translated in the version used, for the meaning "there is no light in them," is not justified. The Revised Version renders "surely there is no morning for them," they have no hope of a dawn of brighter things. The proper rendering is:

"When they say unto you, Seek unto the necromancers and unto wizards;
"Ye chirpers and mutterers, should not a people seek unto their God?
"On behalf of the living will they seek, unto the dead for instruction and for testimony?
"If they say not so, who have no dawn," etc.

This passage has no reference whatever to the Holy Scriptures, or any part of them; but is a rebuke of the people of Judah for seeking necromancers and wizards, rather than the living God (pp. 44, 45).

They are not warned against seeking God in the forms of the Reason or the Church. They are not taught that Holy Scripture is most necessary, or that Holy Scripture is the rule of faith and practice. The prosecution insist upon the rendering of King James' Version and upon the reference to Holy Scripture. But the Church has not indorsed their version or their interpretation, and you cannot insist upon them as tests of orthodoxy.

(2) Matt. x. 32, 33:

"Every one therefore who shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny

me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven."

Our Saviour here tells His disciples what may be expected in the final day of judgment. Then those who have confessed Christ will be confessed before the Father and those who have denied Christ will be denied. This passage has nothing whatever to do with the mode in which Christ becomes known, whether through Bible, Church, or Reason. Jesus does not assert that Holy Scripture is most necessary, but that confession of Him is most necessary. He has nothing to say about those who neither confess nor deny Him through lack of knowledge of Christ. The denial here spoken of is the antithesis of confession. It is not the attitude of the careless or indifferent, or of those who have not yet been convinced of the Messiahship of Jesus or of the divine authority of Holy Scripture. It is solely and alone of those who have definitely examined the claims of Christ and have deliberately and finally denied Him before men. If the prosecution think that Martineau is such a man, I do not agree with them. But I agree with them as to the fact that all those who thus deny Christ will be denied of Christ in the judgment. Now I ask the court whether I am to be condemned simply on the spider's web of connection that any one may see between this text and the experience of Martineau? Have I said in my Inaugural that men may so deny Christ and be saved? I have not.

(3) Luke xvi. 29–31:

"But Abraham saith, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And he said, Nay, Father Abraham: but if one go to them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, if one rise from the dead."

It is difficult to see the relevancy of this passage. It is doubtless a true reflection of Abraham that the one who refused to hear Moses and the prophets, that is, the witness of the Old Testament Scriptures, would not be persuaded to hear one who rose from the dead. And yet Jesus Christ rose from the dead, and we have the New Testament Scriptures in addition to the Old Testament Scriptures. As the sufficiency of the Old Testa-

ment Scriptures did not obstruct the resurrection of Christ and the giving of the New Testament Scriptures, why should the sufficiency of the whole Bible prevent men from finding God also in the forms of the Church and the Reason?

If Holy Scripture is most necessary, according to this passage, then it is Moses and the prophets that were most necessary. But are the prophets so necessary that we have no need of apostles? Is Moses so necessary that we have no need of Christ? If not, then the passage does not prove most necessary to the exclusion of other things, as the prosecution would prove from their use of the phrase "most necessary."

(4) John v. 39:

"Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me."

The reference here is to the Old Testament Scriptures and to them alone.

The Old Testament Scriptures certainly bear witness of Christ, but that is not to say that the New Testament Scriptures may not bear witness of Him, or that the Church may not bear witness of Him, or that the Holy Spirit may not bear witness of Him in the heart, in the forms of the Reason.

(5) John xiv. 6:

"Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father, but by me."

Jesus is the way to God, and, indeed, the only way, because He is the only mediator between God and man. But that does not imply that all men shall have the same intellectual apprehension of Jesus or the same doctrine of His person, His offices, and His work. It does not tell us the way to Jesus. Holy Scripture is a way to Jesus. This passage does not tell us so, and there is nothing in this passage to show that the Church and the Reason are not also ways to the Son of God. It matters little how we *get to* the way, if only we are *in* the way—so it matters little *how we get* to Jesus, if Jesus is only *our way to God*. Will any of you undertake to say that Martineau is not in this way? Or, if you do, will you convict me of heresy because I cannot agree with you as to the question of fact?

(6) I. John v. 10 is cited by the prosecution in King James' Version:

"He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made him a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son."

This passage was tested in the Response last year. I repeat what was then said:

"If one turn to the original Greek he will see that the translation, 'believeth not the record that God gave of his Son,' does not correspond with the original, which reads 'witness,' and that witness is not Holy Scripture either in whole or in part. The passage is therefore irrelevant to the specification, to prove that I am in error in teaching that Martineau found divine certainty through the Reason. In that this passage of Holy Scripture teaches a direct and immediate testimony of God within a man without the mediation of Holy Scripture, it rather favors the doctrine that God may, as in the time of the apostles, pursue this direct method with some men in our days" (pp. 45, 46).

(7) Gal. i. 9:

"As we have said before, so say I now again, If any man preacheth unto you any gospel other than that which ye received, let him be anathema."

I know not what the prosecution would prove from this passage. But let me call your attention to the fact that the apostle speaks of the gospel of Jesus Christ, not of a system of dogma. I fear lest the prosecution may unconsciously confound the two, and so think that because Martineau does not accept their dogmatic system or the dogmatic system of the modern Evangelical party, he has rejected the gospel and substituted another gospel for it. But they present no evidence that this is the case. It is true that Martineau does not accept our canonical gospels in all respects, but it is evident that the apostle is not alluding to the canonical gospels in this passage. It is doubtful whether any gospel had yet been written when he wrote these words. The apostle is referring to the gospel as the glad tidings of salvation in Jesus Christ which he himself preached as an apostle of Jesus Christ. The apostle is not thinking

even of his own theology, which at the early date when he wrote this epistle was still in process of formation; but he is stating the essential doctrine of salvation which in this epistle he is so grandly setting forth over against the Judaizers. But where do I recognize another gospel than the gospel preached by Paul? Where do I justify Martineau or any one else preaching another gospel? I cannot preach the doctrines advocated by the prosecution, or those of the school of theology to which they are attached; for they are not the gospel. I will not say that they, like those Judaizers, are insisting upon a different gospel, "which is not another," any more than I will say it of Martineau; but I venture to suggest that they are getting into dangerous proximity with that different gospel, if they persist in maintaining that the doctrines of their school of theology are essential parts of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

(8) II. Timothy, iii. 15–17:

"And that from a child thou hast known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

I called attention in my Response last year to the fact that this passage is cited from King James' Version, and said: "But the Revised Version renders, 'Every Scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.' There is a difference of doctrine here which is of some importance in the use of this text for purposes of probation" (p. 45).

As correctly rendered it teaches the profitableness of every inspired Scripture; it does not teach the unprofitableness of the Church and the Reason.

(9) II. Peter i. 19–21:

"And we have the word of prophecy made more sure; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts: knowing this first, that no prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation. For no prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost."

This passage tells us that the Old Testament prophets were moved, driven, or impelled by the Holy Spirit in their prophecy; that their word of prophecy has been made more sure to us; and that no prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation; but it does not tell us that the Reason or the Church are not great fountains of divine authority. It does not tell us that men cannot find God through the Reason or the Church. We may ask, How else were the prophets moved, driven, or impelled except by the Holy Spirit acting in the forms of their Reason? And if the Holy Spirit communicated the word of prophecy and the divine authority to proclaim that word to the prophets in the forms of their Reason, why may not the Holy Spirit communicate to other men divine guidance and certitude through the forms of the Reason, even if He does not call them to be prophets and give them a word of revelation?

We have examined the nine passages from Holy Scripture cited by the prosecution. Some of them establish the doctrine that Holy Scripture is most necessary, which doctrine we do not deny. But none of them are in conflict with the declarations made in the Inaugural. The prosecution in their argument use four additional passages, Acts viii. 32–35; x. 35 seq.; xvii. 10 seq.; xix. 1–7. These refer to the experience of the Ethiopian, Cornelius, the Bereans, and Apollos in their acceptance of Christ. Their experience proves that Holy Scripture was most necessary to them, in that it was necessary that their lower stage of religious experience should advance to the higher stage of Christianity; but it does not prove that the unwritten but oral gospel of Christ was necessary to them in the sense that they could not have been in a state of grace and salvation without it. It is well known that these were all pious men, worshipping God as He had been revealed to them, and were prepared to accept Christ, and did accept Him as soon as Christ was made known to them. They present no evidence, therefore, of the proposition of the prosecution that Holy Scripture is the only fountain of divine authority. And you have no right to consider them as against me even if I have failed in convincing you of their irrelevancy, because Scripture can only be used by the prosecution to establish the essential doctrine set forth in the Charge. They cannot be legally used to prove that my

declarations are erroneous, as you have already determined in sustaining my preliminary objection. I am not obliged to defend my Inaugural against these extracts from Holy Scripture and Confession, as you have already ruled. I am simply and alone called upon to defend myself against the allegation that my declarations are against the two essential doctrines mentioned in the Charge, namely, that "Holy Scripture is most necessary," and that "Holy Scripture is the rule of faith and practice."

The prosecution have no right to use Holy Scripture and Confession in these charges further than to prove these two essential doctrines. They cannot use these passages against my declaration without violating the law of process in our Church. You cannot use these passages against me and condemn me on their account without a violation of the obligation you assumed when you undertook to sit as jurors in this case, and of the ruling of the Presbytery itself before the argument began.

(2) The doctrines attributed to me are as follows:

(*A*) "The Reason is a fountain of divine authority, which may and does savingly enlighten men, even such men as reject the Scriptures as the authoritative proclamation of the will of God and reject also the way of salvation through the mediation and sacrifice of the Son of God as revealed therein."

(*B*) "The Church is a fountain of divine authority which, apart from the Holy Scripture, may and does savingly enlighten men."

(*a*) The prosecution are obliged to prove these doctrines in their specifications, by extracts from the Inaugural. There are two specifications under each charge. These specifications consist of four groups of extracts from the Inaugural. These extracts are properly proofs of some fact that the prosecution should state. But what do they propose to prove? They do not tell us in their specifications. If the extracts are statements of fact such as the law of specification requires, where are the proofs of the fact? If they are proofs, where are the statements of fact?

(*b*) But suppose we take them as both facts and proofs of fact, inasmuch as they are extracts from the Inaugural. We are

then obliged to consider the question of their relevancy to the charge. I am obliged to admit these extracts, and you are obliged to vote that the specifications are true so far as the extracts are concerned. But what is it that they prove? How are you to bring them under the charge? Consider the effect of these extracts upon the several members of the court. I take it that my statement that "Martineau could not find divine authority in the Church or the Bible, but did find God enthroned in his own soul," is objectionable to many of you. You may think me guilty of error or of indiscretion in making such a statement. You might desire to condemn me on that account. Would you then be justified in voting to sustain the charge for that reason? On consideration you will see that there are several links in a chain of argument before you can attach this statement about Martineau to the doctrine attributed to me. You ought to test all the links of this chain before you can honorably condemn me as guilty of the charge. This testing ought to be made under the specification. The only way to accomplish this under present circumstances is to insert in these specifications the doctrine attributed to me in the charge, *i.e.:*

"In an Inaugural Address, which the said Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., delivered at the Union Theological Seminary in the city of New York, January 20th, 1891, on the occasion of his induction into the Edward Robinson Chair of Biblical Theology, which Address has been published and extensively circulated with the knowledge and approval of the said Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., and has been republished by him in a second edition with a preface and an appendix, the said Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., taught that the Reason is a fountain of divine authority which may and does savingly enlighten men, even such men as reject the Scriptures as the authoritative proclamation of the will of God and reject also the way of salvation through the mediation and sacrifice of the Son of God as revealed therein; all which is sustained by the following sentences from the said Inaugural."

Only by thus inserting the statement of fact can you vote intelligently upon this specification. This is the form in which I shall bring the question before you.

(*c*) We have simply to determine whether the doctrines attributed to me are sustained by the extracts given from the Inaugural. I admit the statements that "the Reason is a foun-

tain of divine authority," and "the Church is a fountain of divine authority." But I deny all the rest of the doctrines attributed to me in the form and in the language in which the prosecution state them in these two charges. They do not prove and they cannot prove from the Inaugural that I teach that men who reject the Scriptures and the salvation through Jesus Christ are savingly enlightened by the Reason or by the Church. There are no express statements to that effect in the Inaugural. There are no statements which by logical deduction involve such conclusions. You cannot hold me responsible for any inferences made from my statements by the prosecution or by yourselves, whether such inferences appear valid to you or not. There are several invalid assumptions which the prosecution are forced to make before they can convince you even by indirection of the validity of such inferences.

(3) I shall waste no time in an attempt to expound the doctrines which have been invented by the prosecution and wrongly attributed to me, but I shall proceed to the main question in hand, namely, whether the doctrines which I truly hold, that "the Reason is a fountain of divine authority" and "the Church is a fountain of divine authority," are contrary to the essential doctrines named in the charges, or to any other doctrines of Holy Scripture and Confession. I shall show you that they are not contrary to, but in strict accordance with, the Westminster Standards and Holy Scripture.

My doctrine is that "*the Reason is historically a great fountain of divine authority.*" Do I contradict the Westminster Confession when I take this position? Some of you think that I do. But you overlook some very important statements in the Confession of Faith of our Church. It is a happy circumstance that in the Inaugural Address itself I defined the Reason in the use I made of it. The prosecution recognized my definition when they quoted it in their original charge. I said in the Inaugural that I was "*using Reason in a broad sense to embrace the metaphysical categories, the conscience, and the religious feeling*" (p. 26). It seems probable that the prosecution do not keep this definition before them when they make inferences from the statements which they cite from the Inaugural. This probability amounts almost to a certainty when

we observe that they have omitted this definition from the list of extracts from the Inaugural given in the new charge; for I hesitate to impute to a committee of Presbytery an unworthy motive for this omission. This court should notice this omission and beware lest you make it yourselves. You should keep in mind constantly that the *Reason as I use it embraces the conscience and the religious feeling.*

The Testimony from the Standards

(*a*) The Westminster Confession sets forth the great distinguishing doctrine of the Reformed churches, that the divine grace is sovereign and free, far above and beyond human instrumentalities, more comprehensive than any limits conceivable by man; free to go beyond the ordinary divinely appointed means of grace; free to persist and overcome every resistance of sin and unbelief. While the Holy Spirit ordinarily uses Bible, Church, and sacrament, He sometimes works apart from them and without them. On this principle the Westminster Confession bases its doctrine of the salvation of elect infants and elect incapables, who from their tender age or their abnormal organization are "incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word" (X. 3). Such are saved by Christ through the Spirit, "who worketh when, and where, and how He pleaseth" (X. 3).

This doctrine of the freedom of the divine grace and the power of the divine Spirit to work anywhere, and in any place and in any manner He pleaseth, opens a gate upon a wide territory into which the Westminster divines looked with awe and hesitating wonder, but which they left for later divines to explore as a region of liberty and extra confessional doctrine. The Westminster divines did not themselves go any further into this new field of the seventeenth century than to maintain that there were elect infants and elect incapables, but modern Presbyterians have with unanimity extended their doctrine of elect infants and elect incapables to all infants and all incapables; and have also added the class of elect heathen, a class which the Westminster divines excluded from the election of grace. If any class of persons can be saved by the divine

Spirit apart from Church and Bible and sacraments, how else can they be saved except by the direct contact of the divine Spirit with their spirits in the *forms of the Reason?* I have given a careful history of this doctrine in the little book "How shall we Revise?" and have traced the several stages of change toward this doctrine, through which our Presbyterian Church has gone on advancing toward the present determination to revise the tenth chapter of our Confession. Dr. Shedd says:

"That some evangelized men are saved in the present life by an extraordinary exercise of redeeming grace in Christ has been the hope and belief of Christendom" ("Dogmatic Theology," II. 706).

"This (X. 3) is commonly understood to refer not merely or mainly to idiots and insane persons, but to such of the pagan world as God pleases to regenerate without the use of the written revelation" (II. 708).

"It is certain that the Holy Spirit can produce, if He please, such a disposition and frame of mind [a habit of faith and penitence] in a pagan without employing, as He commonly does, the written Word" (II. 708).

I do not approve of Dr. Shedd's assertion that this modern view "has been the hope and belief of *Christendom*," but there is little doubt that his statement expresses the conviction of modern Presbyterians. But if the Holy Spirit without mediation of Holy Scripture or Holy Church can produce faith and penitence in a pagan, how else can the divine Spirit produce these habits of soul, except through the forms of the Reason?

Accordingly I said in the appendix to the Inaugural Address, and I say it again: "Unless God's authority is discerned in the forms of the Reason, there is no ground upon which any of the heathen could ever have been saved, for they know nothing of Bible or Church. If they are not savingly enlightened by the Light of the World in the forms of the Reason, the whole heathen world is lost forever" (pp. 88, 89). This is quoted by the prosecution as if it were erroneous. But it states the exact truth.

The Westminster Confession points the way into this territory of divine grace imparted through the Reason; who then shall venture to obstruct it?

The attitude of the Westminster Confession to the heathen and the unbaptized in Christian lands is clear from the following statement of Chapter XXV. 2: "The visible Church . . .

of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, . . . together with their children—out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation." We cannot subscribe to this last clause at the present time. We refuse to deny the possibility of salvation to the unbaptized children of the Baptist churches, or to members of the Society of Friends, or to soldiers of the Salvation Army, which have no ministry, no sacraments, and no church organization. We recognize that there may be and that there are possibilities of salvation through the activity of the divine Spirit in heathen lands. The faith of the modern Presbyterian Church has changed in this particular. If this clause "out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation" be an essential and necessary article, the whole Church is heretical. But it is not an essential article. We could erase this statement of XXV. 2 without impairing the great doctrine of this section of the chapter.

The Society of Friends and the Salvation Army both use Holy Scripture as a means of grace; but both agree in using also the Reason in religion to an extent far beyond that which is common to the evangelical Christian denominations. But the elect heathen have no access to Holy Scripture. There is no other avenue of grace for them than the Reason. And there is no doubt that the Holy Spirit uses the Reason in these cases as a fountain of divine authority and through it imparts religious certainty.

(*b*) Some may imagine that the introductory sentence of the Confession of Faith is against this doctrine, when it says:

> "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 inexcusable; yet they are not sufficient to give that knowledge of God, and of His will, which is necessary unto salvation" (I. 1).

This section is indeed cited by the prosecution in support of their doctrine. But this statement of the Confession does not contravene the doctrine that the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority. The light of nature should be carefully distinguished from the light of grace. The Confession states how far this light of nature goes. It "so far manifests the goodness, wisdom, and power of God as to leave men inexcusable." I

agree to this, but I think the light of nature goes further still. It shines from the face of the sun; it declares the glory of God from the firmament; it discloses the wisdom of God in the order of nature; it unfolds the goodness of God in His beneficent provisions for all creatures; it manifests the power of God in the irresistible forces of light, fire, and storm; it appears in the natural reason, framing all the operations of our mind in the forms of time, place, and circumstance, and coloring them with the hues of the true, the beautiful, and the good; it is set forth in the history of the world, which is the divine education of our race. But the Confession is correct in stating that the light of nature "is not *sufficient* to give that knowledge of God and of His will which is necessary unto salvation." The knowledge necessary unto salvation can only come from the light of grace. The simple question is whether this light of grace shines outside the boundaries of the Church, beyond the range of Holy Scripture and Holy Sacrament. The Confession does not assert this. But it does not deny it, and we have a right as Presbyterians to maintain the opinion as extra-confessional doctrine provided we can prove it from Holy Scripture or from the experience of mankind, or from any other valid reasons. The light of nature is a glorious light of revelation. It should bring man to his knees before God as a penitent sinner. But, as I have elsewhere said, "the light of the eternal Logos is a still more blessed light; for it is the light of the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. The world came into existence through Him. He was ever in the world, even when the world knew Him not. He was ever coming into the world in the progress of divine revelation, until the theophany and prophecy; historic guidance and ideal aim were realized in the incarnate Redeemer."

"It is quite true that the Westminster divines did not catch a glimpse of this light of the Logos. Their Christology was defective at this point as well as other points. They did not give expression to this doctrine. It is significant that they do not cite from the prologue of John's gospel, with the exception of verses 1 and 14 to prove the incarnation of the Logos. But they did not exclude the doctrine of the Light of the world even if they neglected it. It is the merit of the Society of Friends or Quakers that they discerned this doctrine in the prelegue of

John's gospel, and held it up before the modern world until it became one of the most characteristic doctrines of modern times." Does the light of the Logos shine in heathen lands apart from Bible and sacrament? Does the light of the Logos shine in Christian lands to some of those whom the Church has driven away from the sacred aisles of redemption? The Confession does not deny it. If the prologue of the gospel of John teaches it, the Confession must yield to Holy Scripture. Then those who deny it are the real heretics. It matters not, however, in point of law, what may be the correct opinion on this great subject. Unless the prosecution can show that it is a cardinal doctrine of the Confession, that the Logos does not shine with sufficient light outside the Church to save men, and that Holy Scripture sustains the Confession in this particular, you cannot legally convict me of heresy for teaching that the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority, when I explain that the light of the Logos shines in some cases among the heathen, through the Reason, with a divine authority, which convinces and assures pious souls that they have and hold the truth and salvation from God.

(*c*) The prosecution also cite in evidence the last half of section 1st, as follows:

"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."

This clearly teaches "Holy Scripture to be most necessary." There need be no dispute about that. I agree to it as fully as the prosecution. The question is whether the Scriptures are most necessary in the sense that no one can find God and salvation without them. This the Confession does not teach. The Confession refers to a divine revelation of salvation to the Church before the divine revelation of salvation was committed to writing in Holy Scripture. Holy Scripture was not most necessary to salvation before it was given and written; but

only after it was written. It is most necessary to salvation to those who enjoy the unspeakable privilege of possessing it. But what shall we say of those who do not possess the Holy Scriptures? Are they deprived of the opportunity of salvation on the lower stage because others more highly favored enjoy the privilege of salvation on the higher stage of Holy Scripture? You cannot say so unless you would exclude from salvation all who know not Holy Scripture, including the heathen, imbeciles, and babes. You must make these exceptions to the statement that Holy Scripture is most necessary. But are we shut up to these exceptions? Are there none in Christian lands to whom Holy Scripture is practically an unknown book? Some are kept from Holy Scripture by priestcraft, others by the use that has been made of it in the interests of the privileged classes, others still by the dogmatic barriers to which attention was called in the Inaugural. Doubtless there is guilt on the part of these, but in my opinion there is much greater guilt on the part of the modern pharisees who have obstructed the access of these multitudes to the word of God. What now shall we say with reference to all these who for one reason or another have no saving knowledge of Holy Scripture? Is Holy Scripture so necessary in the case of all of them that there can be no salvation without their knowledge of it and faith in it? I do not believe it. You do not believe it. You preach to them Jesus Christ and salvation through Him. You do not go to them with the Bible and demand of them that they shall accept the Scriptures in order to salvation. If they accept Jesus Christ as their Saviour they will be saved even if they have never seen a copy of the Bible, or have never read or heard a chapter from its pages. The Scripture is most necessary as the rule of faith and life to guide the Church and the people in the paths of redemption until they attain its full salvation; but it is not most necessary in the sense that no individual man may be saved without a personal knowledge of it and a personal faith in it. Christianity is a personal faith in Christ the living and reigning Redeemer.

The more concise statement of the Larger Catechism cited by the prosecution must be interpreted in the same way. It is true that "God's word and spirit only, do sufficiently and effect-

ually reveal Him (God) unto men for their salvation." But "word and spirit" are combined in this statement. The "Holy Spirit only" one can always say, and also "word and spirit only;" but we cannot say "word only" if we mean by word the written Scripture; for all admit that some men are saved by the Holy Spirit's effectual calling without the use of Holy Scripture. Indeed, that is expressly stated in the chapter on Effectual Calling, as we have seen.

(*d*) The prosecution cite in evidence section 5th, as follows:

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

It is difficult to see why the prosecution cite this passage. They overlooked it in their original charges. This section is to me the choicest one in the chapter, one which I not only agree to, but greatly admire in all its sentences and words. The only clew I have to the use the prosecution propose to make of it is their italicizing of the words, "*the only way of man's salvation.*" I know not what they propose to prove by this phrase. "What is the only way of man's salvation?" Is it Holy Scripture? Is it not rather Jesus Christ, the way, the truth, and the life? The Confession calls attention to the "full discovery" Holy Scripture "makes of the only way of man's salvation." It does not say that the *only* discovery of the way of man's salvation is in Holy Scripture, but that the *full* discovery is there. The prosecution have to substitute their "*only*" for the "*full*" of the Confession, ere they can use this sentence to prove anything which they have proposed in the charge.

In point of fact this section of the Confession is in direct conflict with that dogmatic theory of the canon, which underlies the whole attack upon my doctrine of Holy Scripture. This section of the Confession gives the human testimony of

the Church its full force as probable evidence; but distinctly asserts that the divine evidence, the only one that can give certainty, is the Holy Spirit bearing witness by, and with the word in our hearts.

Those who are charging me with error are themselves guilty at this point, for they rest the authority of the canon upon the probable evidence of the early Church. I agree with the Confession in resting it upon the internal divine evidence of the Holy Spirit bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts. They make it a purely historical question, and can therefore never go beyond the range of probability in their doctrine of the canon, can never reach certainty. They close the way to that divine evidence which alone, according to our Confession, can give certainty of the divine authority of Holy Scripture. And they say that "there is no other fountain of divine authority than Holy Scripture. You cannot gain certainty through the Church or the Reason." I said in the passages quoted from the Inaugural, and I say again: "Divine authority is the only authority to which man can yield implicit obedience, on which he can rest in loving certainty and build with joyous confidence. . . . There are historically three great fountains of divine authority—the Bible, the Church and the Reason" (p. 4).

Those who deny this statement are the true heretics. For they would deprive us of loving certainty and joyous confidence in our religion. As the ancient pharisees were rebuked by our Lord because they shut the kingdom of heaven against men, refusing to enter themselves or to permit others to enter, so these modern pharisees should be rebuked by the Presbyterian Church for obstructing all the divinely appointed means of access to divine authority, all the avenues by which the divine Spirit gives certainty to men in religion. They would deprive us of that assurance of grace and salvation which is such an unspeakable comfort in our holy religion.

(*e*) The prosecution cite in evidence section 6th of the Confession as follows:

"*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. 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; 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."

The part italicized was cited in the original charges. The part not italicized was left out of the citation in the original charge. A sense of propriety has doubtless induced the prosecution to give the latter in their new charges. They may italicize the first half, I shall emphasize the whole of it. For I fail to see how the first half can be properly used against my declarations. I agree to it without exception. It does not say that "the whole counsel of God" is revealed in Holy Scripture; but only *that part* of the counsel of God "concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life." The statement limits the revelation in Holy Scripture to necessary things. These necessary things are (1) either expressly set down in Scripture, or (2) by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture. These are necessary things and no others. The sentence now closes with a prohibition from adding any other necessary things; for that is certainly the meaning of the sentence "unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelation of the Spirit or traditions of men." That is just the doctrine the prosecution should keep distinctly in mind at the present time, because, as will appear, the Confession here prohibits exactly what they are doing in this prosecution, namely, adding to the necesary doctrines of Holy Scripture other doctrines of modern dogmaticians which they are claiming to be so necessary that I must be adjudged a heretic for not holding them. I certainly do not sin against this passage of the Confession, because I am not adding to the list of necessary doctrines. My effort for some years has been rather to show that many doctrines deemed necessary to the traditional dogma are not necessary from the point of view of Scripture and Confession. That is indeed the underlying issue of the present contest in the Presbyterian Church. The prosecution could not have done me a better

service than by bringing this passage into evidence, thus enabling me to emphasize what has already been said, that no one can be condemned for heresy who does not transgress an essential doctrine of Holy Scripture.

The first part of this section has nothing in it in contravention of the doctrine that the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority. But the second part distinctly favors that doctrine, for it states (1) that something more is necessary than the written or spoken word of Holy Scripture. "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." This illumination of the Spirit of God is an illumination of the Reason, or to use the sentence of the previous section, "bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts." This "inward illumination," this illumination in our hearts, what can it be but in the conscience, the religious feeling, the forms of the Reason?

(2) Circumstances concerning the worship and church government are "to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence." Here is a field of unnecessary and unessential things where there is no light in Holy Scripture and where man is left to the use of the reason and the light of nature, in which the Holy Spirit may guide the individual Christian and the Church without the use of the written Word. This passage of the Confession therefore teaches that Scripture reveals necessary things, and that unnecessary things are beyond its scope and are to be determined from other authoritative sources; that the inward illumination of the Spirit in the heart, in the conscience, in the Reason, is necessary in any case.

(*f*) The prosecution cite in evidence section 10th, as follows:

"*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.*"

They emphasize the words which give the essence of the doctrine, namely, that "The Supreme Judge can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture."

In what respect do I controvert that? Any one at all familiar with my writings will recognize that I have been in the habit of using this doctrine as one of the great doctrines of the Reformation and of Puritanism. Let me repeat what I wrote some years ago:

"It was this principle that made the Puritan faith and life invincible. "O that their descendants had maintained it! If they had laid less stress upon the minor matters: the order of the decrees, the extent of the atonement, the nature of imputation, the mode of inspiration, and the divine right of presbytery—and had adhered to this essential principle of their fathers, the history of Puritanism would have been higher, grander, and more successful. We would not now be threatened with the ruin that has overtaken all its unfaithful predecessors in their turn. Let their children return to it; let them cling to it as the most precious achievement of British Christianity; let them raise it on their banners, and advance with it into the conflicts of the day; let them plant it on every hill and in every valley throughout the world; let them not only give the Bible into the hands of men and translate it into their tongues, but let them put it into their hearts and translate it into their lives. Then will Biblical interpretation reach its culmination in practical interpretation, in the experience and life of mankind" (pp. 365, 366).

It is not Holy Scripture which is the supreme Judge, it is the *Holy Spirit*, and the *Holy Spirit* alone. Holy Scripture is that in which the Holy Spirit speaks, and He speaks bearing witness by and with the word in the heart of the believer. The Holy Spirit speaks to the reason of the godly man through Holy Scripture and gives him the ultimate decision in all matters of faith and practice.

I never taught any other doctrine. If any one thinks that this doctrine conflicts with the doctrine that the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority, he thinks wrongly and is apart from the true lines of logical reasoning. The Confession does not here say that the Holy Spirit does not speak in the Reason apart from Holy Scripture, and so speaking, speak with divine authority. It says that the Holy Spirit is the supreme Judge. He is the supreme Judge wherever and whenever and in whatever form He speaks. The Confession is only concerned to teach that it is when speaking in the Holy Scripture that He is the supreme Judge, and that when so speaking the Church must yield allegiance whatever may have been the

decrees of councils or opinions of ancient writers; and that private spirits must obey, whatever the doctrines of men may have been; in other words that Church and Reason must yield to the supreme Judge the Holy Spirit, when speaking in Holy Scripture. I have not said that the Holy Spirit speaks the final word in the Reason to which the Church and the Bible must yield. I have not exalted the Reason above the Bible. I am no Rationalist. It is the teaching of the Confession to which I subscribe, that the Holy Spirit when He speaks the infallible word in Holy Scripture always speaks through the Scripture to the Reason, and by His inward work in the heart, in the Reason, gives certainty, assurance, and infallible conviction of the truth and grace of God. There is no conflict between Reason and Scripture in such a case. There can be none. *The Holy Spirit unites them in an infallible bond of certainty.*

(*g*) The prosecution also cite in evidence several answers to questions in the Catechisms which teach that Holy Scripture is "the only rule of faith and obedience," "the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him."

The only matter charged against me in the original charge was that my doctrine was in irreconcilable conflict with the cardinal doctrine of Holy Scripture and Confession, that "Holy Scripture is the only infallible rule of faith and practice." The prosecution leave off the adjective *infallible*, and now charge me with teaching a doctrine which is in conflict with the doctrine that Holy Scripture is the only rule of faith and practice. Let me call your attention to the purpose of the Inaugural.

The aim of the Inaugural Address was not to vindicate the Bible as a rule of faith; certainly not to say anything which could directly or indirectly militate against that essential doctrine. If that had been my aim I would have made it my theme. My aim was to set forth the divine authority of Holy Scripture, and therefore the title given to the Address was "The Authority of Holy Scripture." That was its theme, that was the objective point of its argument and its rhetoric. It aimed to remove every stumbling-block set up by the traditional dogma in the way of the authority of Holy Scripture. It endeavored to set forth the authority of Holy Scripture by adducing such evi-

dence from Scripture itself as every reasonable man might understand and estimate at its intrinsic value.

It is not charged that I deny the authority of Holy Scripture. The complaint is that I do not make the authority of the Bible sufficiently great to be the rule of faith and practice. But this complaint is without justification, for it is not necessary to maintain that the Bible is the only authority in matters of religion, or the only great fountain of divine authority, or the only channel of divine guidance, in order to maintain consistently that Holy Scripture is the rule of faith and practice. May not the light of nature have divine authority? Listen to the Confession:

"Although the light of nature and the works of creation and providence do so far manifest the greatness and power of God, as to leave men inexcusable" (I. 1).

If the light of nature so manifest the greatness and power of God—does it not bear divine authority?

Listen to Holy Scripture:

"For when the Gentiles which have not the law, 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 meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another" (Rom. i. 19, 20).

There is a divine law in the heart and conscience of men. Paul here teaches that this law is divine, but it is not infallible.

Is it a necessary consequence that "the rule" should be "the only great fountain of divine authority?" I claim that the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority and yet not a rule of faith and practice. I shall explain this further on. But I am not obliged to explain it. It is the duty of the prosecution to prove that there is irreconcilable conflict here. They do not propose this in their charge. They have not proffered any evidence of it. They have simply assumed it, and they have asked you to take *this leap over a chasm of difference in order to give an illogical verdict.*

III

THE REASON

We have tested all the proofs given by the prosecution from the Westminster standards and have seen that they do not sustain the thesis of the prosecution; but rather bear witness against them. Let me now call your attention to the great change that has taken place in the doctrine of the Reason since the 17th century.

Christian philosophy has made rapid strides forward since the Westminster Confession was framed. The Cambridge Platonists, many of whom were pupils of the Westminster divines, led the way in this great movement. The result has been that the human reason has gained a place in Christian theology that it could not have had before. How can we as Christian scholars go back to the psychology and metaphysics of the Westminster divines? Who will venture to ignore the history of modern philosophy, or the achievements that have been made in the field of theology in the long conflict with Deism, Rationalism, and Agnosticism? The conscience has assumed a vastly higher place in Christian ethics. The Metaphysical Categories have been more correctly defined and explained. The Religious Feeling has emerged as an original endowment of man which lies at the roots of his religious nature. The witness of the Christian consciousness is of immense consequence to Christian theology. The Reason is acknowledged to be the greatest endowment God has given to man. It is the holy of holies of human nature, the presence chamber of God within the soul, into which the divine Spirit enters when He would influence the man, and in which our Saviour dwells when He would make the man altogether His own. We shall admit that the Westminster Confession is altogether inadequate in its doctrine of the Reason. As I said some years ago, "The Reason, the Conscience, and the Religious Feeling, all of which have arisen during these discussions of the last century, into a light and vigor unknown and unanticipated at the Reformation, should not be antagonized the one with the other, or with the Spirit of God" ("Biblical Study," p. 138). The

divine Spirit uses all these forms of the Reason in His influence upon men, making them so many streams of the fountain of authority which He causes to burst forth from the innermost soul of man. The letters between Antony Tuckney and his pupil Benjamin Whichcote show how much this venerable divine feared the use of the Reason by the Cambridge school in the 17th century. This attitude of Tuckney is assumed by conservatives in every generation. The same class of men show similar fears at the present time. But as each generation of scholars has overcome the opposition of their times and shown such fears to be groundless, as due in part to old age and in part to the rigidity of opinions in some minds, and in part to a natural reluctance to accept the new with its consequences of change and uncertainties of result—so the conservatives of our generation will be overcome and their fears will ere long prove to be *ghosts of their own fashioning and illusions of their own creation.*

There is no barrier whatever in the Westminster Confession to this use of the Reason as a great fountain of divine authority. The Confession does not unfold the doctrine of the light of the Logos, or the mode by which the Holy Spirit regenerates and sanctifies children, idiots, and redeemed pagans apart from Bible and Church—it does not describe the activities of the Holy Spirit in the forms of the Reason. But that does not justify us in shutting our eyes to new light and new evidence on this important doctrine. Our subscription protects our liberty in all matters not defined by the Confession. Here is the open field of extra-confessional doctrine in which the Church has not given its decision and where, if it be ready to decide, it must make its decision in the constitutional way by revision overtures to the presbyteries. "The Westminster Confession opens the gates to this doctrine when it represents that the divine Spirit 'works when, and where, and how he pleaseth,' and it does not exclude the light of the Logos by its denial of the sufficiency of the light of Nature. The authority of the light of Nature is one thing, the authority of the light of Grace is another thing. The authority of the natural Reason is one thing, the authority of the Reason as informed by the divine Spirit is another thing. The sufficiency of the light of Nature is a doctrinal error, but the sufficiency of the Light that

shines forth from the divine countenance in the presence chamber of the Reason, through the religious feeling and the conscience, is one of the grandest doctrines of the Bible, of history, and of human experience."

I.—Positive Evidence from the Confession

We have shown that there is nothing in the Westminster Confession of Faith which contravenes the doctrine that the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority. We shall now show that the Confession distinctly recognizes the Reason as a great fountain of divine authority. The prosecution shut their eyes to seven chapters of the Confession (12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 20, 26) when they represent that my doctrine of the Reason is erroneous. In their original charges they state that I "strike at the vitals of religion" in teaching that the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority. I do indeed "strike at the vitals of religion," but in a sense quite different from that in their minds, *for this doctrine so strikes at the vitals of religion that there can be no vital religion without it. It does indeed enter into the very life of the religion of Jesus Christ. It strikes at the barriers of dead orthodoxy and barren ecclesiasticism and strikes through them to the fountain-head of Christian Life.*

(*a*) There can be no such thing as Effectual Calling unless the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority. The Westminster Confession teaches that—

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

In effectual calling the Holy Spirit acts upon the soul of man. The call is by the divine word and the divine Spirit; always by the divine Spirit but not always by the divine word; but whether

the divine word is used or not, in any case it is the divine Spirit who enlightens the mind to understand the things of God; gives a new heart of flesh for the old heart of stone; renews the will, determining it by almighty power to that which is good. All these operations of the divine Spirit change the mind, the heart, the will, the constituent parts of the inner man. Does any one suppose that the divine Spirit enlightens the mind without using the Reason? Can the heart be transformed from a hard stone to sensitive flesh without using the Religious Feeling? Can the will be determined to that which is good without using the Conscience? If mind, heart, and will are changed in effectual calling, then Reason, Religious Feeling, and Conscience are quickened with the pulsations of the divine Spirit and animated with new life. When the mind is savingly enlightened by the Spirit of God, how can this be otherwise than by the Spirit of God speaking with divine authority through the forms of the Reason, so that the mind understands the things of God on the authority of God? When the will is renewed and determined by the divine Spirit to that which is good, how otherwise can it be determined than by a divine authority in the conscience overcoming every doubt as to the good, and every disinclination to the good?

In effectual calling, the calling is effectual simply because the Holy Spirit enters the human Reason with divine energy to work through the Reason effectually in all the avenues of human nature. By effectual calling the redeemed enter into a new world in which divine authority flows through the fountain of the Reason to govern and enrich all their lives.

(*b*) There can be no such thing as Sanctification unless the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority. The Westminster Confession teaches that—

> "They who are 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, by his word and Spirit dwelling in them" (XIII. 1).

Sanctification is accomplished by Christ's word and Spirit dwelling in them—not by Christ's word alone, but also by the indwelling Spirit; by the word and Spirit usually in Christian

lands; but by the Spirit always in every land and in every redeemed person. By the word dwelling in us we understand not only Holy Scripture engraved on the memory, but appropriated by the soul and transformed into principles of holy living and doing. How then shall we understand the indwelling Spirit? Where does the holy Spirit dwell if not at the central point of our human nature, and where else can that be for any intelligent person than in the Reason, where the conscience is taught to speak the categorical imperative which is now truly a word divine; where the religious feeling is stimulated to holy impulses which are as the breath of God to men; where the Reason is informed with holy thoughts which are truth from heaven; and where the divine presence fills the soul with the assurance of a divine authority which is no bondage, but peace and joy? There can be *no sanctification* unless the Holy Spirit dwell in the Reason and so by divine authority govern the life and conduct. This was distinctly taught by the old Puritans in their pursuit of personal holiness. It was imbedded by them in the Westminster Confession. This Puritan principle was revived by Wesley and made by him one of the cardinal principles of Methodism. He committed the sad mistake of inclosing it in inadequate and erroneous statements of the doctrines of sin and of grace, and yet it has proved a life-giving force to that great organization. This principle has been again here asserted with power by the Salvation Army.

It is very significant at the close of our century, that we have a great military organization outside the Christian Church, without a ministry and without the sacraments, which seeks above all things the salvation of the lost and endeavors to impart a full salvation to all people. The Salvation Army has become one of the most powerful religious organizations in the world. It has the presence of Christ and the power of the Holy Spirit and the blessing of God the Father in its redemptive work. Like the Society of Friends, the Army claims immediate communion with Christ. It uses the Bible but it does not use the Church. It uses the Reason and especially the Religious Feeling, still more than it uses the Bible in order to direct union with the Holy Spirit and communion with Christ. You will find these statements among its orders for field officers:

"The F. O. must have been converted or changed by the power of the Holy Spirit from the old, worldly, selfish, sinful nature to the new, holy, heavenly, divine nature; and not only must he thus have received a new heart, but he must have the Holy Spirit living in that heart, possessing it and working through it, to will and to do the good pleasure of God" (Section II. 1).

"(*d*) He has been changed by the Divine power into the image of God. He has been remodelled after the pattern of the second Adam, having been born again of the Spirit of God, so that now he has become a partaker of the Divine nature.

"(*e*) He is possessed and controlled by God. His body is the dwelling-place of the Holy Spirit. As God hath said, 'I will dwell in them and walk in them. I will be their God and they shall be my people' (I. Cor. vi. 16). Consequently the will of God is done in him, and through him, and by him. He lives the same kind of life and is actuated by the same purpose as God Himself; that is, a life of benevolence. God lives for the welfare of the universe; the F. O. lives for the happiness of mankind."

I do not approve of all the statements of General Booth and his officers with regard to sanctification, but in the language quoted they state the Biblical ideal and the Puritan ideal of our Westminster Confession. Christian life in the Presbyterian Church has too often not been in accordance with this idea. Our dogmatic divines have neglected the doctrine of sanctification. Our ministry, trained for the most part in speculative dogma rather than in a Biblical faith, to a scholastic theology rather than to a Westminster theology, have failed to honor sufficiently the indwelling Spirit of God. It would seem that God has raised up the Salvation Army to stimulate us all to seek a full salvation and to live Christian lives which are directed by the Holy Spirit dwelling in the Reason and sending forth streams of divine authority through all the activities of our nature in order to make our souls like a well-watered garden, a fruitful paradise of God.

(*c*) There can be no such thing as Saving Faith unless the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority. The Westminster Confession teaches that—

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

This section teaches that the grace of faith is the work of the Spirit of Christ in the hearts of the elect, whereby they are enabled to believe. If faith is wrought in our hearts by the divine Spirit, can it be wrought in any other way than through the Reason? Can there be any faith in which the conscience, the religious feeling, and the Reason do not share?

"The principal acts of saving faith are, accepting, receiving, and resting upon Christ alone for justification, sanctification, and eternal redemption" (XIV. 2).

Can there be any "receiving and resting upon Christ" if the Reason exclude Christ, if the conscience disapprove of Christ, if the religious feeling shrink from Christ? It is because the Holy Spirit lights up the chambers of the soul, it is because Jesus Christ shines in our hearts with light divine that we see Him and know our Saviour, as we see and know the sun when he rises at the break of day. It is through the effusion of divine energy, the infusion of divine life, the suffusion of divine light, that sinful man is born of God to live in the Spirit and know his Saviour. As an old Puritan says:

"Faith then is the gift of God, and the act of man: a wonderfull and supernaturall gift of God, and a lively motion of the heart renewed by grace, and powerfully moved by the Spirit. The power to beleeve, and will to use that power, is of God: But the act of the will in resting upon Christ is mans. It is man that beleeveth, but it is God only and altogether that inableth, stirreth up, putteth forward, and inclineth the heart to beleeve. By Gods enlightening man seeth, by his teaching he understands: and the Lord inclining his will, hee willeth, embraceth, possesseth and keepeth Christ with all blessings promised in him. So that faith is the motion of mans heart wrought in him by the Spirit of God. Even as a wheele, which of itselfe cannot move, yet being moved of another, doth move; whose motion though but one, is said to be the motion of the mover, and of the thing moved; so faith is nothing but the action of God in man, but considered in a diverse manner it is both the act of God and man: as wrought by God in man, it is the work of the Lord: as the motion of man, his heart being moved of God, it is the act of man. For the action of man in beleeving with the heart, is nothing but his knowing and acknowledging of things, by Gods making him know and acknowledge them; his apprehending, willing, chusing, embracing, and retaining them, by Gods making him to apprehend, will, chuse, embrace, and retaine them" ("A Treatise of Faith," Ball., pp. 11, 12).

(*d*) There can be no such thing as Good Works well pleasing to God, unless the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority. The Westminster Confession teaches that—

"Their ability to do good works is not at all of themselves, but wholly from the Spirit of Christ. And that they may be enabled thereunto, besides 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" (XVI. 3).

In order to good works it is therefore necessary that the Holy Spirit should "work in the believer to will and to do of his good pleasure." If the Holy Spirit work in a man, how else shall He work than in the forms of the Reason? The Holy Spirit not only works in the man, but He dwells in him while working, in his innermost soul. And where can the Holy Spirit dwell within us save in the forms of the Reason?

(*e*) There can be no such thing as Assurance of Grace unless the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority. The Westminster Confession teaches that—

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

The "inward evidence of these graces," "the testimony of the Spirit of adoption witnessing with our spirits," what is this except the witness of the Holy Spirit within the forms of the Reason?

"A Methodist minister some years ago insisted to me that Presbyterians did not believe in the doctrine of assurance. I could hardly convince him by reading to him the statement of the Confession of Faith. He said that he had never met a Presbyterian who believed the doctrine; that Presbyterians only hoped they were saved, but were never assured of their salvation. My observations and inquiries have led me to the opinion that in the main the Methodist minister was correct. The ministry and people of the Presbyterian Church have not as a rule sought assurance of grace and salvation as it has ever been their privilege and duty to do. The Reformed doctrine, that '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' (XVIII. 3), has induced Presbyterians to rest content with the possession of simple justifying faith. They have not realized the grace of adoption and 'the testimony of the Spirit of adoption;' they have not sufficiently advanced in the grace of sanctification and so have not the inward evidences of those graces unto which these promises are made" ("Whither?" pp. 157, 158).

If the Westminster doctrine of the Assurance of Grace were really a part of the living faith of the Presbyterian Church, no one could accuse me of heresy for teaching that the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority, for let any one consider what is involved in this doctrine. It is the assurance of a believer, the making him certain that he is a child of God. This comes by inward evidence within the soul of man, not merely by outward evidence from Bible or Church. It is the Holy Spirit witnessing with our spirits—Spirit with spirit—not simply the Holy Spirit witnessing through Holy Scripture and Holy Sacrament. It is the direct and immediate contact of the Holy Spirit with the spirit of the believer—a contact which gives certainty. What can give certainty except divine evidence? What can assure our souls but divine authority? The Confession distinctly teaches that the Holy Spirit is present to the spirit of man with divine authority, and that presence is within the man, in his inmost being, his higher spiritual nature. Where is that presence if not in the forms of the Reason?

(*f*) There can be no true Liberty of Conscience unless the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority. The Confession states the great practical principle of Puritanism as follows:

"God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men which are in anything contrary to his word, or beside it in matters of faith or worship. So that to believe such doctrines, or to obey such commandments out of conscience is to betray true liberty of conscience; and the requiring an implicit faith, and an absolute and blind obedience, is to destroy liberty of conscience, and reason also" (XX. 2).

God is the Lord of the conscience. The conscience has no other Lord. The conscience is especially the place where God is Lord and through which He exercises His divine authority. Liberty of conscience is essential to true religious life and

activity. No "implicit faith" is required. No blind obedience is lawful. The Christian conscience refuses to close its eyes. It ever looks upward for authority divine, to enjoy the vision of God. Conscience refuses bondage, it is the free-born daughter of God. True religion appeals to the conscience, the faithful monitor of God within the breast. Let the conscience rule the man and God will rule him. Bind him to blind obedience, any external authority whatever, whether church or state, whether system of dogma or letter of Scripture, and you obstruct the dominion of God in the man. The conscience must remain free in order to healthful religious life. The Lord of the conscience must speak with divine authority through the conscience in order that the life may be a holy life. If the Lord of glory inhabit the conscience, make it His throne within the man, all its monitions will be divine. This is the ideal of liberty of conscience which every Christian should seek. You shatter this ideal for yourselves, if you say it is heresy to teach that the Reason—explaining Reason as the conscience—is a great fountain of divine authority.

(*g*) There can be no real communion with Christ, unless the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority. The Westminster Confession teaches:

> "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: and, being united to one another in love, they have communion in each other's gifts and graces; 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" (XXVI. 1).

The *bond between the saints is a bond of faith tied by the Holy Spirit.* The Church and the Bible often mediate between the appropriating faith and the bestowing Holy Spirit; but they do not take the place of either the Holy Spirit or of faith. Faith lays hold of Christ, the direct object of the soul's activities. Faith so unites to Christ as to give fellowship in the graces of Christ and in the life of Christ from His incarnation to His reign and second advent. This faith so unites with Christ that there is direct and immediate communion with Him. Christ with irresistible attraction draws faith to Him and faith rests on His breast. Where can faith and Christ

meet save in the Reason? Faith does not ascend to heaven. Christ descends from heaven. Christ presents Himself to faith as its appropriate object, as its source and inspiration, as the ground of its existence and its certainty. Christ imparts certainty to faith in this communion; where alone it can be imparted, in the forms of the Reason.

I called attention to the neglect of these chapters of our Confession by the traditional orthodoxy in my "Whither?" three years ago. I said: "We have gone over the eleven chapters that make up the central section of the Westminster Confession. We have seen a general neglect of these precious doctrines by the Traditional Orthodoxy. The current orthodoxism has fallen sadly short of the Westminster ideal. As it erred by excessive definition in the first eleven chapters, it has erred by a general failure in the second eleven chapters, so that the Presbyterian Church at the present time is at an angle with its Confession of Faith; and subscription to the Westminster system in the historic sense is out of the question" (p. 162). I am not surprised, therefore, that the prosecution seem so unconscious of the existence of these doctrines of our Confession, as to suppose that I am heretical because I subscribe to them and teach them in their historical meaning. These chapters *declare me innocent and convict the prosecution of heresy.*

(*g*) In addition to these seven chapters of our Confession, let me call your attention to two important statements with reference to the Reason in connection with the doctrine of Holy Scripture:

"The authority of the Holy Scriptures, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God, the author thereof" (I. 4).

"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" (I. 5).

These clauses of our Confession give the Reason a very important office in the use of Holy Scripture. Holy Scripture is in itself an external means of grace. It is necessary that the grace contained therein should in some way be communicated to the human soul. Its grace must be transferred from the written page and the speaking voice into the heart of man. By

the eye and the ear it approaches man. How shall it gain a lodgment in his mind and transform his heart? The Confession represents that only the Holy Spirit can accomplish this by His inward work in our hearts, that is, working in our consciences and in our religious feelings, in our reason. The Westminster Confession, therefore, in eight chapters teaches that the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority, and that there can be no impartation of the grace of God to men and no appropriation of the grace of God by men, unless this grace enters with divine authority into the forms of the Reason. You cannot deny this doctrine without destroying the great central doctrines of our Confession of Faith.

II.—Evidence from Holy Scripture

We have consumed so much time in our proofs from the Confession, that we hesitate to consume any more in the argument from Holy Scripture. And yet it seems necessary under present circumstances to give at least an outline of this argument.

There can be no doubt that the highest forms of prophecy under the Old Testament dispensation, and the New Testament as well, originated by the influence of the Holy Spirit speaking to holy men through the forms of their reason. If there is anything supernatural in Biblical prophecy, that prophecy, at least in a measure, must have originated from the direct contact of the divine Spirit with the human spirit. Even in the lower forms of prophecy, in the ecstatic state, when the man lies prostrate on the ground, or has his eyes closed and his senses shut to the external world, the divine Spirit gives the holy impulse, the insight, and the foresight, those great prophetic endowments which enable the prophet to declare the things of God. How much more is this the case in those holy writers who have given us the sacred Scriptures. Unless they were holy penmen with extraordinary prophetic gifts, with supernatural endowments communicated by divine authority speaking in the forms of the Reason, there is no basis for the divine authority of Scripture at all. The Confession recognizes this when it says:

"Therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry times and in divers manners, to reveal himself, and to declare that his will unto his church" (I. 1).

When therefore I say that "the Reason is historically a great fountain of divine authority," I am justified by the history of divine revelation until the close of the canon, whether the statement be true with regard to later times or not. On this account I claim that the first charge should be thrown out of court. But inasmuch as I claim that this divine authority in the forms of the Reason extends to the present age, as for example in the case of Martineau, I will at once proceed to set forth my Biblical authority for this opinion. Let me, however, say at once that I subscribe to this statement of the Confession: "These former ways of God's revealing his will unto his people being now ceased" (I. 1). Nothing has been added to the canon of Holy Scripture by divine revelation since the days of the apostles, and it seems altogether improbable that anything will be added in the future. The question is, therefore, whether there is any divine authority in the forms of the Reason for other purposes than formulating inspired writings for a canon of Holy Scripture.

We appeal to the statements of Holy Scripture respecting those outside the visible kingdom of God, and therefore excluded from contact with Holy Scripture and Church. What shall we say to the preaching of Paul?

"And he made of one every nation of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek God, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though he is not far from each one of us: for in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain even of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring" (Acts xvii. 26–28).

Do none of these offspring of God among the heathen feel after Him? Do those who feel fail to find Him? Do none of those, the root of whose being is in God, look to the root and become conscious of that fountain of life springing up within them? Or are these words of Paul a fancy, incapable of realization, a dream which finds no counterpart in the real heathen man?

What of the preaching of Peter?

"Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him" (Acts x. 34, 35).

Are there no God-fearing men among the nations who hold to the ethnic religions? Are there none who give alms and work righteousness? Was Peter mistaken? Does God really respect persons and reject a man because he was not born a Hebrew or because he was not educated in Christian lands? Was Cornelius the only illustration of this profound utterance? And was he accepted simply because he might have been a proselyte?

What of the preaching of Jesus?

"The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here. The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, a greater than Solomon is here" (Matt. xii. 41, 42).

If the proud Assyrians, the inhabitants of Nineveh, were not excluded from repentance and redemption because they had no Bible and were hostile to the kingdom of Israel, why should any other metropolis of the ethnic religions be excluded if they repent in accordance with the teaching they have? Is the Oriental queen the only potentate who has found God by wisdom outside the kingdom? True, the one heard the preaching of Jonah and the other the wisdom of Solomon. But there is no evidence that either of them accepted Holy Scripture or united with Holy Church.

We appeal to the promises of our Lord.

(1) The presence of Christ Himself is promised:

"Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. xviii. 20).

"Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 20).

"I will not leave you desolate: I come unto you. Yet a little while, and the world beholdeth me no more; but ye behold me: because I live, ye shall live also. In that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you. He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto

him. Judas (not Iscariot) saith unto him, Lord, what is to come to pass that thou will manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world? Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him" (John xiv. 18–24).

Jesus distinctly promises His own abiding presence with His people. If we have not so seen Christ and known Him, it is because we have not lived in accordance with the privileges of our religion.

(2) The presence of the Holy Spirit is promised:

"And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may be with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth: whom the world cannot receive; for it beholdeth him not, neither knoweth him: ye know him; for he abideth with you and shall be in you" (John xiv. 16–18).

"Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth: for he shall not speak from himself; but what things soever he shall hear, these shall he speak: and he shall declare unto you the things that are to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you" (John xvi. 13, 14).

If we have not the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, it is an evidence that we are feeble Christians.

Consider the teachings of the Epistles:

"Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are" (I. Cor. iii. 16, 17).

"Or know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have from God? and ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price: glorify God therefore in your body" (I. Cor. vi. 19, 20).

"For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake. Seeing it is God, that said, Light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (II. Cor. iv. 5, 6).

"For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father, from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named, that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, that ye may be strengthened with power through his Spirit in the inward man; that Christ may dwell in

your hearts through faith; to the end that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be strong to apprehend with all the saints what is the breadth and length and height and depth, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye may be filled unto all the fulness of God" (Ephesians iii. 14–19).

"If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is, seated on the right hand of God. Set your mind on the things that are above, not on the things that are upon the earth. For ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall be manifested, then shall ye also with him be manifested in glory" (Colossians iii. 1–4).

"And he that keepeth his commandments abideth in him, and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he gave us" (I. John iii. 24).

These are only specimens of a multitude of passages which distinctly teach that the Church as a body, and Christians as individual members of that body, have the presence of Christ, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and the power from God the Father with them, and that it is their privilege to recognize this divine presence and to live under the authority of God. Those therefore who deny that the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority overlook some of the most important passages of Holy Scripture, especially those which guide into the higher life of communion with the Triune God.

III.—The Testimony of Christian Experience

Let me call your attention to my motive for introducing the divine authority in the forms of the Reason into my Inaugural Address. If you will read the Inaugural with any degree of attention, you will see that my purpose was not to extol Rationalism or to magnify Martineau or to teach the salvation of the heathen; but as I distinctly said: "We have examined the Church and the Reason as seats of divine authority in an introduction to our theme, the authority of the Scriptures, because they open our eyes to see mistakes that are common to the three departments" (p. 28).

My subsequent use of the divine authority in the forms of the Reason was in order to show that the three seats of authority speak in harmony; and in order to point to their vast

importance for a higher Christian life. I said, and I reaffirm what I said: "The Reason also has its rights, its place and importance in the economy of Redemption. I rejoice at the age of Rationalism, with all its wonderful achievements in philosophy. I look upon it as preparing men to use their reasons in the last great age of the world. Criticism will go on with its destruction of errors and its verification of truth and fact. The human mind will learn to know its powers and to use them. The forms of the reason, the conscience, the religious feeling, the æsthetic taste—all the highest energies of our nature will exert themselves as never before. God will appear in their forms and give an inward assurance and certainty greater than that given in former ages. These increased powers of the human soul will enable men to search those higher mysteries of Biblical theology that no theologian has yet mastered, and those mysteries that are wrapped up in the institutions of the Church to all who really know them. It is impossible that the Bible and the Church should ever exert their full power until the human reason, trained and strained to the uttermost, rise to the heights of its energies and reach forth after God and His Christ with absolute devotion and self-renouncing love. Then we may expect on the heights of theological speculation, and from the peaks of Christian experience, that those profound doctrines that now divide Christendom by their antinomies will appear as the two sides of the same law, or the foci of a divine ellipse, which is itself but one of the curves in that conic section of God's dominion in which, in loving wisdom, He has appointed the lines of our destiny" (pp. 65, 66).

Consider for a moment. (*a*) What can you do in *private prayer* unless divine authority comes to you in the forms of the Reason? How can you fix your mind on God, how can you send forth a petition unto His ears, how can you expect an answer unless the soul reaches forth with all its powers in order to lay hold upon God? And where will you find Him? In the air? Can you ascend to Him? We speak of it in local relations, but we do not really ascend to heaven—God descends to us. He condescends to answer us by entering into us and taking possession of us by His almighty presence and power.

How can you know that your prayers have been heard? How can you know that they have been answered unless the divine Spirit gives you that knowledge through a fountain of divine authority bursting forth within you? I appeal to your Christian experience in private prayer. Are you not accustomed to turn away from the world and fix your attention on God in earnest pleas for help or glad thanksgiving? Have you not been assured as by a touch divine flashing the light you need to see the pathway of privilege and duty, determining you to pursue the right course and calming your feelings into a heavenly peace? No possible influence, of friendly counsel, or hostile threats, can stay or deflect the course of the man whom God has taught in prayer.

I cannot understand how any one who is accustomed to private prayer, and especially to ejaculatory prayer, and who endeavors to follow the guidance of God's Spirit in his daily life—I cannot understand how any such man could possibly consent to a denial of a fountain of divine authority within his own soul.

(*b*) Think also of your hours of religious meditation and private communion with God. Some of you, I doubt not, have enjoyed such hours when the world has vanished, Holy Church is forgotten, the Bible lies unnoticed, and nothing interposes between you and God. What heights of religious ecstasy, what raptures of heavenly bliss do those enjoy whose religious feelings thrill with the touch of the divine Spirit, whose conscience is alive with holy concepts, and whose religious imagination sees Jesus Christ in His wondrous grace and matchless beauty. Such heavenly places in Christ Jesus are open to us because Christ Jesus comes to us in accordance with His promise and enters the forms of the Reason, and fills all the avenues of the soul with fountain-streams of sweetest authority.

(*c*) How can Christian doctrine be rightly unfolded unless by a Christian speculation guided by the divine Spirit working within the Reason? There is speculative theology which is mere rationalizing—there is scholastic theology that is mere scholasticism. All such theology is a mere process of logical evolution, subject to the errors into which weak man is ever falling. But a true Christian theologian who would know the

truth of God must be willing to do the will of God. Faith cannot go far ahead of practice. Theology cannot outstrip life. Nothing is genuine in Christian theology which is not born of God's Spirit. How else shall the Christian theologian get the truth of God unless he be guided by the Holy Spirit into the truth? The Holy Spirit dwells in the Church and in the individual Christian for this purpose, giving divine authority and certainty of truth in the forms of the Reason. Thus the theologian grows in the divine doctrine. Thus the Church advances in its most holy faith.

I have shown you by indubitable evidence from Confession and from Scripture and from Christian experience that "there are historically three great fountains of divine authority, the Bible, the Church, and the Reason." It is an historical fact which cannot be gainsaid without closing the eyes to evidence which pervades history.

Early in our century a great revival movement took its rise in Oxford, and spread all over the Church of England and the churches which are her daughters. It was the Anglo-catholic revival, whose essential principle was the recognition of the divine authority in the Church. In the middle of our century another revival movement spread over the English-speaking world, having as its great principle the divine authority in the Bible. In the closing years of our century another great revival took its rise in the East of London and spread all over Christendom in the form of the Salvation Army. This Army is the antithesis of the Anglo-catholic movement because it is altogether unchurchly. It seeks immediate communion with God, divine authority within the soul by the baptism of Blood and Fire which come from the real presence of Christ and the all-pervading power of the indwelling Spirit.

I call these three great revival movements of our century to witness that divine authority comes to men through the three great fountains, the Bible, the Church, and the Reason. Every revival movement of the past witnesses a similar confession. Wherever there has been vital religion, wherever there have been holy men and women seeking after the living God, God has given them the assurance of His presence and authority, sometimes through the Church, sometimes through the Bible,

and sometimes through the Reason. We cannot deny this without shutting our eyes to history, or refusing to recognize in these revival movements anything but illusions and delusions of pious enthusiasts. I decline to recognize one form as genuine and refuse the others as delusions. I recognize them all, each in its place combining to accomplish the full work of grace in the world.

Convict me of heresy under Charge I. and you challenge the Christian centuries. All the ages will be against you and, in a multitude of voices like the roar of many waters, will denounce you as knowing neither the truth nor the power of God.

The Case of Martineau

I have shown you that the doctrine which I truly hold, that "the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority," is an important doctrine of Holy Scripture and of our Standards. I shall now show you that the inferences from this doctrine made by the prosecution in their charge are inferences for which they are exclusively responsible, and for which you cannot hold me responsible without a violation of the laws of process in our Church and without a violation of the laws of logic established by God in our minds.

It seems altogether probable that this clause is directed against what I said with reference to Martineau; for the only passage cited from my Inaugural which can in any way be tortured into sustaining it is the following:

"Martineau could not find divine authority in the Church or the Bible, but he did find God enthroned in his own soul. There are those who would refuse these rationalists a place in the company of the faithful. But they forget that the essential thing is to find God and divine certainty, and if these men have found God without the mediation of Church and Bible, Church and Bible are means and not ends; they are avenues to God, but are not God. We regret that these rationalists depreciate the means of grace so essential to most of us, but we are warned lest we commit a similar error, and depreciate the reason and the Christian consciousness" (Charge, p. 4).

I am glad that the prosecution omit Martineau's name from

the charge, and that therefore they make no such imputations against him as they made in Specification III. of the original first Charge, when they said: "such as James Martineau, who denies the doctrines of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection of the Body, the personality of the Holy Ghost, who rejects the miracles of the Bible and denies the truth of the Gospel narratives, as well as most of the theology of the Epistles." But they have introduced these imputations into their argument; and it appears that they use Martineau as a representative of "such men as reject the Scriptures as the authoritative proclamation of the will of God and reject also the way of salvation through the mediation and sacrifice of the Son of God as revealed therein;" for in no other possible way than by proving that Martineau does so reject the Scriptures and the Son of God, can they prove this section of their charge. I mentioned no other name than Martineau in connection with my doctrine of the Reason, and I certainly did not say that either Martineau as an individual or the rationalists as a class rejected Christ and the Scriptures. I am not responsible for anything I did not say in my Inaugural. I am not responsible for any opinions the prosecution may impute to Martineau.

If it be true that James Martineau denies so many doctrines which I hold dear, I greatly regret it. I have not learned from his writings that he was so sweeping in his denials as the prosecution allege. The prosecution certainly present no proof of it. But it makes no difference to this court whether the prosecution are right or wrong in their charges against Martineau. These have nothing whatever to do with the case. We are all of us shocked at times by his utterances. I am as strongly opposed to his speculative errors as any of you. I am not a sponsor for his orthodoxy. He is not a party in this case. He is beyond the reach of these prosecutors. He is a member of a Presbytery in Ireland. They should confine themselves to the offences of Dr. Briggs, whom they are able to reach through the circumstance that they are fortunate enough to be members of the Presbytery of New York. But here as elsewhere the offence is one in the imagination of the prosecution, for which they have no justification in the Inaugural Address. I have nowhere said that Holy Scripture is "not sufficient to give that

knowledge of God and of His will, which is necessary unto salvation." I said that "Martineau did not find divine authority in the Church or the Bible, but he did find God enthroned in his own soul." Holy Scripture is sufficient to give saving knowledge even when men do not find it. It is sufficient for all men—for the entire world. But all men do not in fact gain this saving knowledge from the Bible. I did not say whether Martineau gained saving knowledge from the Bible or not. That was not the question before me in the Inaugural. I was considering the question of religious certainty, the fountains of divine authority. I did not say that Martineau rejected the way of salvation revealed in the Bible, but I said Martineau could not find certainty of divine authority in the Church or the Bible. He says he did not and could not. We have no right to doubt him or dispute him in this statement of his experience. The only question which was raised by me was, whether he did find God "enthroned in his own soul." That is a question of fact. I did not raise the question whether a man who rejects the way of salvation revealed in the Scripture may find God enthroned in his own soul. I did not consider that question in the Inaugural. I decline to consider it now. I insist that this court shall confine itself to the questions raised in my Inaugural and not rove over the field of theology generally, under the guidance of this erratic committee. I have shown that Scripture, history, Confession, and experience prove that there are those who find God enthroned within their own souls. The question is whether Martineau was such a person. I have said that he was such a person. It is possible I may be mistaken in this question of fact. But such a mistake is no heresy unless I am a heretic under the general charge that "the Reason is a great fountain of divine authority." If I am in error about Martineau, the example used by me was a bad one. A bad example may discredit a proposition, but it does not disprove it. If my opinion of Martineau errs at all, it is on the side of Christian love which covers over a multitude of sins. The prosecution run great risks of trenching on Christian love, if they venture to assert that Martineau is mistaken when he claims to have found God enthroned in his own soul. Listen to his words:

"Divine guidance has never and nowhere failed to men; nor has it ever, in the most essential things, largely differed amongst them, but it has not always been recognized as divine, much less as the living contact of Spirit with spirit—the communion of affection between God and man. While conscience remained an *impersonal law*, stern and silent, with only a jealous Nemesis behind, man had to stand up alone, and work out for himself his independent magnanimity; and he could only be the pagan hero. When conscience was found to be inseparably blended with the Holy Spirit, and to speak in tones immediately divine, it became the very shrine of worship—its strife, its repentance, its aspirations, passed into the incidents of a living drama, with its crises of alienation and reconcilement; and the cold obedience to a mysterious necessity was exchanged for the *allegiance of personal affection*. And this is the true emergence from the darkness of ethical law to the tender light of the life divine. The veil falls from the shadowed face of moral authority, and the directing love of the all-holy God shines forth" (Martineau's "Seat of Authority in Religion," p. 75).

Some of you may stand on the lower legal stage of the Christian religion and so deny the religious experience of a man who can say such things. I cannot do so and I refuse to do so. It is plain to me that Martineau has gained *a higher stage of Christian freedom and direct communion with God, and it is immaterial how he gained it.*

IV

THE CHURCH

I DECLARED in the Inaugural that "*The Church is a great fountain of divine authority.*" I make the same declaration in your presence at this time. I shall show you that this declaration is not contrary to Holy Scripture and the Westminster Standards, but on the other hand that it is so important a doctrine of the Holy Scripture and the Standards that to deny it would be heresy.

I have already tested under the first charge the nine passages of Scripture cited by the prosecution under both the first and the second charges, and I have shown that there is no relevancy in them to either charge.

I have also considered the several passages of the Westminster Standard which are also the same under both charges, and

have shown that they do not teach that Holy Scripture is the sole fountain of divine authority; and that they leave room for the Reason as a fountain of divine authority. It seems unnecessary for me to review them again and show that they also leave room for the Church as a fountain of divine authority. I shall use my time therefore in the positive argument from Confession and Holy Scripture in support of my thesis. The prosecution claim that the doctrine that the Church is a fountain of divine authority is contrary to the doctrines that the Holy Scripture is most necessary, and the rule of faith and practice. It is difficult to understand how any intelligent man *can leap the gulf between these two propositions;* or how any Churchman, Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic, Anglican, Lutheran, Presbyterian, or Congregationalist can deny that divine authority speaks and acts through the Church. If an ancient Puritan or a Westminster divine could descend from Paradise into this Presbytery to-day, he would be filled with astonishment that a Presbytery of a Church that calls itself Presbyterian could have so far abandoned the faith of the Puritan fathers, as to permit the prosecution to charge a minister with heresy for maintaining that there is divine authority in the Church. I am well aware, as was stated in the book "Whither?" that modern Presbyterians have departed far away from the Westminster doctrine of the Church and the sacraments; but who could have imagined that a man would be charged with heresy for holding to the Westminster doctrine and maintaining it against the errors of modern dogmaticians? It is significant that the Westminster Confession gives seven chapters (XXV.–XXI.) upon the doctrine of the Church and the sacraments, doctrines as essential and necessary to the system of doctrine taught in the Westminster Confession as the doctrine of Holy Scripture contained in the first chapter. The prosecution do not cite against me a single sentence from these seven chapters when they charge me with error in teaching that the Church is a fountain of divine authority. If this be an error, it touches the doctrine of the Church as well as the doctrine of Holy Scripture, and one would expect to find something in these seven chapters that would give the Westminster decision of this most important question. To these chapters I sincerely sub-

scribe, and I challenge the sincerity of the subscription to these chapters of any man who denies that the Church is a fountain of divine authority. I shall take the liberty of citing these chapters to give their testimony in the case, and it will be found that their testimony is in unmistakable terms against the prosecutors.

The Westminster Confession teaches clearly that the Church is a great fountain of divine authority (*a*):

"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. 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 the 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" (C. F., Chap. XXX. 1, 2).

I know that there is an overture from the General Assembly proposing to weaken the force of this chapter by inserting a qualifying clause, but this clause will not do away with the doctrine—it simply shows that the Revision Committee of our branch of the Presbyterian Church has in a measure receded from the high ground maintained in the seventeenth century. But in any case this section teaches that church officers have the divine authority of Jesus Christ in their government of the Church and in their use of the power of the keys. This authority does not make them infallible, but it does make them ministers of Jesus Christ with authority to rule as His agents.

Unless the members of this court have been called to their office by the authority of Jesus Christ, speaking to them first in their own reasons in the internal call and then through the authority of the Church in the external call of ordination, this court is no court of Jesus Christ, no church organization, whatever else it may be. Unless Jesus Christ has committed to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, you have no authority whatever to exercise ecclesiastical discipline. You are usurping the crown rights of Jesus Christ, which He has given only to His church, if you with one voice assert the authority of the Church and with the other prosecute me for heresy for asserting the divine authority of the Church. There is no need of *a*

heresy trial on this question. If this Presbytery is ready to declare that the Presbyterian Church has no divine authority, I will at once renounce your jurisdiction. I would refuse to fellowship as an ordained minister with a body of ministers claiming to be ordained and yet denying that they had any divine authority to exercise their ministry. I would seek the fellowship of a Church that is conscious of a divine authority in its ministry, in its sacraments, and in its ordinances.

(*b*) The Westminster Confession further teaches that

"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, 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. Unto the 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" (C. F., Chap. XXV. 2, 3).

This passage clearly shows that the visible Church is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ; that He hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God unto it; and "doth by His own presence and Spirit make them effectual." If the Presbytery is not a court of the Kingdom of Christ erected by divine authority; if you have not been given the ordinances by Jesus Christ to administer in His name; if Jesus Christ and His Spirit are not present in the midst of you—then you are no part of the Church of Jesus Christ at all. I do not think that any considerable number of you hold such heretical views. But whatever this court may conclude, I declare that the statement of the Confession is a true statement. There is divine authority in the Church; it is Christ's kingdom, He reigns over it, He inhabits it by His Spirit, He makes its institutions efficacious, He grants access to Himself through His Church. Our Presbyterian fathers rejoiced in such access. Their descendants enjoy this unspeakable privilege. Are we to be robbed of our birthright? Are you ready to banish from the official doctrine of the Presbyterian Church the witnessing Spirit, the indwelling Christ, the living God, in order to incase the

Holy Trinity in the covers of a book? Shall we destroy the Church in order to exalt the Bible?

(*c*) The Larger Catechism defines a sacrament as follows:

"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; to strengthen and increase their faith and all other graces; to oblige them to obedience; to testify and cherish their love and communion one with another, and to distinguish them from those that are without" (Question 162).

The sacraments which we are constantly enjoying in our churches, being instituted by Christ, must have divine authority. Whenever we use them, the authority of God is impressed upon us by the words of institution and the prayer of consecration. They are not mere ceremonies established by divine authority. They are means of grace, they give something of immense value to us. They signify, seal, and exhibit the benefits of Christ's mediation. There is divine authority in this signifying, sealing, and exhibiting. There is no less authority in what the sacraments set forth than in what Holy Scripture sets forth. They "strengthen and increase faith and all other graces." How can they do this unless divine authority imparts that strength and increase?

The Shorter Catechism thus describes the efficacy of a sacrament:

"The sacraments become effectual means of salvation, not from any virtue in them, or in him that doth administer them; but only by the blessing of Christ, and the working of his Spirit in them that by faith receive them" (Question 91).

If the efficacy of a sacrament depends upon the working of the Holy Spirit, then the Holy Spirit must be in touch with the believer in the sacrament, and if He is in touch with the believer, God is in touch with him, and there is divine authority imparted in the presence and power of the Holy Spirit.

The Larger Catechism tells us how we feed upon the body and blood of Christ:

"As the body and blood of Christ are not corporally or carnally present in, with, or under the bread and wine in the Lord's supper: and yet are spiritually present to the faith of the receiver, no less truly and really

than the elements themselves are to their outward senses; 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 or 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" (Question 170).

This passage teaches the real presence of Christ to the soul of the believer, and that the believer may have and often does have a consciousness of the sacred presence while the spirit of Christ communes with his spirit. If our Lord is really present to us in the Lord's Supper, is not divine authority present with us in Him? and if divine authority is present in Him are not all of the spiritual benefits thus received of divine authority, and do they not come with certainty to our souls? The Holy Supper is often more potent than Holy Scripture in the impartation of divine authority and certainty. It is thus rightly named a sealing ordinance. You cannot deny that there is divine authority in the Church without denying the presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, without robbing the sacraments of their historic value to the Christian world. I appeal to your religious experience in the communion hour. Have we not enjoyed fellowship with our divine Master at the Lord's table? Have not our religious emotions been quickened by a power divine? Have we not felt in our inmost being the divine touch? Have we not seen the Lord with eyes of faith and holy love? Listen to the testimony of prophet and sage, of evangelist and apostle, of martyr and saint, of theologian and reformer, of holy men and women in all ages, an innumerable company, whose voices flow down the ages, from all churches, from all lands, and in every language and tongue, through every variety of liturgy and ceremony and rite:

O Christ, Saviour divine! we testify to Thy gracious presence, Thy sweet authority, Thy heavenly gifts of comfort and of joy, in the sacrament of Thy love.

(*d*) I ask your attention to the first section of the Book of Discipline:

"Discipline is the exercise of that authority, and the application of that system of laws, which the Lord Jesus Christ has appointed in his Church: embracing the care and control, maintained by the Church, over its members, officers, and judicatories."

This section distinctly says that Jesus Christ has appointed in His Church authority to exercise discipline, and makes the statement that discipline is the exercise of that authority. The Directory of Discipline is the authority under which you are now acting at the present time. If you renounce the doctrine of the first section of the Discipline of our Church, you vitiate any process, even if it be conducted in strict accordance with every other section. If you adhere to the doctrine of this section, you must bring the case to a close so far as this charge is concerned.

The Book of Discipline claims that there is divine authority in the Presbyterian Church to exercise discipline. It does not tolerate a specification of heresy which contravenes its fundamental principle. It rules the prosecutors out of court for using the powers of the Book of Discipline to overthrow the fundamental principle of the Book of Discipline. These prosecutors deny the authority of the Church to do the very thing they request the Church to do.

The Church is a great fountain of divine authority according to the Standards of the Presbyterian Church. There is no inconsistency between the first chapter of our Confession which teaches that the Holy Scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the seven chapters of the Confession which set forth the divine authority which there is in the Church. Holy Church, like Holy Scripture, is an ordinance of God, a means of grace, a channel of divine influence, an instrument of salvation, a fountain of holy authority. As divine authority speaks to us in holy psalmist and holy prophet, in holy sage and holy historian, in holy evangelist and holy apostle and holy seer in manifold ways and divers manners, yet blending in holy harmony; so divine authority speaks to us through Holy Church in all the forms of divine worship, in sacred praise, in public prayer, in the solemn reading of the divine Word and in the preaching of the Gospel.

Have you not felt the thrill of the divine touch, the ecstasy of the divine presence, and the rest of submission to and acquiescence in the divine authority impressing itself with irresistible weight and conviction of certainty when assembled with God's people in public worship? Why do Christians resort to

Holy Church if it be not for the regenerating, cleansing, sanctifying, and comforting influences of the divine Spirit which pervade a living Church and an assembly of living Christians? It is because the enthroned Christ is really present with His assembled people. The Holy Spirit broods over them with divine energy, and divine authority flows forth from the fountain of the Church in a thousand quickening rills.

The Church is not an *infallible rule of faith.* I do not recognize an *infallible pope.* I do not recognize an *infallible episcopacy;* still less do I recognize an *infallible General Assembly.* It became clear when the presbyters overthrew the bishops in the 17th century that presbyter might be only "priest writ large," and the history of Presbyterianism has shown that presbyter bishops may be guilty of more extensive despotism than diocesan bishops. Our Confession truly says:

"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" (XXXI. 3).

The Church has no divine authority in itself—apart from God. Its divine authority is in that its chief institutions were divinely appointed, and that these divinely appointed institutions are the ordinary channels of the divine grace. The Church is a fountain of divine authority. The divine authority flows forth from God Himself, as the sole original fountain-head and ultimate source, through the fountain of the Church, and distributes its healing and life-giving streams through all its ministries.

Possibly I may engage in a work of supererogation by citing passages from Holy Scripture in evidence of the divine authority that Christ imparts to His Church, and yet there are some minds that are so blinded by prejudice that I might be charged with disregarding Holy Scripture if I failed to use it. The divine authority of the sacraments and the ministry may be proved from the words of our Saviour:

"And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever

thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matthew xvi. 18, 19).

"And Jesus came to them and spake unto them, saying, All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world" (Matthew xxviii. 18-20).

"And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it; and he gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins" (Matthew xxvi. 26-28).

No one can interpret these words in any legitimate way without finding in them the divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the two sacraments.

Paul teaches the same doctrine:

"For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, how that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come" (I. Cor. xi. 23-26).

"And he gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ: till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. iv. 11-13).

"For even as we have many members in one body, and all the members have not the same office: so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another. And having gifts differing according to the grace that was given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of our faith; or ministry, let us give ourselves to our ministry; or he that teacheth, to his teaching; or he that exhorteth, to his exhorting: he that giveth, let him do it with liberality; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness" (Romans xii. 4-8.)

These passages are only specimens of a large number which show conclusively that according to Holy Scripture the Church is a divine institution, pervaded by divine grace, and flowing

with divine authority in a myriad rills to quicken and enrich the people of God. If this court could go so far astray from the Bible and the Confession as to convict me of heresy for asserting that the Church is a great fountain of divine authority, you would do me *a very great honor*. But that honor would be embittered by *the disgrace of a Church which I love*.

The Case of Newman

I have shown you who the true heretics are, as regards the main item of the charge. It is now necessary for me to test the invalid inference attributed to me. The charge is that I teach that "the Church is a fountain of divine authority, *which apart from the Holy Scripture, may and does savingly enlighten men*."

It is difficult for me to understand what the prosecution mean by "apart from Holy Scripture may and does savingly enlighten men." I turn to Specification II. of the original Charge, for light. It reads as follows:

"Dr. Briggs affirms that, in the case of some, the Holy Scriptures are not sufficient to give that knowledge of God and His will, which is necessary unto salvation, even though they strive never so hard; and that such persons, setting aside the supreme authority of the Word of God, can obtain that saving knowledge of Him through the Church."

I understand, therefore, that "apart from" is a milder form of "setting aside the supreme authority of the Word of God." Three passages from my Inaugural Address are cited as proof. But they do not prove it. The charge imputes to me what I have never taught either directly or indirectly. This explanation is sufficient according to law to compel you to vote me guiltless, and I might simply rest my case upon it. But I prefer to explain my statement and show you how the prosecution pervert it. The citation from the Inaugural and the use made of it in their argument show that the prosecution have the late Cardinal Newman in mind. He was my sole illustration under the head. If they fail in this illustration, they have no other.

(*a*) I said that Newman could not reach certainty through the Bible or the Reason. I did not say that he did not obtain

the saving knowledge of God through the Bible, or that the Church savingly enlightened him apart from the Bible. I used him as a modern example of one who found the Church a great fountain of divine authority. Nothing whatever was said of the sufficiency or insufficiency of Holy Scripture, or of saving enlightenment from any source whatever. Newman never denied the sufficiency of Holy Scripture to give that knowledge of God and His will which is necessary unto salvation, or to savingly enlighten men; and I never have denied it. The prosecution make no difference between saving enlightenment and certainty. There is a great difference between them. If they had known the 18th chapter of our Confession, they could never have made such a blunder. Religious certainty is not necessary to salvation. Saving enlightenment, the knowledge sufficient unto salvation, according to Calvinistic principles does not bear certainty with it. As the Confession says:

"This infallible assurance doth not so belong to the essence of faith, but that a true believer may wait long, and conflict with many difficulties before he be partaker of it: yet, being enabled by the Spirit to know the things which are freely given him of God, he may, without extraordinary revelation, in the right use of ordinary means, attain thereunto. And therefore it is the duty of every one to give all diligence to make his calling and election sure; 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: so far is it from inclining men to looseness" (XVIII. 3).

"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: 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, and by the which, in the mean time, they are supported from utter despair" (XVIII. 4).

Simple faith contains knowledge sufficient unto salvation, but only a faith which is grown to be strong, clear-eyed, and fruitful has infallible assurance or certainty of salvation. I said

that Newman did not get this certainty through the Bible and the Reason, but that he did get it through the Church. The prosecution seem to ignore this certainty. They say nothing about it. It seems incredible that they should ignore the difference between saving enlightenment and certainty. They could not say that "certainty of salvation can come only through Holy Scripture"? The Confession so clearly teaches the reverse of it and Christian experience confirms the Confession. It is sufficient to refer to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The Confession says that Christ is " as really, but spiritually present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses" (XXIX. 7).

If this be a true statement, religious certainty is communicated to the faith of believers by the really present Christ. The Lord's Supper is a confirming and sealing ordinance.

But if any one should say Newman did not find certainty in the sacrament, let him consider the further statement of the Confession:

"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" (XXV. 3).

If Christ "doth by His own presence and Spirit, according to His promise, make the ministry and the ordinances of God committed to the Church effectual for the gathering and perfecting of the saints," does He not give religious certainty through the Church? He might *gather* the saints by simply giving them a saving enlightenment, or a knowledge of God sufficient unto salvation; but He could not *perfect* the saints unless He gave them also certainty, the assurance of grace and salvation. What I said about Newman is therefore strictly in accordance with the Confession.

The Case of Spurgeon

The prosecution use the passage from the Inaugural referring to Spurgeon, under both charges. They *harp upon it*

in their argument to excite prejudice against me. What I said about Spurgeon may not be pleasing to the prosecution. It may be very distasteful to many members of the Presbytery. But is it not strictly true? Is it not a fact that Spurgeon is an example of the modern evangelical? Did he not assail the Church and the Reason in the interest of the authority of Holy Scripture? These are well-known weaknesses of the great preacher. But he had so many excellent Christian qualities that the world pardons his weakness in the matters referred to and honors him as the noblest evangelical of them all. It may seem strange to some of you that "the average opinion of the Christian world would not assign him a higher place in the kingdom of God than Martineau or Newman." But a little reflection ought to convince you that it is so. Spurgeon is the hero of the Evangelical party in the Church. He was generally esteemed to be the greatest preacher of the gospel in our generation. His sermons have been of incalculable benefit to multitudes. I yield to none in admiration of Spurgeon as a master of sacred eloquence. But any one who understands the state of religious opinion in England knows that Spurgeon only represented a party among the Non-conformists, and that a considerable proportion of them would not assign him a higher place than Martineau or Newman. He lived to find himself in a hopeless minority in his own denomination and to separate from the mass of the Non-conformists, whom he accused of being on the "down grade." He was not a master of Christian theology, and, therefore, so soon as he went out of his sphere to teach men wiser than himself he made a sad failure among those who were nearest to him in denominational affinities. In the average opinion of the Church of England, Spurgeon would certainly assume the lowest place of the three. Among Roman Catholics, the world over, Newman would have the pre-eminence. Among German Protestants, Martineau would hold the highest rank. In North America, without doubt, Spurgeon is in greatest estimation. I did not assign Spurgeon a lower place than Newman or Martineau. I did not say that in the opinion of the Christian world he would take the lowest place of the three. I did not give the average opinion of the United States, or of Non-conforming England, or of Presbyterian Scot-

land, or of Ulster, or of the Evangelical party; but I said correctly: "The average opinion of the Christian world would not assign him a higher place in the kingdom of God than Martineau or Newman." But suppose I made a mistake in statistics, and my opinion is wide of the facts, is such a mistake heresy? Am I responsible for the facts? Am I to blame if Spurgeon in public estimation shares the throne with Martineau and Newman? Is it any merit of mine if he be exalted above them? Can I change the facts by my statements about them? Where do they find in Holy Scripture the authority for exalting Spurgeon above Martineau and Newman? Where do they find in the Westminster Confession that the modern Evangelical is the most favored of the children of God? Possibly the prosecution by some cabalistic art or jugglery of exegesis may surprise us by such evidence; but they were bound to present such extraordinary facts in order that we might give them due consideration and deliberate answer. Their proofs do not exclude Newman from the kingdom of God. They do not put him beneath the feet of Spurgeon.

As Christian ministers I ask you, ought we not to estimate these three representative Christians of our time with Christian love? And is it not Christian love to say, we refuse to determine which of them has the highest place in the kingdom of God? We recognize each as a prophet to our generation. We see in each a man who has enjoyed the light of the divine countenance and who has reflected in his life and character the graces of a child of God.

I asked the question in the Inaugural, and I ask it again of this court, whether in view of all the facts adduced, "may we not conclude, on the whole, that these three representative Christians of our time have, each in his own way, found God and rested on divine authority?" Let each juror answer this question for himself. You must answer it in your verdict. You must either say with me, "Yes, we may conclude that Spurgeon, Newman, and Martineau have rested on divine authority;" or you must say with the prosecution, "No! Spurgeon found God in the Bible, but Newman did not find God in the Church, and Martineau did not find God in the Reason. They were mistaken in their religious experience. They were without God

and without divine authority for their faith and life." You cannot evade the issue. Your verdict will be interpreted by the Christian world as a yes or no to the question. *I rejoice in this issue. Again I say, Yes;* and I would deliberately choose the company for time and for eternity of Martineau and Newman rather than of such loveless persons as would cast them out of the congregation of the faithful.

Co-ordinating the Fountains

I said in the Inaugural that "Men are influenced by their temperaments and environments which of the three ways of access to God they may pursue." This was made the ground of a distinct specification under the original 1st Charge. The sentence is cited among the extracts in the specification, and may therefore be regarded as one of my declarations which is offered as contrary to essential doctrine. It will explain my meaning over against misrepresentations of it which were made in specification of the original first charge and in the argument of the prosecution.

I did not say that men were determined by their environments, but influenced by their environments. No man ever came to God without the prevenient call of God's Spirit. No one ever found God in the Reason until God Himself entered into the Reason to make Himself known there. No one ever found God in the Bible until the Holy Spirit pointed the way. No one ever found God in the Church, until Christ's touch opened his eyes. Men are indeed influenced by their temperaments and environments. That is a matter of common experience. All are not Churchmen; all are not Evangelicals; all are not Rationalists. But all may be Christians, using each one the avenue of religion most familiar to him and most suited to him. But in any case it is the divine Spirit who determines when, and where, and how the effectual call shall be made; and when, and where, and how the transforming grace shall be imparted and the infallible assurance of faith bestowed.

It is said that I am co-ordinating the Bible, the Church, and the Reason. The prosecution did not put this in their charge. But they have put it into the minds of some of this court in their argument and it may influence your decision.

I call attention to the fact that I have denied more than once that I co-ordinated the three fountains of divine authority. I denied it in the Appendix to the second edition of my Inaugural as follows: "I did not say, and I did not give any one the right to infer from anything whatever in the Inaugural Address, or in any of my writings, that I co-ordinated the Bible, the Church, and the Reason" (p. 85).

I denied it again in my lectures on "The Bible, the Church, and the Reason," where I said: "The Churchmen have exalted the Church above the Bible and the Reason. The Rationalists have exalted the Reason above the Bible and the Church. The Evangelical party have exalted the Bible above the Church and the Reason; but no party, so far as we know, has made Bible, Church, and Reason co-ordinate, that is, on the same level, in the same order, of equal, independent authority" (p. 63).

And again: "The only persons so far as I know, who have ever thought of co-ordinating the Bible, the Church, and the Reason as fountains of divine authority, are some recent controversialists who impute to others their own misconceptions, or who, after the manner of scholastic logicians, invent imaginary opponents in order to show their dialectic skill in destroying them" (p. 210).

You cannot constrain me to accept the inferences of others. You must in law accept my explanations. When I say, "The Bible, the Church, and the Reason are historically three great fountains of divine authority," can you rightly infer that I co-ordinate the three? How about the apostle John in the 1st epistle, v. 8, 9, when he says:

> "For there are three who bear witness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and the three agree in one. If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for the witness of God is this, that he hath borne witness concerning his Son."

Are the Spirit, the water, and the blood co-ordinate witnesses? Listen to Bishop Westcott.

Westcott argues that the water and the blood refer not only to the baptism of Christ and the atoning blood of Christ on the cross, but to the two sacraments: "Just as the Spirit is found to be personal in His work with men, so also the water and the blood speak personally through those in whom their efficacy

is realized. The participle expresses the actual delivery of the witness, and this as a present, continuous action. The witness here is considered manifestly as the living witness of the Church and not as the historic witness of the gospels. Through believers these three, 'the Spirit, and the water, and the blood,' perform a work not for believers only, but for the world (John xvii. 20 f)." "The threefold witness of which St. John has spoken, simply as being threefold, satisfies the conditions of human testimony. Much more then, he argues, does a threefold divine witness meet all claims; and such a witness it is implied we have in the witness of the Spirit, the water, and the blood. This witness therefore is 'greater' than the witness of men in regard to its authority."

Here we have three witnesses giving divine testimony to our Saviour, without any reference to Holy Scripture: two of them the sacraments, and therefore necessarily the Church, one of them the divine Spirit. This passage not only shows that there can be three witnesses speaking with divine authority and yet not co-ordinate; but it also shows that the two sacraments of the Church bear in them and with them divine authority. This Presbytery will hardly undertake to declare Bishop Westcott a heretic, especially when Luther and so many of the Fathers are at his back.

I have now gone over the four specifications of the two charges, which represent that the doctrine that there are three great fountains of divine authority, the Bible, the Church, and the Reason, is irreconcilable with essential and necessary doctrines of the Confession and of Holy Scripture. If they are inconsistent doctrines, then I am indeed excluded from orthodoxy in the Presbyterian Church. If they are not inconsistent, I am not heterodox in this particular. I have given you my explanations and my evidence. It is for you to give the verdict in the fear of God and subject to the review of the superior courts of the Church. Above them all stands the supreme court of heaven, the tribunal of Jesus Christ, the only King and Head of His Church.

High over high is watching.
And the Highest over them.

In the divine presence I challenge you to make a righteous verdict.

V

THE INERRANCY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

CHARGE III. is as follows:

"The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., being a Minister of the said Church and a member of the Presbytery of New York, with teaching that errors may have existed in the original text of the Holy Scripture, as it came from its authors, which is contrary to the essential doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures and in the Standards of the said Church, that the Holy Scripture is the Word of God written, immediately inspired, and the rule of faith and practice."

I shall analyze this Charge as I did the previous two. (1) The Charge alleges three offences. It alleges that the doctrine taught by me is contrary to these three essential doctrines—(*a*) that Holy Scripture is the Word of God written; (*b*) that Holy Scripture is immediately inspired; and (*c*) that Holy Scripture is the rule of faith and practice.

(2) It is alleged that I teach "that errors may have existed in the original text of the Holy Scripture, as it came from its authors." This statement of my doctrine I can admit as fairly accurate. But when we look at the specification, notice that it consists of a long extract from the Inaugural Address. You should bear in mind that the only proper use of this extract is to prove the doctrine attributed to me in the Charge, which doctrine I admit. You have no right to use it to impute to me any other objectionable doctrine. You have no right to vote me guilty on the ground of any other objection to my words than that stated in the Charge. This is all the more important in view of the irrelevant passages of Scripture cited to sustain the Charge, which may be interpreted by you in a sense different from the true sense. You have no right to vote me guilty on the basis of these passages. You can consider nothing but my doctrine as stated in the Charge and determine whether that is contrary or not contrary to the essential doctrines named in the Charge.

(3) The only question which need concern us, therefore, is

whether my doctrine is contrary to any one, or any two, or all three of the essential doctrines of the Confession stated in the Charge. Doubtless the prosecution think that there is contradiction here; and it may be that a majority of this Presbytery think so. You may agree with a recent opinion that "*a proved error in Scripture contradicts not only our doctrine, but the Scripture's claims, and therefore its inspiration in making those claims.*"

But those who uttered these words had no authority to make dogma for the Presbyterian Church. Their opinion is worth no more than that of other theologians of equal rank. It is worth much less than the authority of the much greater and more widely honored divines whose names are given in my volume on "The Bible, the Church, and the Reason," as holding to errors in Holy Scripture (pp. 215–235).

You may cite the deliverance of the last General Assembly against me:

"The General Assembly would remind all under its care that it is a fundamental doctrine that the Old and New Testaments are the inspired and infallible Word of God. Our Church holds that the inspired Word, as it came from God, is without error. The assertion of the contrary cannot but shake the confidence of the people in the sacred Books. All who enter office in our Church solemnly profess to receive them as the only infallible rule of faith and practice. If they change their belief on this point Christian honor demands that they should withdraw from our ministry. They have no right to use the pulpit or the chair of the professor for the dissemination of their errors until they are dealt with by the slow process of discipline. But if any do so act, their Presbyteries should speedily interpose, and deal with them for violation of ordination vows. The vow taken at the beginning is obligatory until the party taking it is honorably and properly released. The General Assembly enjoins upon all ministers, elders, and Presbyteries, to be faithful to the duty here imposed" (Minutes, pp. 179, 180).

In response to this deliverance of the last General Assembly, I beg leave to say: (*a*) The General Assembly when it makes a deliverance gives the opinion of all those who may be present and who may consent to it. Such deliverance has no more weight than the names of such persons can give it. It does not bind the minority, still less those who were absent when the vote was taken. (*b*) The General Assembly has no authority under the constitution to make dogma by deliverance. (*c*) The General

Assembly has no authority under the constitution to give an interpretation of the doctrine of the Church by deliverance, and impose such interpretation upon the Presbyteries and the ministry. (*d*) It was a gross breach of propriety and a flagrant violation of right for the General Assembly to attempt to decide a case by deliverance which it had a few hours previous directed to be approached by judicial process. (*e*) The ordination vow is just as binding on the General Assembly which imposes it as it is upon the minister who takes it. The General Assembly ought not to take the initiative in such a violation of obligation. (*f*) If the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America should ever decide in a judicial case in accordance with said deliverance, no self-respecting Biblical scholar could for a moment remain in that branch of the Presbyterian Church. He would need no reminder, still less a process of discipline, to induce him to withdraw and connect himself with a Church that was true to its constitution and its history.

I have put in evidence, and have asked you, in order to save valuable time, to read instead of reading them myself, all those extracts given in "The Bible, the Church, and the Reason," on pages 215–235; from Origen, Jerome, and Augustine, among the Fathers; from Luther and Calvin, among the Reformers; from Baxter and Rutherford among the Presbyterians of the 17th century; from Van Oosterzee of the Reformed Church of Holland; from Marcus Dods, A. B. Bruce, James Iverach, professors of the Free Church of Scotland; from A. H. Charteris, moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland; from the Anglicans, Sanday and Gore of Oxford and Plummer of Durham; from Prof. Beet of the English Wesleyans; from Alfred Cave of the English Independents; from our American scholars, Thayer, W. R. Huntington, Apple, Fisher, Vincent, and Fairchild.

These citations might be increased to an enormous extent. It would not take a scholar long to decide between the authority of the members of the General Assembly at Portland and the authority of these Fathers, Reformers, Puritans, and modern divines, who have given such emphatic statements of their opinion.

The court will see the great difficulty of the task now imposed upon me in view of this deliverance of the General Assembly.

And yet I do not hesitate to undertake it in the fear of God and with a firm conviction that I can show you that the General Assembly at Portland by this deliverance violated the constitution of our Church and promulgated doctrine which is not authorized by Scripture or our Standards. Your attention is again called to the principle established in the introduction to my defence. I showed you that it was not sufficient that a doctrine should be essential and necessary in your opinion. It must be essential and necessary to the Westminster system. It is not enough that you, or certain dogmatic teachers, or the General Assembly by a majority vote, should declare a certain doctrine to be inconsistent with an essential doctrine of the Westminster Confession. It must be shown that it is really inconsistent with the Westminster system itself. You cannot insist that your deductions and reasonings should be accepted by me, if I hold the opinion that your reasonings and deductions are false. If I can hold the two doctrines without regarding them as inconsistent, you cannot make them inconsistent to me. You may exact of me that I shall be faithful to the doctrine of the true and full inspiration of the Word of God written. But you cannot exact of me that I shall say there are no errors in Holy Scripture, for the reason that the Confession does not assert this and I am not bound to your views of consistency or inconsistency—but only to the Confession and to my own judgment. If the prosecution had claimed and had tried to prove that the Confession teaches as an essential doctrine attested by Holy Scripture that there are no errors in Holy Scripture, then it would have been easy to test every such citation and show that no such teaching can be found. In that they propose this doctrine as a consequence of the statements of the Confession as to the "Word of God written" and that the "Holy Scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice," they rest their case upon the logical consequences of Confessional statements, instead of the Confessional statements themselves. But we are bound as Presbyterians only to the essential and necessary articles of the Westminster Confession. We are not bound to unnecessary and unessential statements of the Confession. Still less are we bound to statements which are not in the Confession at all, but which are regarded as logical deductions

from the Confession by a party in the Church. If we are to be held to all the supposed logical consequences of the Westminster Confession, do you not see that you will be held by the dominant party to the whole system of scholastic dogma taught in certain schools of theology? By supposed logical deductions, the Scriptures and the Confession will be overlaid by a crust of traditional opinion which may go on developing into thicker and more comprehensive forms until Confession and Bible are buried under a mountain of scholasticism.

If the prosecution should succeed in establishing this dogma of the inerrancy of Scripture as the official doctrine of the Church, and all those who cannot subscribe to it should retire, how long would it be before they would impose the dogma of reprobation upon a weakened and crippled Church and make revision of the Confession an impossibility? There are some who think this is the real purpose of the prosecuting committee and of those who are at their back in this trial.

Inasmuch as there is such a misapprehension of the facts of the case, I must go into this question to some length and with much care. I shall first take up the question of the consistency of the two doctrines, then consider the Confessional statements, and finally give the Biblical evidence.

I.—What is Plenary Inspiration?

I agree to the doctrines (1) that "Holy Scripture is the Word of God written;" (2) "immediately inspired;" and (3) "the rule of faith and practice."

Do these statements necessarily involve the doctrine that there are no errors in Holy Scripture? (*a*) The doctrine that "the Holy Scriptures are the rule of faith and practice" clearly does not involve that "the Holy Scriptures are the rule in matters other than faith and practice." If I find fallibility in Holy Scripture in matters of faith and practice, I am inconsistent with the Confession. But, in the Inaugural, I expressly disclaimed such fallibility. This disclaimer is recognized in the citations from my Inaugural given by the prosecution:

"The Bible has maintained its authority with the best scholars of our time, who with open minds have been willing to recognize any error

that might be pointed out by historical criticism; for these errors are all in the circumstantials and not in the essentials; they are in the human setting, not in the precious jewel itself; they are found in that section of the Bible that theologians commonly account for from the providential superintendence of the mind of the Author as distinguished from divine revelation itself. It may be that this providential superintendence gives infallible guidance in every particular; and it may be that it differs but little, if at all, from the providential superintendence of the fathers and schoolmen and theologians of the Christian Church. It is not important for our purpose that we should decide this question. If we should abandon the whole field of providential superintendence so far as inspiration and divine authority are concerned, and limit divine inspiration and authority to the essential contents of the Bible, to its religion, faith, and morals, we would still have ample room to seek divine authority where alone it is essential, or even important, in the teaching that guides our devotions, our thinking, and our conduct" (p. 22).

The only errors I have found or ever recognized in Holy Scripture have been beyond the range of faith and practice, and therefore they do not impair the infallibility of Holy Scripture as a rule of faith and practice.

But it is claimed that if I recognize errors in matters beyond the range of faith and practice, I excite suspicion as to the infallibility of Holy Scripture within the range of faith and practice. You are entitled to that opinion for yourselves, but you have no right to force your opinion upon me. The Confession does not say "rule of all things," but "the rule of faith and practice." You must judge by the Confession, not by your fears, or your impressions, or by the conclusions you have made. But is it true that fallibility in the Bible in matters beyond the scope of the divine revelation impairs the infallibility in matters within the scope of divine revelation? We claim that it does not. The sacred writings were not composed in heaven by the Holy Spirit, they were not sent down from heaven by angel hands, they were not committed to the care of perfect men, they were not kept by a succession of perfect priests from that moment until the present time. If these had been the facts in the case, we might have had a Bible infallible in every particular. But none of these things are true. God gave His Holy Word to men in an entirely different way. He used the human reason and all the faculties of imperfect human nature. He used the voice and hands of imperfect men. He allowed

the sacred writings to be edited and re-edited, arranged and rearranged and rearranged again by imperfect scribes. It is improbable that such imperfect instrumentalities should attain perfect results. It was improbable that fallible men should produce a series of writings infallible in every respect. It was sufficient that divine inspiration and the guidance of the Holy Spirit should make their writings an infallible rule of faith and practice, and that the divine energy should push the human and the fallible into the external forms, into the unessential and unnecessary matters, into the human setting of the divine ideals. As the river of life flowing forth from the throne of God, according to Ezekiel's Vision, entering into the Dead Sea quickens its waters and fills them with new life, so that "everything shall live whithersoever the river cometh" . . . "But the miry places thereof and the marshes thereof shall not be healed" (Ez. xlvii. 9–11); so may it be with that divine influence which we call inspiration, when it flows into a man. It quickens and enriches his whole nature, his experience, his utterance, his expressions, with truth and life divine, and yet leaves some human infirmities unhealed in order that the revelation may be essentially divine and infallible and yet bear traces of the human and fallible into the midst of which it came.

You will sometimes hear the proverb cited: "Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus." But this ancient proverb has no manner of application to the matter in hand. It does not refer to errors of ignorance or inadvertence, but to errors of deceit and falsehood. If it could be shown that the writings of the Old Testament, any of them, were written with the intent of deceiving and misleading men, then we could not trust them as infallible in matters of faith and practice. But the errors that have been found in the Bible are not errors of deceit but of inadvertence, not of falsehood but of lack of knowledge. A witness in a court of justice is not rejected because he betrays ignorance and slips into errors of detail, which may have resulted from carelessness and inattention. His evidence is all the stronger for these marks of simplicity and the faults of common people. A witness who makes no mistake is open to suspicion, lest his testimony may have been prepared for the occasion by his advocate or himself. Historical documents are not cast aside as worth-

less because they contain errors. No historic document can be found that is altogether infallible. Even the Pope of Rome does not claim infallibility in all things, in his utterances at the table and on the street, in his conversation with his friends about literature, art, science, or philosophy, war, or finance, but only when sitting in the chair of St. Peter he speaks, *ex cathedra*, as the vicar of Christ, in his official position as the supreme head of the Church in matters of faith and morals. I refer you to the testimony presented to the court and read from "Biblical Study," pp. 240–243, and "The Bible, the Church, and the Reason," pp. 115–117, as setting forth the views which I have held for many years on this subject, and I ask you to consider whether they are in conflict with the Biblical or Confessional doctrine of the rule of faith.

It is evident that I and others can hold that Holy Scripture is "the only infallible rule of faith and practice," and yet hold that there are errors in Holy Scripture in matters that do not in any way impair its infallibility in matters of faith and practice.

(*b*) The charge of the prosecution is, that errors in Holy Scripture conflict with the essential doctrine that "Holy Scripture is the Word of God written." The prosecution may think that there is conflict here, but they are mistaken. The reason why they see conflict is because they interpret "Word of God written" differently from what I do. They put into this doctrine in their original Specification, "true and full inspiration," meaning so far as we can determine—(1) Plenary inspiration; (2) Verbal inspiration; (3) Inerrancy. Let me remark at the outset that although I admit the phrase "true and full inspiration," it is not a phrase of the Confession or of Holy Scripture. The only phrase of the Confession used by them in this statement is "the Word of God written." I hold to the "true inspiration of the Word of God written," but I also hold that there are errors in Holy Scripture, and that there is no inconsistency between these statements. The inconsistency is in the mind of the prosecutors because they already include in the term full inspiration, verbal inspiration and inerrancy; whereas I use plenary, or full, in the grammatical and historical sense as referring to the contents of the words. When we say that a

lamp is full of oil, we do not mean that the lamp is oil, but that it contains oil in the receptacle which it incloses. When I say the Scriptures are full of divine inspiration, I mean that the Scriptures as writings are filled full with an inspired rule of faith and practice, which rule fills and pervades Scripture in all its parts. I have the authority of John Wallis, a clerk of the Westminster Assembly, for this view, when he says:

"The Scriptures in themselves are a Lanthorn rather than a Light; they shine, indeed, but it is *alieno lumine*; it is not their own, but a borrowed light. It is God which is the true light that shines to us in the Scriptures; and they have no other light in them, but as they represent to us somewhat of God, and as they exhibit and hold forth God to us, who is the true light that 'enlighteneth every man that comes into the world.' It is a light, then, as it represents God unto us, who is the original light. It transmits some rays; some beams of the divine nature: but they are refracted, or else we should not be able to behold them. They lose much of their original lustre by passing through this medium, and appear not so glorious to us as they are in themselves. They represent God's simplicity obliquated and refracted, by reason of many inadequate conceptions; God condescending to the weakness of our capacity to speak to us in our own dialect" (John Wallis, "Sermon," Lond., 1791, pp. 127, 128).

I apprehend that Wallis is a greater authority for interpreting the Westminster Confession than any American theologian or than the last General Assembly at Portland. It is evident, therefore, that there is no logical inconsistency between these statements unless you put into the phrase "plenary or full" all that you wish to find there in the way of verbal inspiration and inerrancy. If you do this I challenge your proofs from Holy Scripture and Confession.

The Will of God Committed to Writing

(*a*) The Confession represents that—

"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" (I. 1).

This teaches that God "committed wholly unto writing" "that knowledge of God and of his will which is necessary unto salvation." This statement I sincerely adopt. But note what was committed "wholly unto writing:" "the knowledge of God and of his will which is necessary unto salvation"—nothing more; not the knowledge of geography, not the knowledge of chronology, not the knowledge of correct citations, not exactness in names of persons and things, unless you can prove that these are necessary to salvation. This statement of the Confession amounts to nothing more than "rule of faith and practice;" it is hardly as much, because there are some matters of faith and practice which may not be necessary to salvation. This statement does not touch upon knowledge not necessary to salvation. If there are errors in such matters as are not necessary to salvation, what has that to do with this passage? When it is said that God committed that wholly unto writing, does it teach that God Himself committed to writing, or does it imply the use of holy penmen? Manifestly the latter. If then God used holy penmen to commit this knowledge to writing, you cannot conclude that these penmen did not commit to writing, together with this knowledge of God necessary to salvation, other knowledge which was not necessary to salvation; and if so, you cannot conclude that there were no errors in that matter which these men wrote, unless you can also prove that God commissioned them to commit this also to writing. You cannot prove any such thing from this passage of the Confession which limits itself to "knowledge necessary to salvation." Further, "commit to writing" does not imply any more than that this knowledge of God necessary to salvation is wholly in these writings. It does not imply that the words which contain this knowledge are inspired, or that they may not be connected with human and fallible material.

"*The Word of God Written*"

(*b*) The phrase, "the Word of God written," in the first clause of Section 2d of Chapter I., seems to have great importance in the minds of the prosecution. I fail to see what use they can make of it in proof of the inerrancy of Holy Scripture.

This section gives a list of the canonical books of Holy Scripture and prefaces the list with the statement, "Under the name of Holy Scripture, or the Word of God written, are now contained all the books of the Old and New Testaments, which are these," etc.

This is a comprehensive statement which simply amounts to this: that Genesis, Exodus, and so forth, are books of Holy Scripture, that is, "the Word of God written." "Word of God written" is only an explanation of the term "Holy Scripture." It may be that the prosecution have in mind some hidden sense of this passage which they have not yet brought out to the light of day, but, with the best study that I can give it, it amounts to nothing more than that Genesis is the written Word of God, Exodus is the written Word of God, that is, is Holy Scripture, etc., etc. I certainly hold to this. Genesis, Exodus, and the entire list of writings given in this section are the Word of God, constituent parts of Holy Scripture. I do not know why the prosecution cite this phrase unless they think that it is contrary to my statement when I say: "The Bible, as a book, is paper, print, and binding—nothing more. It is entitled to reverent handling for the sake of its holy contents because it contains the divine word of redemption for man, and not for any other reason whatever" (p. 30). This extract was used in the original Specification. It is left out of the present Charge. But was the Bible, as written by the sacred penmen, a book with paper, print, and binding? We think not. All these are quite modern. What printer was ever inspired, what paper-maker ever communicated divine authority to the paper, what binder ever imparted salvation through his tools to the binding? I gave the true reason for reverent handling of the Bible. My language indeed is only a paraphrase of the first section of the Confession. The Confession says: "It pleased God to commit the knowledge of God and of his will which is necessary unto salvation wholly unto writing." I said: "for the sake of its holy contents because it contains the word of redemption for man." I do not see how my language could be any nearer to the Confessional language unless I cited the Confession word for word.

Holy Scripture is the Word of God

(*c*) The prosecution cite Section 4th in order to prove that the Confession teaches that Holy Scripture is "the Word of God." There can be no doubt of this. The prosecution seem to interpret it as if it meant that Holy Scripture is so the Word of God that every sentence and word in it is divine and infallible. But the Confession certainly does not say this, and it evidently does not mean this.

I have shown that we cannot take the statement of one of the three doctrinal standards as of essential importance unless it correspond with the statements of the other documents, and that we must so interpret the varying phrases of the three standards as to get a doctrine which will be consistent with the phrasing of them all. The Larger Catechism teaches that "the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God, the only rule of faith and obedience." But the Shorter Catechism, the last of the three documents to be composed, and which presupposes the other two, teaches that "the Word of God which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him." It is evident, therefore, that the Westminster doctrine of Holy Scripture must be so constructed as to enable us to say, "the Bible contains the Word of God," as well as to say, "is the Word." There are two extremes of statement which are both inconsistent with the Westminster statement. If, on the one hand, you take the statement of the Shorter Catechism and say, Holy Scripture contains the Word of God in its chief doctrines, but there are some doctrines of faith and rules of life which are not the Word of God; then you cannot subscribe to the statement, "is the Word of God." So, on the other hand, if you take the statement of the Larger Catechism in such a sense as to say, Holy Scripture is the Word of God in all its parts, thoughts and words, sentences and linguistic expression, then you cannot subscribe to the statement, "contains the Word of God." The true Westminster doctrine is the same that we have already seen, that the Bible contains the Word of God in that it contains the rule of faith and practice, and it is the Word of God because this rule of faith and practice so fills

and pervades and controls Holy Scripture as to make it to all intents and purposes the Word of God. As a Westminster divine well says:

"For the Scripture stands not in *cortice verborum*, but in *medulla sensus*, it's the same wine in this vessel which was drawn out of that."

I can sincerely subscribe to both statements, "is the Word of God," and "contains the Word of God," but I challenge the subscription to the words "contains the Word of God" on the part of those who insist that "is the Word of God" means verbal inspiration and inerrancy in every particular. I challenge the subscription to the clause "contains the Word of God" by the prosecution, when they say:

"God is the arranger of its clauses, the chooser of its terms, and the speller of its words so that the text in its letters, words, or clauses is just as divine as the thought" (Stenographer's Report, p. 558).

The blind zeal with which some have recently insisted upon "is the Word of God" reminds us of Luther's uncharitable conduct at the conference at Marburg. To use the words of Dr. Schaff:

"Luther first rose, and declared emphatically that he would not change his opinion on the real presence in the least, but stand fast on it to the end of life. He called upon the Swiss to prove the absence of Christ, but protested at the outset against arguments derived from reason and geometry. To give pictorial emphasis to his declaration, he wrote with a piece of chalk on the table in large characters the words of institution, with which he was determined to stand or fall: *Hoc est corpus Meum*" ("History of the Christian Church," VI., p. 640).

We well know the evil consequences of a divided and distracted Protestantism which resulted from this intolerant and opinionated conduct of the great reformer. Shall we allow men who are pigmies alongside of Luther to plunge our Presbyterian Church into distraction and division by the entering edge of the copula "is"? In the usage of language, this little word "is" is capable of a variety of interpretations. "This is my body" in the words of Jesus is of infinitely more consequence than "Holy Scripture is the Word of God" in our Confession of Faith. Give heed to the warning of history.

Immediately Inspired

(*d*) The prosecution cite Section 8th in order to prove the infallibility of the original text of Scripture. The Confession teaches that—

"The Old Testament in Hebrew and the New Testament in Greek, being immediately inspired by God, and by his singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentical; so as in all controversies of religion, the church is finally to appeal unto them" (I. 8).

There are three affirmations here: (1) that the original text was immediately inspired by God; (2) that they have been kept pure in all ages and are therefore authentical; (3) they are the final appeal in all controversies of religion. The third statement gives the scope of the others. The Scriptures are the final appeal in religious controversies; matters of faith and practice, not for questions of science. Those who have resorted to the Bible to prove that the sun moved round the earth, that the earth could not be circumnavigated, that the universe was created in six days of twenty-four hours, and the like, have surely gone beyond the range of the Westminster Confession, which specifies controversies of religion. Those zealous defenders of the infallibility of the Scriptures in other like matters of detail outside of the range of religious controversies, apart from matters of faith and practice, will ere long be convicted of similar error. (See further the evidence presented in "The Bible, the Church, and the Reason," pp. 95 seq.)

(1) The prosecution emphasizes the phrase "being immediately inspired by God," which indeed they include in the Charge itself in the clause "immediately inspired." The Confession states that "the Old Testament in Hebrew and the New Testament in Greek, being immediately inspired by God."

It is evident that the prosecution rest their case upon the adverb "immediately." What does it mean in this passage? "Immediately" does not refer to the time when the Holy Scriptures were composed, and therefore it has nothing whatever to do with the original autographs. The Confession does not say, "having been immediately inspired by God," referring to their origin in the past, but "being immediately inspired by God,"

alluding to their present condition. The doctrine is that the Hebrew and Greek copies, as we now have them in our hands, are immediately inspired by God; they have within them the divine grace of inspiration, and it is there immediately from God as compared with the translations from the Greek and Hebrew originals, where the inspiration is mediately from God, namely, through the medium of these originals. That this is the meaning of the Confession is clear from the controversial literature of the times when the Confession was composed. Let me quote from William Lyford, one of the most honored divines among the English Presbyterians and one whose name and authority were of the first to the authors of our Standards:

"Thus that *Jesuite*, with whom Doctor *White* has to doe, layes this for his first conclusion (namely) *that the scriptures alone, especially as translated into the English Tongue, cannot be the rule of Faith:* He gives two Reasons for his Assertion; The first is, because these Translations are not infallible, as the Rule of Faith must be; for neither were the Scriptures immediately written by the Holy Ghost in our language, neither were the Translators assisted by the Spirit infallible, as appears by the often change, and correcting of the Translations, which shews that some of them were defective.—How can an unlearned man be sure, that this Translation, which now I have, or you have, does not erre, unless you admit the Authority of the Church, to assure us, that such and such a Translation doth not erre?

"For answer hereunto, I lay down these two Conclusions: First, that Divine Truth in English, is as truly the Word of God, as the same Scriptures delivered in the Originall Hebrew or Greek; yet with this difference, that the same is perfectly, immediately, and most absolutely in the Originall Hebrew and Greek, in other Translations, as the vessels wherein it is presented to us, and as far forth as they agree with the Originalls: And every Translation agreeing with the Originalls in the matter, is the same Canonicall Scripture that Hebrew or Greek is, even as it is the same Water, which is in the Fountain, and in the Stream; We say this is the Water of such or such a Well, or Spring, because it came from thence; so it is in this business, when the Apostles spake the wonderfull works of God in the language of all Nations (that were at *Jerusalem*) wherein they were born; the Doctrine was the same to all, of the same Truth and Divine Authority in the severall Languages: And this Doctrine is the Rule we seek for, and the foundation upon which our Religion is grounded, and it is all one thing, whether it be brought to my understanding in Welch, or English, or Greek, or Latine: all Language, or Writing, is but the Vessell, the Symbole, or Declaration of the Rule, not the Rule itself: It is a certain form or means by which the Divine Truth cometh unto us, as things are contained in their words, and because the

Doctrine and matter of the Text is not made known unto me but by words, and a language which I understand; therefore I say, the Scripture in English is the rule and ground of my faith, whereupon I relying, have not a humane, but a divine Authority for my Faith. Even as an *unbeliever* coming to our Sermons, is *convinced of all*, and *judged of all*, and he will acknowledge the Divine Truth of God, although by a humane voice in preaching, it be conveyed unto him, so we enjoy the infallible Doctrine of the Scripture, although by a mans Translation it be manifested to me" ("Plain Mans Senses"—Lyford, pp. 48, 49).

It is evident, therefore, that the adverb "immediately" gives the prosecution no support for their doctrine that the original autographs were without error. It has nothing whatever to do with such autographs.

(2) There is an important phrase in this section which the prosecution do not emphasize and which they do not insert in the Charge. This phrase gives irresistible witness against them. It is the following: "By his singular care and providence, kept pure in all ages." The statement is that the Greek New Testament and the Hebrew Old Testament have been kept pure in all ages by the singular care and providence of God, and are authentical. They are authentic for their purpose as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, to determine controversies of religion. They have been kept pure by divine providence in all ages for this purpose. Those who use this passage in order to prove the inerrancy of Scripture in every particular make several inferences which are not justified. They have no right to infer that the adjective "pure" means inerrant in every particular. Pure, yes, for its purpose of grace and salvation. Pure, yes, to determine infallibly controversies of religion. Pure, yes, to give the infallible rule of faith and practice and to determine every question of religion, doctrine, and morals. Pure, yes, so that these great purposes of the grace of God shall in no wise be contaminated, or colored, or warped, or changed in the slightest particular; but not pure in the sense that every sentence, word, and letter of our present Greek and Hebrew text is absolutely errorless and inerrant. The Westminster divines knew as well as we do that the accents and vowel-points of the Hebrew text then in their possession did not come down from the original autographs pure and unchanged. They were not in the original autographs at all.

Levita, Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Beza, and the great array of Biblical critics in the 16th and 17th centuries had settled that. They knew, as well as we know, that there were variations of reading and uncertainties and errors in the Greek and Hebrew texts in their hands. The great Polyglots had settled that. They knew that there were errors of citation and of chronology and of geographical statement in the text of Scripture. Luther and Calvin, Walton and Lightfoot, Baxter and Rutherford, and a great company of Biblical scholars recognized them and found no difficulty with them.

The language of the Confession does not of itself teach that the Holy Scriptures are altogether without error; and it is extremely improbable, from the historic situation of the Westminster divines in the development of Biblical scholarship, that they ever designed to make any such statement. But even if they had intended to make such a statement, and did actually make it, implicitly, if not explicitly, in the clause, "kept pure in all ages," it is the unanimous testimony of modern Biblical scholarship that there are errors in the Hebrew and Greek texts now in our hands, errors that meet us in textual criticism, in literary criticism, and in historical criticism, that no one has been able to deny or to explain away. Modern Biblical scholarship has forced the advocates of inerrancy to fall back from the texts in our hands and grant that there are errors in them, in order to rally about the modern dogma of the inerrancy of the original autographs.

The attentive reader of the Westminster Confession will note that it states with regard to the original texts that (1) "The Old Testament in Hebrew and the New Testament in Greek are immediately inspired by God," and (2) that they, "by his singular care and providence, have been kept pure in all ages." The first statement, that the original texts are immediately inspired by God, is not in debate in the Presbyterian Church. All parties agree to that. The second statement affirms nothing more as regards the original autographs than it affirms of the Hebrew and Greek texts in our hands. "Kept pure" means that the text we have is as pure as the original text was, no more, no less. Those modern scholastics who have generated this dogma of the inerrancy of the original autographs seem

altogether unconscious of the fact that they have transgressed the Confessional statement, when they claim that the original autographs were so pure as to be inerrant, and then admit that they have not been kept sufficiently pure in all ages as to be inerrant at the present time. The Confessional doctrine is "kept pure in all ages." This we firmly believe. The texts are as pure to-day to determine religious controversies as they ever were. They are as pure, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, as when they first issued by immediate inspiration from the hands and the brains of those who wrote them and uttered them. Our opponents deny the Confessional statement when they assert that the original autographs were purer than the Biblical texts are now. They deny the Confession which states that they have been "kept pure in all ages." They make the synagogue and the Church the scapegoats, and throw upon them the blame for the errors in the present texts of Scripture. Doubtless many errors have arisen in the course of transmission through the mistakes of copyists. But these may, for the most part, be traced out and explained according to the principles of textual criticism. These errors are chiefly errors of inadvertence, although some have arisen from dogmatic efforts to harmonize variant passages and to correct supposed errors in the older texts. It discredits the scientific work of textual criticism to make conjectures as to an original text different from the best one we can find after we have exhausted the resources of criticism. Conjectures in the interests of scepticism are quite as easy as conjectures in the interest of orthodoxy. Those who by pure conjecture invent an inerrant original autograph, that has never been in the possession of the synagogue or the Church so far as we can trace the historic records, deny that God has kept the Holy Scripture pure in that period of their history concerning which we are left in darkness. It is quite easy to imagine anything in the dark.

"The Confession does not present any obstacle whatever to Biblical scholarship at this point. The Confession says: 'kept pure in all ages.' This is in accord with Biblical scholarship. It is well known to those who have pursued the study of Biblical criticism that textual criticism, while it advances steadily toward the original autographs, finds the number of errors

increasing as well as diminishing. As it works its arduous way backward some errors are removed, but others of equal difficulty are disclosed. The Higher Criticism in its quest after the exact literary forms of the original Scriptures also finds an increasing number of errors. Historical criticism in its comparison of Bible with monument and the parallel line of history clears up many difficulties, but also adds to the number of errors of names, dates, geography, and incident. Biblical scholarship could have no objection to the statement of the Westminster Confession "kept pure in all ages," for criticism shows that the present text is as pure and free from errors of truth and fact as any earlier text accessible to us. Indeed, the study of the errors of Holy Scripture is one of the strongest evidences of the credibility of the Scriptures. It shows clearly that the text has in all ages been kept pure for its purposes of grace and salvation. All the errors that have yet been discovered are but as moles on a beautiful face, or those discolorations of a cathedral which come in part from the wear and tear of ages and in part from minor defects in the marbles themselves, but which enhance the beauty and majesty of the structure, witnessing to its integrity, strength, and grandeur." (See "The Bible, the Church, and the Reason," pp. 99 seq.)

(3) Another neglected clause of the Confession reads as follows:

> "Therefore they are to be translated into the vulgar language of every nation unto which they come, that the word of God dwelling plentifully in all, they may worship him in an acceptable manner, and, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, may have hope" (I. 8).

This passage was omitted altogether from the Specification in the original Charge. The prosecution doubtless saw their mistake in this omission and had a presentiment that it would be used against them.

This passage teaches the efficacy of translations of the Scriptures and maintains that the Word of God comes through translations as well as through originals. The authority of Holy Scripture is not confined to the original autographs or to the original languages of Holy Scripture, but is conveyed by the holy doctrine and facts of Scripture through every language under heaven. Holy Scripture is the power of God unto salva-

tion in whatever form it assumes or through whatever message it comes to penitent men of every nation, kindred, or tongue. There can be no true doctrine of the inspiration of Holy Scripture, or of the authority of Holy Scripture, or of the infallibility of Holy Scripture, which deifies original autographs, exaggerates Hebrew, Greek, or Aramaic words and sentences, and depreciates the translations which alone are accessible to the people of God. When it is said that "God is careful of his *yodh*. He does not dot his *i* for nothing, nor cross his *t* merely for decoration" (Stenographical Report, pp. 566, 567), the prosecution use language which is so anthropomorphic as to be irreverent. When it is further said that the Bible is "the human medium which tabernacles Jesus Christ, the Word made Bible must be as perfect, as spotless, as infallible" (Stenographical Report, p. 515), the prosecution teach a Christology which is contrary to the faith of the Church of God. The Bible is not Jesus Christ in the form of a book. The Bible is not God manifest in the Scriptures in a sense parallel to God manifest in the flesh of Jesus Christ. The authority of the Bible and its infallibility is of a very different kind from the authority of the Incarnate Son of God. Its authority is in the divine revelation of the rule of faith and life for the redemption of men. The Bible is authoritative to the people of God, not merely to those who can read it in Hebrew and Greek. The Bible is infallible to all the ministry, not merely to those who can spell out by the help of a dictionary its Greek and Hebrew words. The Bible is sufficient for the whole Church, not merely for a few textual critics. It is important that there should be the best textual criticism and that the ministry should in considerable numbers be Hebrew and Greek scholars. But it is contrary to the principles of Protestantism and especially of Puritanism that any doctrine of the Bible should be taught that makes it necessary for us to resort to the original texts and the original autographs in order to get at the fountain of inspiration and authority. It is a ludicrous feature of the present situation that Biblical scholars are defending the translations of which they have no need, and experts in textual criticism are acknowledging that they find no inerrant manuscripts, the Higher Critics are searching the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures through and through to learn

the exact truth and facts about the origin and character of the Bible; while men who can hardly spell out their Hebrew and Greek Bibles, who are as innocent of textual criticism as a child unborn, and who show by their speech and writing that they know not the meaning of the words Higher Criticism—that such men are prating about the infallibility of original autographs and the inviolability of traditional theories. We may safely say that divine authority is not stereotyped in original autographs so hidden from the eyes of men that they can less easily be discovered than the north pole or the Garden of Eden. The fountain of authority is in the great heart of the gospel, the message of redemption which the Bible tells in every language into which it may be translated, and which the Holy Spirit ever accompanies with His quickening presence.

A study of the Confession makes it clear that it knows nothing of the modern doctrine of the inerrancy of the original autographs of Holy Scripture. When the General Assembly assumed to say by a majority vote that "Our Church holds that the inspired Word as it came from God is without error," they said what is not true in fact at the present time unless their own majority vote determines what our Church holds; and they said what has never been true in fact in the history of the Presbyterian Church, if they meant, what circumstances seem to indicate that they meant, to affirm that the original autographs were without error.

The Witness of Holy Scripture as to Errors

All the texts cited by the prosecution against the passages from my Inaugural are irrelevant. If they had affirmed in their Charge that it is an essential and necessary article of the Confession and of Holy Scripture that the original autographs of Holy Scripture are inerrant and had used these passages as proofs, it would have been easy to show that not one of them gives the slightest support to such a theory. They show that they have no confidence in the proof texts of their own selection. In the specification of the original Charge of which the present Charge is an amplification, the prosecution cite twenty-seven texts of Scripture against me. They have thrown out all

but three of them from the present Charge and have added four new ones. But the new are no better than the old. Another year's reflection would probably suffice to have all of them thrown out. Under these circumstances it seems not worth my while to pay any attention to them. I hold to all that these texts teach when interpreted by sound principles of exegesis. But I am sure that no Biblical scholar who is entitled to the slightest consideration or respect would risk his reputation by citing any of the texts for any such purpose as the prosecution have in mind.

I shall adhere to the policy which I have thus far followed with regard to errors in Holy Scripture. I have refused to accept the dogma that the original autographs were inerrant. I have maintained that there are errors in the texts which we have and in the best texts we can get by the science of textual criticism, and that it is improbable that the original texts, if we could discover them, would be much different from those we have in that regard. But I have refused to affirm that there were errors in the original autographs; because it is unscientific and it is unscholarly and it is against the truth-loving spirit of Christianity to make affirmations of dogma where we have no certain evidence. I have always refrained as far as possible from pointing to errors in the present text of Scripture. But every Biblical scholar admits them. There are a few professors in the Biblical department in American theological seminaries who hold to this modern dogma of inerrancy, and in the interests of this dogma try to explain away the errors of Holy Scripture, but even these Procrusteans are obliged to admit that they must resort, for some of the most stubborn of them, to conjectures that these were bastards to the original text.

I shall call your attention to some errors in Holy Scripture which have been recognized by the great divines of the Church and which are acknowledged by the best Biblical scholarship of our age, in order that you may see how unsafe it is to risk the divine authority of Holy Scripture on the soundness of such an unhistoric and unstable modern dogma as inerrancy. I refer you again to the long list of citations in my "Bible, Church, and Reason," proving that errors in Holy Scripture were recognized

by Origen, Jerome, Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Baxter, Rutherford, Van Oosterzee, among the older divines; and among those now living, by Marcus Dods, Sanday, Bruce, Beet, Charteris, Plummer, Gore, Cave, Iverach, Thayer, Huntington, Apple, Fisher, Vincent, and Fairchild. Citations from ten times as many might easily be produced. In the presence of such authorities, even members of the late General Assembly might well feel a sense of humiliation and shame for their deliverance, which advises all who agree with these divines to retire from the Church. Such divines bear the Church with them wherever they go. A Church from which such divines would retire would go a long distance in the direction indicated by the Confession when it represents that some churches "have so degenerated as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan."

(*a*) Calvin says with reference to Matthew xxvii. 9:

"How the name of Jeremiah crept in, I confess I know not nor am I seriously troubled about it. That the name of Jeremiah has been put for Zechariah by an error, the fact itself shows, because there is no such statement in Jeremiah."

St. Augustine and St. Jerome had recognized this error centuries before. Professor Sanday, the most eminent scholar in the New Testament in Great Britain, now living, regards this as an erroneous citation. New Testament scholars who differ from them are hard to find. Possibly these may all be mistaken in their opinion, and American dogmaticians may succeed in convincing you that this is no error, or at least that it was not an error in the original text. But what will you do with these scholars and all whom you cannot convince? Are you prepared to say that they must retire from the Presbyterian Church?

(*b*) Calvin recognizes a mistake in Hebrews xi. 21. He says:

"No doubt Moses spoke of the head of his couch, when he said עַל רֹאשׁ מִטָּתוֹ but the Greek translators rendered the words, 'on the top of his staff,' as though the last word was written מַטֶּה. The Apostle hesitated not to apply to his purpose what was commonly received: he was indeed writing to the Jews; but they who were dispersed in various countries had changed their own language for the Greek. And we know that the Apostles were not so scrupulous in this respect, as not to accommodate themselves to the unlearned, who had as yet need of milk" (Calvin's Commentary on Hebrews, xi. 21).

You may see the difference in our English Bible:

"And he said, Swear unto me: and he sware unto him. And Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head" (Gen. xlvii. 31).

"By faith Jacob, when he was a dying, blessed each of the sons of Joseph; and worshipped, leaning upon the top of his staff" (Hebrews xi. 21).

The LXX. version mistakes the points of the Hebrew word and renders incorrectly. This error appears in the epistle to the Hebrews. There is no doubt that it is an error. It is hard to see how you can remove this error from the original text of the New Testament, because the LXX. version is back of it. But what matters such an error as this? What difference does it make to our faith and practice whether Jacob leaned on his staff or his bed's head? Why should you demand that the Holy Spirit must have so overruled the mind of the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews that he would correct his citation from the LXX. so as to correspond with the correct Hebrew text? If by any strange device you can persuade yourselves that this is not an error after all, what are you going to do with the man who thinks with John Calvin and whom you cannot convince? Will you exclude him from the Church because he finds bed's head in the Old Testament inconsistent with staff in the New Testament?

(*c*) The epistle to the Galatians contains a serious chronological error, according to the opinion of most scholars:

"Now this I say: A covenant confirmed beforehand by God, the law, which came four hundred and thirty years after, doth not disannul, so as to make the promise of none effect" (Galatians iii. 17).

This four hundred and thirty years from the promise to Abraham until the law-giving is in accordance with the four hundred years of the prediction in Genesis xv. 13 and Acts vii. 6; but it is contrary to the narrative Ex. xii. 40, which gives the sojourn in Egypt as four hundred and thirty years. However, the LXX. version by an insertion in the text overcomes the difficulty; but this text is not accepted by the best criticism. This difference of chronology involves an error either on the one side or the other. Dillmann shows that the genealogical

tables are also widely discrepant in the number of generations during the period from the descent into Egypt till the law-giving. The general opinion is that the number 430 is correct and that Stephen and Paul are in error.

Professor Beet, of the Wesleyan Church in England, says:

"About trifling discrepancies between the Hebrew and Greek texts, Paul probably neither knew nor cared. And they have no bearing whatever upon the all-important matter he has here in hand. He adopted the chronology of the LXX., with which alone his readers were familiar; knowing, possibly, that if incorrect it was only an understatement of the case" (Commentary on Galatians, p. 90).

Dr. Schaff says:

"But this difference in the chronology of the Greek Bible and our present Hebrew text, although very serious in a historical point of view, is of no account for the argument in hand. Paul means to say, the older an agreement, the stronger its authority. The Hebrew text would strengthen the argument" (Commentary on Galatians, *in loco*).

I shall not discuss this difficult question. But I ask you to consider whether you are going to make the divine authority of Holy Scripture depend upon the removal of this error from the text. And will you discipline all those who think that you cannot make the four hundred and thirty years of the sojourn in Egypt harmonize with the four hundred and thirty years from Abraham to the Exodus?

(*d*) It is the common opinion that Stephen makes an erroneous statement in Acts vii. 16, where he says:

"And they were carried over unto Shechem, and laid in the tomb that Abraham bought for a piece in silver of the sons of Hamor in Shechem."

The late Professor Lechler says:

"Stephen says that the remains of Jacob and also of his sons were carried to Sychem; his language has occasioned here, too, perplexity with respect to several particulars. 1. We are told in Genesis i.13 that Joseph and his brethren buried the body of Jacob in the cave of the field near Hebron, whereas Stephen says that Jacob was buried in Sychem. 2. According to Josh. xxiv. 32, the Israelites, when they took possession of Canaan, buried the bones of Joseph, which they brought from Egypt, in Shechem (Sychem); but it is not stated in this passage or elsewhere in the Old Testament that the bones of Joseph's brethren, whom the terms

employed by Stephen include, were buried at the same place. 3. Stephen says that Abraham bought the piece of ground in Sychem, of the sons of Emmor. Yet it was not Abraham, but Jacob, who bought this piece of ground of the former owners (Gen. xxxiii. 18, 19). Consequently, Stephen confounded the latter with the spot near Hebron, which Abraham had bought. Every possible attempt has been made to explain these variations, from the period in which the oldest manuscripts were written down to the age of the reformers, and thence to the present day. Interpreters have, without success, availed themselves of every resource which the laws of Criticism or of Grammar, or the principles of Lexicology, or of Hermeneutics seemed to offer. The theory has been proposed that two burials are described in terms which were intentionally abbreviated, or that the passage before us speaks of two purchases. It is, however, the most judicious course to admit frankly, that, with reference to the purchase of the ground and the burial of Jacob, it might easily occur that Stephen, whose discourse treated an entirely different and a loftier theme, should, in his rapid course, confound two analogous transactions. As to the burial of Joseph's brethren in Canaan, the Old Testament presents no conflicting statements, but merely observes silence; it is very probable that such a tradition, the existence of which at a later period can be proved, was already current in Stephen's age, and adopted by him" (Lechler, "Acts," p. 116).

Calvin also recognizes this error of Stephen:

"It is evident that he [Stephen] made a mistake in the name of Abraham, since Abraham bought a double cave of Ephron the Hittite, for the interment of his wife: but Joseph was buried elsewhere, viz., in the field which his father Jacob bought of the sons of Hamor for an hundred lambs. Wherefore this passage is to be corrected" (p. 110).

The late Professor Evans in holy indignation exclaims:

"If Stephen transposes certain Old Testament incidents, or confuses certain names, does that affect the convicting power of his terrific arraignment of an apostate Israel? Was not the power of the Holy Ghost in every word that he spoke, even when least accurate? Suppose that one of his hearers had undertaken to reply to him, saying: 'You have said that Abraham left Haran after the death of his father Terah; whereas, if you study the figures in Genesis, you will find that Terah must have lived fifty years or more in Haran after Abraham left. You were mistaken, also, in saying that Abraham bought the sepulchre of the sons of Hamor in Shechem. If you look into the matter a little more closely you will find that that was Jacob, and that Abraham bought his purchase at Hebron of Ephron the Hittite.' But would that have silenced Stephen? Such a criticism on such a speech would have been like flinging a feather in the teeth of a cyclone" ("Inspiration and Inerrancy," pp. 165–167).

Possibly you may see your way through this error, but scholars greater and wiser than you cannot. You may be ready to follow the opinion of an American divine:

"In all such cases, it is necessary to consider the difficulties which attend the supposition of mistake or contradiction, as well as that of truth and consistency, especially as sceptical critics and their Christian followers are accustomed to look only at one side of the question. In this case, for example, it is easy to cut the knot by assuming a mistake on Stephen's part, but not so easy to account for its being made by such a man, addressing such an audience, and then perpetuated in such a history, without correction or exposure, for a course of ages" (Alexander on Acts, p. 269).

Is this argumentation to be made a test of orthodoxy? Have you no pity for Calvin and Lechler and Evans? Are all who see as they do to be cast out of the Presbyterian Church and given over to Satan?

(*e*) Let me give you the statement of another American professor:

"The greatest reliance is, however, placed on the third case adduced—the statement of Luke that Jesus was born at the time of a world enrolment, which was carried out in Syria during the governorship of Cyrenius. Weiss offers three reasons why Luke is certainly incorrect here, which Schürer increases to five facts, viz.: 1. History knows nothing of a general empire census in the time of Augustus. 2. A Roman census would not force Joseph to go to Bethlehem nor Mary to go with him. 3. Nor could it have taken place in Palestine in the time of Herod. 4. Josephus knows nothing of such a census, but, on the contrary, speaks of that of Acts v. 37 as something new and unheard of; and, 5, Quirinius was not governor of Syria during Herod's life. This has a formidable look; but each detail has been more than fully met" ("Presbyterian Review," p. 248).

Professor Weiss and Professor Schürer are of the highest rank in the study of the New Testament. There is no American scholar now living, unless it be Professor Thayer, who could claim equal recognition by the Christian world. You may be convinced by the reasoning given above, but what are you going to say with regard to the multitudes of Christian scholars who are not convinced? The greatest New Testament scholars in the world, seeking only what is true and right, and without prejudice, find error here, and they are entitled to

our respect and confidence. But the author of this reasoning does not win our confidence in his fairness, for he bandages his eyes at the very beginning of such an investigation by winding about them a rag with the inscription, "A proved error in Scripture contradicts not only our doctrines, but the Scripture's claims and therefore its inspiration in making those claims."

(*f*) This same anti-revisionist makes the following statement, which possibly may convince some of you:

"Dr. Fisher most wisely rests his charge against the complete harmony of the four evangelists, viz.: the alleged disharmony in the accounts of the place and phraseology of the sermon on the mount, the healing of the centurion's son, the denials of Peter, the healing of the blind man, at Jericho, and the time of the institution of the Lord's supper. But that in each of these, most natural means of harmonizing exist, are even in some instances recognized as possible by Dr. Fisher himself, President Bartlett has lately so fully shown in detail that we cannot bring ourselves to repeat the oft-told tale here" ("Presbyterian Review," II., p. 252).

Prof. George P. Fisher is an authority than whom there is no greater in America in questions of New Testament history. If he finds lack of harmony in these four instances in the gospels, most persons will conclude that there must be valid reasons for his opinion. But Prof. Fisher does not stand alone. He is sustained by New Testament scholars the world over. It is possible that this advocate of inerrancy may have the right of it, and that all these scholars may be wrong. You may think that you may safely follow him and rely on his authority rather than on the others. But can you do this as jurors? Can you in the divine presence, in view of the facts adduced, undertake to affirm it as the truth of God, as an essential and necessary article of faith, that these and other like cases are not errors? You may be able to persuade yourselves to it as an act of allegiance to your party in the Church, but if you do it as jurors you forfeit your Christian integrity and honesty of soul; for it is as certain as the sun shines that the great majority of this Presbytery do not and cannot know the certainty of all these things by their own study and knowledge.

(*g*) In the book of Genesis there are two stories respecting the wives of the patriarchs Abraham and Isaac, which are so similar that it is commonly supposed that they are two differ-

ent stories of the same thing. This opinion is strengthened by the fact that the one of them (Gen. xx.) is in the Ephraimitic document, the other (Gen. xxvi.) in the Judaic document. There is indeed a third similar story where the scene is laid in Egypt according to Gen. xii. Delitzsch calls attention to the fact that Sarah, according to the context in which Gen. xx. stands, must have been ninety years of age when Abimelek took her from her husband to be his concubine.

The late Prof. Delitzsch, who was recognized as a man of deep personal piety and of missionary zeal, as well as a great Old Testament scholar, gives it as his opinion that the editor of the Hexateuch took Genesis xx. from the Ephraimitic document and put it in the narrative out of its historical position, very much as he thinks that the synoptists put the account of the purification of the temple by Jesus at the end of His ministry in connection with His third passover, whereas it belongs according to the gospel of John at His first passover. Delitzsch explains these three stories as three different traditions which the editor used, and that he is entitled to our thanks for having given the three faithfully and for not suppressing any of them in favor of the others. These views of Delitzsch, sustained by Old Testament scholars in general, may seem to you difficult to reconcile with the divine inspiration of these passages. But Delitzsch and other scholars find no such difficulty. Have you ever thought of it? The difficulty is in the dogma of inspiration in which you have been trained. It is not in the Bible itself. Think of it for a moment. Here is a man inspired by God to gather the ancient traditions of his nation into an historical writing that will trace the unfolding of redemption among the patriarchs. He does not receive these stories by divine revelation. No scholar thinks of such a thing. He finds these stories in earlier documents and uses them. He was doubtless guided by the divine Spirit in their use, he was guided in his purpose of selecting such stories as would set forth the divine grace and the progress of redemption; but was it necessary that the divine Spirit should enable him to decide between two or three ancient stories of similar character? Was it essential to the purpose of an holy writing that he should decide whether these were three events, or variant traditions

of two events, or of one event? Would the Holy Spirit guide him so as to decide as to the locality, whether it happened in Philistia or in Egypt; as to whether it was the wife of Abraham or the wife of Isaac; and as to what exact time in the life of either of them the event occurred? None of these things were at all necessary to the purposes of grace. The lesson of the story is just as good with Abraham as with Isaac, with Pharaoh as with Abimelek. It is all the better if it can be shown that we have three stories of the same event, as we have three stories in the gospels of the purification of the temple.

Prof. Henry P. Smith calls attention to an inconsistency between the books of Kings and Chronicles:

(*h*) "But the high places were not taken away: nevertheless the heart of Asa was perfect with the Lord all his days" (I. Kings xv. 14).

"And Asa did that which was good and right in the eyes of the Lord his God: for he took away the strange altars, and the high places, and brake down the pillars and hewed down the Asherim; and commanded Judah to seek the Lord, the God of their fathers, and to do the law and the commandment. Also he took away out of all the cities of Judah the high places and the sun images: and the kingdom was quiet before them" (II. Chron. xiv. 2–5).

A similar conflict is found between I. Kings xxii. 43 and II. Chron. xvii. 16:

"And he walked in all the ways of Asa his father; he turned not aside from it, doing that which was right in the eyes of the Lord: howbeit the high places were not taken away; the people still sacrificed and burnt incense in the high places."

"And his heart was lifted up in the ways of the Lord: and furthermore he took away the high places and the Asherim out of Judah."

This conflict might be removed by conjectural textual criticism as I have elsewhere suggested; but such criticism was not proposed by the Revised Version of the Old Testament; and it is opposed by the fact that these differences are in accord with many others and they seem to reflect different points of view of the compilers and writers. As they stand in the translations and in the original texts, they are flat contradictions, and either the one writer or the other must be in error. If any of you can avoid the opinion that these are errors, you are entitled to your opinion. We have no desire to compel you to say that

these or any others are errors. But have you any right to force your opinions upon us? We cannot shut our eyes to contradictions. We cannot throw aside the laws of thought. We prefer rather to see the truth than by majority votes be counted among the orthodox. We shall be true to the divine laws of reasoning even if that reasoning convicts the last General Assembly of error.

The number of such instances as I have given above might be increased to an indefinite extent, extending over a large part of the Old Testament and the New Testament. We are all reluctant to acknowledge errors in Holy Scripture. We acknowledge them only when we are compelled so to do by evidence that cannot honestly be gainsaid. But we refuse to accept the modern dogma of inerrancy. In no creed of Christendom is it taught. It has never received the official stamp of any Church unless you suppose that the last General Assembly used such a stamp in its deliverance last May. If the Presbyterian Church should be induced, either by a revision of the Confession or by a decision in a judicial case, to make such a dogma the official doctrine of the Presbyterian Church, our Church would be cut off from historic Christendom, and become a mere sect, bearing no longer the historical name of Calvinism, for they would thereby declare Calvin a heretic; no more the historical name of Presbyterian, because they would thereby separate from Westminster Presbyterianism and the Presbyterian Churches of the rest of the world. They might take the name of an old sect and call themselves Scripturalists—but they would insensibly become by a necessary process of degradation mere Bibliolaters.

You are now to determine in the fear of God whether I am guilty of this Charge or not. I have shown you that I subscribe to all the statements of the Confession and of Holy Scripture in the passages cited to sustain the Charge. I have shown you that there is no inconsistency between the doctrine that there are errors in the Scriptures as I explain them and the statements of Confession and Scripture. You cannot convict me on the ground of Confession or Scripture. You can only convict me on the ground of a deliverance of the Assembly at Portland, or of some dogmatic theory in your minds. If you

should do this you will violate the constitution of the Presbyterian Church, break faith with me, and sear your own consciences before God.

VI

THE AUTHENTICITY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

CHARGE IV. reads as follows:

"The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., being a Minister of the said Church and a member of the Presbytery of New York, with teaching that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch, which is contrary to direct statements of Holy Scripture and to the essential doctrines of the Standards of the said Church, that the Holy Scripture evidences itself to be the word of God by the consent of all the parts, and that the infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself."

It is evident to any one who takes the pains to compare the Charge with Specification 6th of the first Charge in the original Charges and Specifications, that the prosecution have changed their base. The prosecution originally proposed to prove that Dr. Briggs' assertion, "that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch," was a fact which sustained the Charge that he taught "doctrines which conflict irreconcilably with and are contrary to the cardinal doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures and contained in the Standards of the Presbyterian Church, that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the only infallible rule of faith and practice." This charge they have abandoned and propose to prove that the "teaching that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch" is "contrary to direct statements of Holy Scripture and to the essential doctrines of the Standards of the Presbyterian Church. (1) 'That the Holy Scripture evidences itself' to be 'the word of God' 'by the consent of all the parts,' and (2) that 'the infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself.'" Here are two charges which you have decided to try together, but to vote upon separately.

Let me call attention to two principles established at an earlier stage in my argument.

(1) It is not sufficient to point to direct statements of Holy Scripture, unless the Church has already defined that these statements are *direct*, or it is agreed by the parties that they are direct. I shall show you later on that there are no such *direct* statements of Holy Scripture. But even if I should fail in such proof, it is plain that the Church has not defined these so-called direct statements of Holy Scripture in the Westminster Standards, and therefore it is not lawful to use them as evidence of an essential and necessary article of the Confession of Faith.

(2) It is not sufficient for the prosecution to claim that a doctrine is an essential doctrine of the Westminster Standards. They may claim anything and everything. It is necessary for them to prove their claim. The court have doubtless noticed that the prosecution have made no attempt in their argument to present such proof. They have made no use of these passages of our Confession whatever. On this account I ask that you rule Charges IV. and V. out of court as entirely destitute of proof. But I shall find it convenient to use these passages of the Confession myself and turn them against the prosecutors. I admit that two doctrines of our Standards are "that the Holy Scripture evidences itself to be the word of God by the consent of all the parts" and "the infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself." But I deny that the clause "consent of all the parts" is an essential doctrine. I am glad, however, that the question has been raised at this very point, because upon its solution will depend a question of conscience which is likely to emerge ere long for many Presbyterian ministers.

The internal evidences given in Section V., Chapter I., to prove that Holy Scripture is the word of God are: (1) heavenliness of the matter; (2) efficacy of the doctrine; (3) majesty of the style; (4) consent of all the parts; (5) the scope of the whole (which is to give all glory to God); (6) the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation; (7) the many other incomparable excellences; (8) and the entire perfection thereof.

The questions which arise are: (1) Are all of these eight evidences essential doctrines of the Westminster Confession? (2) If not, is there any especial reason why "consent of all the parts" should be deemed essential rather than other evidences? (3) If any or all of the evidences are essential doctrines of our Standards, will the new evidences which are proposed by overture from the General Assembly as additions to these evidences and indeed as the first and second in the order, namely, (1) "the truthfulness of the history and (2) the faithful witness of prophecy and miracle," be essential doctrines of our Standards? Let us consider the latter question first.

If this revision should be adopted by a vote of two-thirds of the Presbyteries, such a vote would determine that these evidences are regarded by the Church as of sufficient importance to assert them at the beginning of the catalogue. If then any of the eight evidences are regarded as essential, these two new evidences could claim to be essential on the ground that the Presbyterian Church by a decisive vote had added them to the eight. If this should be so, those of us who cannot agree to these two new evidences would be compelled to retire from the Presbyterian Church, because we cannot subscribe to them. This is probably the underlying motive in those who have advocated this revision. They desire to use them as a purge to the Presbyterian Church. If therefore you recognize that the clause "consent of all the parts" is an essential article of the Confession, we shall be obliged to conclude that the proposed additions to the first chapter will also become essential articles, if adopted. In that case I suggest that the simplest way in which the Higher Critics can be purged from the Church is by the adoption of this revision, and by the decision of the supreme court of the Church of this simple question, whether "consent of all the parts" is an essential article of our Confession. Let no one misunderstand me. I agree to the proposition that "the consent of all the parts" of Holy Scripture is a fact attested by a scientific study of the Bible. I also agree that this fact and the other facts adduced in the Confession are evidences that Scripture is the word of God. I also agree to the fact of "the truthfulness of the history" and "the faithful witness of prophecy and miracle;" but I do not and I cannot

agree that these latter are internal evidences that the Scripture is the word of God. It is not the facts that are in question. It is whether these facts are valid evidences for Holy Scripture. I maintain that if the "consent of all the parts" be an essential article of faith as an evidence that the Scripture is the word of God, then it will be claimed, if the revision succeed, that "the truthfulness of the history and the faithful witness of prophecy and miracle" are essential articles as evidences that the Scripture is the word of God; and all who cannot subscribe to these evidences will be obliged to retire from the Presbyterian Church.

The second question is easily answered according to the principles already laid down. (*a*) There is no special reason why "consent of all the parts" should be regarded as more essential than any of the other evidences, *e.g.* "heavenliness of the matter, efficacy of the doctrine, the scope of the whole, the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's salvation, and the entire perfection thereof." (*b*) There is no passage of Holy Scripture given in the Westminster Confession or cited by the prosecution in support of this phrase, "consent of all the parts," and therefore it cannot be regarded as essential. (*c*) It might be removed from the Confession without destroying the argument from internal evidence. It is not essential to the argument. It is not used in all of the Puritan arguments from the internal evidence. It is one of many evidences which may or may not be stated as occasion requires. (*d*) This evidence is not in the Shorter Catechism and therefore not essential.

We have finally to answer the question whether all of these eight evidences are essential articles of faith as evidences.

(*a*) We might easily show that the eight are not of equal validity as evidences. They must be ranged in order of weight of evidence. They are not an exhaustive list. They constitute a useful list in a chain of probable evidence. (*b*) Five of them are given in the Larger Catechism, but three are omitted. None of them are given in the Shorter Catechism. (*c*) We claim that none of them are essential because the Confession expressly gives them as probable evidence, sufficient "abundantly to evidence," 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." This divine evidence is essential, this alone is essential, this alone is an essential article of faith in evidence of Holy Scripture.

Therefore, the claim of the prosecution in their Charge, that it is an essential doctrine of the Standards of our Church, "that the Holy Scripture evidences itself to be the word of God by the consent of all the parts," cannot be maintained. You cannot recognize this claim wthout putting the Presbyterian Church in grave peril, especially in view of the proposed revision of the first chapter of our Confession.

If this court should still resist my arguments and hold that "consent of all the parts" is an essential article of our creed, then let me say that although I deny that it is an essential doctrine, I yet agree to the doctrine itself. But I fail to see in what respect the doctrine that Moses did not write the Pentateuch contravenes the doctrine of the "consent of all the parts" of Holy Scripture, or the doctrine that "the infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself." I am sure that I hold these three doctrines. It may be that the prosecution can convince you that I am inconsistent in holding these doctrines. But they have not thus far ventured to make such an argument, and if they had done so they could not do away with the fact that I do hold these doctrines. You will then have to apply the law of the supreme court in the Craighead case that—

"No man can rightly be convicted of heresy by inference or implication; that is, we must not charge an accused person with holding those consequences which may legitimately flow from his assertions. Many men are grossly inconsistent with themselves; and while it is right, in argument, to overthrow false opinions, by tracing them in their connections and consequences, it is not right to charge any man with an opinion which he disavows" (Craighead Case, Minutes of the General Assembly, 1824, p. 122).

You cannot convict me in the face of this decision of the General Assembly.

But let us rise above these legal aspects of the case to the merits of the question. The Confession teaches that "the infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself." Accordingly we must resort to Holy Scripture for the infallible

interpretation of the question whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch or not. To that we agree, and to that rule we shall resort so soon as preliminary questions can be settled.

Granting that there is "consent of all the parts" of Holy Scripture, it is our duty to determine what that consent is. This we shall use every effort to determine. But it is evident to the court at the outset that there is an irreconcilable difference of opinion between the parties who propose to resort to the same tribunal and to seek the same guidance. They try to prove to you that Holy Scripture tells us that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. I, on the other hand, will present to you indubitable evidence that "the consent of all the parts" of Holy Scripture, and the interpretation of Scripture which is given by Scripture itself, force the conclusion that Moses did not write the Pentateuch. The argument is therefore reduced to the Scriptural argument. But we are confronted at the outset by the principle already established, that the Church has not officially determined the interpretation of these passages of Holy Scripture, and that you cannot by a majority vote in the Presbytery decide which is the correct interpretation. The constitution of the Church forces you to decide by the interpretation of Scripture given in the Confession and to limit your decisions within the strict lines of its decisions. To depart from them and judge me by the interpretation of those passages of Scripture by a majority vote of the Presbytery will violate the constitution of the Church and all the precedents of ecclesiastical process.

Before proceeding to the evidence from Holy Scripture, let me confront a preliminary dogmatic objection which is current in our Church. It seemed to me that it was the underlying motive in the mind of the prosecution in the original form of the Charge and its Specification, when they represented that the doctrine that Moses was not the author of the Pentateuch "conflicts irreconcilably with and is contrary to the cardinal doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures and contained in the Standards of the Presbyterian Church, that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the only infallible rule of faith and practice."

I grant that there is a bridge by which it has been proposed to cross the chasm between these two statements, "Moses is not

the author of the Pentateuch" and "The Holy Scriptures are the only infallible rule of faith and practice;" and that this is probably the bridge in the mind of a few members of this court, namely, that an infallible rule of faith and practice can only come from well-known prophets and apostles. But this bridge is an airy structure which will not bear the strain that it is proposed to put upon it. It yields to the slightest touch of the breath of criticism and lets its users fall into a gulf of absurdities. And even if it were a sound logical bridge, it is not a Westminster bridge, or a Biblical bridge, and therefore no Presbyterian minister is bound to cross it. Let us test it before we cross it.

It is first necessary to show that no one but a well-known prophet can write a divine rule of faith and practice. It is next necessary to show that Moses is the only well-known prophet who could have written the Pentateuch.

Irenæus says: "God inspired Esdras the priest to recast all the words of the former prophets and to re-establish with the people the Mosaic legislation." If Ezra can be shown to be responsible for our present Pentateuch, is he not as truly a well-known Biblical and inspired man and as capable of producing a rule of faith and practice as Moses? It is evident that even if the author of the Pentateuch must have been some well-known prophet, it does not follow that the divine authority of the Pentateuch stands or falls with the name of Moses.

But is it true that an infallible rule of faith and practice can only come from these holy penmen whose names history has preserved for us? That is the view of an eminent divine and possibly the prosecution share it. This divine says: "If, as one asserts, 'the great mass of the Old Testament was written by authors whose names are lost in oblivion,' it was written by uninspired men." . . . "This would be the inspiration of indefinite persons like Tom, Dick, and Harry, whom nobody knows, and not of definite historical persons like Moses and David, Matthew and John, chosen by God by name and known to men" ("Observer," April 16, 1891). The author of these words may be able to convince you that his theory is the true theory. But what right have you under our constitution to impose this dogma upon me? It is not stated in the Confession

of Faith. It is not given in Holy Scripture. No Christian Church has ever taught it. It is a doctrine of recent times. Modern dogmaticians invented it to use it in the establishment of their theory of the canon of Holy Scripture. They had abandoned the doctrine of the canon taught by the reformers and in the Westminster Confession, and they devised this erroneous doctrine in its place. As I stated some time ago:

"The Reformers found the essence of the authority of the Scriptures in the Scriptures themselves and not in traditional theories about them. Hence they were not anxious about human authorship. Luther denied the Apocalypse to John and Ecclesiastes to Solomon. He regarded Jude as an extract from Second Peter. He said: 'What matters it if Moses should not himself have written the Pentateuch?' He thought that the epistle to the Hebrews was written by a disciple of the apostle Paul, who was a learned man, and made the epistle as a sort of composite piece in which there are some things hard to be reconciled with the gospel. Calvin denied the Pauline authorship of the epistle to the Hebrews, and doubted the Petrine authorship of Second Peter. He held that Ezra or some one else edited the Psalter. He regarded Malachi as a pseudonym for Ezra. The great Reformers found no difficulty in recognizing anonymous and pseudonymous writings in the canon of Scripture" ("Whither?" pp. 87, 88).

Will you follow Calvin or Dr. Shedd, the Reformers or the Hodges, Westminster theology or Princeton theology? Look at the gulf into which these dogmaticians are leading the Presbyterian Church ere you cross their bridge.

Modern Biblical criticism has shattered the traditional theories of the authorship of the Biblical books. Is it a safe position to risk the canonicity and divine authority of every one of these books upon your ability to convince yourselves and others that they were written by well-known apostles and prophets? Look at the facts of the case. (1) Who wrote the book of *Job?* What Biblical scholar at the present time would hazard his reputation on the statement that Moses wrote it? The school of Delitzsch put its composition in the age of Solomon, but the earliest date thought of in the present state of critical opinion is in the reign of Josiah. By common consent the writing is anonymous. Are we obliged to cast it out of the canon on that account? Listen to the wise words of Dr. A. B. Davidson, the prince of Old Testament scholars in Scotland, professor in a Presbyterian College in Edinburgh:

"As to the author of the book we are in complete ignorance. He has been supposed to be Job himself, Elihu, Moses, Solomon, Heman the Ezrahite, author of Ps. lxxxviii., Isaiah, Hezekiah, author of the hymn Is. xxxviii., Baruch, the friend of Jeremiah, and who not? There are some minds that cannot put up with uncertainty, and are under the necessity of deluding themselves into quietude by fixing on some known name. There are others to whom it is a comfort to think that in this omniscient age a few things still remain mysterious. Uncertainty is to them more suggestive than exact knowledge. No literature has so many great anonymous works as that of Israel. The religious life of this people was at certain periods very intense, and at these periods the spiritual energy of the nation expressed itself almost impersonally, through men who forgot themselves and were speedily forgotten in name by others" (Davidson's "Job," p. lxviii).

Will you vote a dogma which makes Professor Davidson a heretic?

(2) Take the book of *Ecclesiastes*. No Hebrew scholar can possibly suppose that it was written by Solomon, because the Hebrew in which this book is composed is the latest in the old Testament. As Delitzsch says: There could be no history of the Hebrew language if Ecclesiastes could be Solomonic. Will you vote all the great Hebrew scholars of the world heretics because they tell you that Koheleth is a pseudonym, and that we do not know its author?

(3) Take the book of *Samuel*. Professor Kirkpatrick, Regius professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge, says:

"It is generally agreed that the book is a compilation from different sources, but who was the compiler, there is no evidence to show."

Will you rule Professor Kirkpatrick out from among the orthodox because he cannot accept the old Jewish tradition that Samuel was the author of books the most part of which relate to events which transpired long after his death?

(4) Consider the books of *Chronicles*, *Ezra*, and *Nehemiah*. Modern scholars regard them as one connected work. Canon Driver, Regius professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford, says:

"A date shortly after B.C. 332 is thus the earliest to which the composition of the Chronicles can be plausibly assigned; and it is that which is adopted by most modern critics. From the character of his narrative

it is a probable inference that the author was a Levite, perhaps even a member of the temple choir" (p. 487).

Will you adopt a dogma that will exclude Canon Driver from orthodoxy because he cannot accept the discredited tradition that Ezra was the author of all these books?

(5) Consider the *Psalter*. What scholar at the present day could possibly hold to the old tradition that it was written by David, or that the titles are inspired? Listen to Bishop Perowne:

"The conclusion, then, at which we arrive here, is the same as in the case of the alleged authorship of certain Psalms. The Inscriptions cannot always be relied on. They are sometimes genuine, and really represent the most ancient tradition. At other times they are due to the caprice of later editors and collectors, the fruits of conjecture, or of dimmer and more uncertain traditions. In short, the Inscriptions of the Psalms are like the Subscriptions to the Epistles of the New Testament. They are not of any necessary authority, and their value must be weighed and tested by the usual critical processes" (Perowne's "Psalms," p. 103).

Doubtless some of you cannot reconcile this statement with your dogmatic theory of the Bible. But Biblical scholars have no difficulty because they construct their doctrine of the Bible from the Bible itself. They do not accept it from dogmaticians. Those of you who have been accustomed to associate the 22d Psalm with the name of David may stumble at the words of the Bishop of Worcester, when he says "that the Psalm was composed by one of the exiles during the Babylonian captivity" (p. 44); but if the Bishop is correct in his opinion, it is better for you to stumble and fall into truth, than to go right on in the smooth and easy road of error.

(6) Dr. Wright, of the University of London, says with reference to Proverbs: "The whole book was in ancient times regarded as the work of Solomon. The phenomena of the book, however, prove it to be of various authorship" ("Introduction to the Old Testament," p. 162); and with reference to the Song of Songs: "The opinion of the older critics, that the Song of Songs describes dialogues between Solomon and an espoused bride, is untenable." You may be troubled by these various authors of Proverbs and the dramatic poet, whose name has not been preserved to us, who wrote that wonderful drama of love; but

these unknown authors trouble you because of your false theory. They do not trouble Dr. Wright, nor do they trouble me. Use the theory we are opposing as a bridge and you will find that it will not bear your weight. If you try to study the literary phenomena of Holy Scripture on this bridge, you will be obliged to throw over one book after another of your Bible, and you will probably lose your own balance in the agony of unloading and go over yourself into the gulf of unbelief. Many a man has had this experience. I doubt whether any fresh and honest mind can escape it, if he attempt to cross the bridge of the dogmaticians.

I might go over the entire Old Testament and show that, according to the consensus of the Old Testament scholars of the world, the exact truth was stated in my Inaugural, when it was said:

"It may be regarded as the certain result of the science of the Higher Criticism that Moses did not write the Pentateuch or Job; Ezra did not write the Chronicles, Ezra, or Nehemiah; Jeremiah did not write the Kings or Lamentations. David did not write the Psalter, but only a few of the Psalms; Solomon did not write the Song of Songs or Ecclesiastes, and only a portion of the Proverbs; Isaiah did not write half of the book that bears his name. The great mass of the Old Testament was written by authors whose names or connection with their writings are lost in oblivion. If this is destroying the Bible, the Bible is destroyed already. But who tells us that these traditional names were the authors of the Bible? The Bible itself? The creeds of the Church? Any reliable historical testimony? None of these! Pure, conjectural tradition! Nothing more! We are not prepared to build our faith for time and eternity upon such uncertainties as these. We desire to know whether the Bible came from God, and it is not of any great importance that we should know the names of those worthies chosen by God to mediate His revelation" (p. 33).

The specimens given from the Old Testament have their parallels in the New Testament. As I have already said:

"(*a*) It is probable that the gospel of Mark was written under the influence of Peter, and the gospel of Luke under the influence of Paul, but there is no evidence that the apostles superintended the writing and publication of these gospels, and it is not certain that they had very much to do with them. Are we to reject these gospels because there is uncertainty as to apostolic superintendence and influence?

"(*b*) The consensus of criticism is against the Pauline authorship of

the epistle to the Hebrews. There is no probability that Paul or any other apostle had anything to do with it. Does this destroy its canonicity?

"(*c*) It is not certain that Matthew wrote the present gospel of Matthew. A large number of the best evangelical critics hold that the real Matthew was the Aramaic Logia at the basis of the gospel, and that our present Matthew is made up chiefly by the use of the original Matthew and the gospel of Mark by a later evangelist. Does the canonicity of Matthew depend on this question?

"(*d*) The gospel of John, after a long and severe contest, is generally acknowledged by critics to be from the hand of the apostle. It is most probable that the apostle John wrote it, but this is not certain. Is a Christian scholar to be compelled to deny its canonicity if he doubts whether John really wrote it?

"It is evident, if the elder and younger Hodge are correct in their theory of inspiration, that a very large portion of the Bible is in peril from the Higher Criticism, and that the only way to save the Bible is to destroy the 'higher critics.' Doubtless many excellent scholars and pious men in the Protestant churches really have this opinion; and that is one of the gravest perils of the present situation. These dogmaticians are responsible for this state of things by the error they have made in making inspiration and canonicity dependent upon authenticity" ("Whither?" pp. 84-86).

It is possible that a majority of this court may agree with this modern dogma about the Bible which I am opposing. But would you make it an essential and necessary article of faith in our Church? Are you prepared to array our Church against the Biblical scholars of the world? Are you resolved at all hazards to stem the onrushing tide of Biblical criticism? If this is your determination, then your legal course is plain. Prepare a memorial to the General Assembly requesting them to send down overtures to the Presbyteries for an amendment of the Confession so as to state this dogma as an essential and necessary article. Let us, as honorable men, meet the issue and decide it—as we decide other questions of revision. But do not try to decide such a momentous question by indirection. Do not read into the Confession a dogma which the Westminster divines never dreamed of. As honorable Christian gentlemen try me by the Confession. You cannot honorably try me by a new dogma, forged in a modern school of theology and used as a substitute for the Westminster doctrine. If you should do such a thing, think you that the counterfeit will not be exposed to the Christian world? You would dash our Church to pieces

against the roaring waves of an outraged scholarship and an affronted Christianity.

The whole case of the prosecution, therefore, rests upon the passages from Holy Scripture. But they have no right to use any passages of Holy Scripture which the Church has not used in formulating an essential and necessary article of the Westminster Confession. Therefore they have no right to use these passages at all in their prosecution. They have no proof of any proposition in the Charge. They have no legal case against me. You are obliged in law to dismiss it.

But inasmuch as these questions of the Higher Criticism are burning questions of our times, and it may be difficult to hold the judges to a strictly legal view of this case, I shall test all the texts of Holy Scripture offered by the prosecution and show you that they do not prove that Moses wrote the Pentateuch; and then I shall show you by indubitable evidence that Holy Scripture teaches that Moses did not write the Pentateuch.

I submit in printed form, that it may be read by the court, "Who Wrote the Pentateuch? or, The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch." Taking it as read I say:

We have gone over all the proofs from Holy Scripture presented by the prosecution to establish the traditional theory of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. We have found them insufficient and invalid. We have indeed considered more than thrice as many passages as they have presented. If anything capable of being used as a proof has been omitted we do not know it.

I might have asked you to close the case with this refutation. But I was not content, in the present state of opinion in the Presbyterian Church, to leave the case in this form. The work of the Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch has reached such substantial results as to appeal to every honest mind to accept them. It is not negative in its results, it is positive. It is not destructive, it is constructive. It gives vastly more precious doctrine and vastly better history than it takes away. It no longer occupies a defensive attitude. It is aggressive and is sure of erelong convincing evangelical America, as it has

already convinced the rest of the world. Therefore I have given you a sketch of the history of opinion on the authorship of the Pentateuch, and I have presented the argument upon which we rely to prove that Moses did not write the Pentateuch. These you have before you in printed form, in the volume entitled "Who Wrote the Pentateuch? or, The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch." Taking this part of my argument as read, let me say that it is necessary that you should weigh the evidence well which is adduced in this argument ere you make a decision upon this important question. It may be that many of you will be unable to make a decision on the merits of the case. If you cannot, you must give me the benefit of the doubt. You cannot vote me guilty of teaching error when I say that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, unless you are convinced that it is an error. Furthermore, if in your opinion it be an error, is it an essential error? Does it contravene any essential and necessary article of the Westminster Confession? Is it an error that impairs the Westminster system of doctrine? If it does not, you cannot condemn me even if you should think the error a serious one from your point of view. You must judge me by the Westminster Confession, not by your private opinion, not by the opinion of any other person in whose judgment you may have more confidence than you have in me.

VII

WHO WROTE ISAIAH?

CHARGE V.:

"The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., being a Minister of the said Church and a member of the Presbytery of New York, with teaching that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name, which is contrary to direct statements of Holy Scripture and to the essential doctrines of the Standards of the said Church that the Holy Scripture evidences itself to be the word of God by the consent of all the parts, and that the infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself."

We have already discussed under the previous Charge all the preliminary questions which arise with reference to this Charge. For the Charges do not differ in their statement of the doctrines of the Confession which it is claimed are in conflict with my teachings, but only in the statement of that special part of my teachings which is in conflict with the Confession. There it was the doctrine that Moses did not write the Pentateuch; here it is the doctrine that Isaiah did not write half of the book that bears his name. We have shown that the Westminster Standards do not directly or indirectly determine the question of the authorship of the Pentateuch. It is equally clear that they do not directly or indirectly determine the authorship of the book of Isaiah. We may therefore go at once to the evidence of the "consent of all the parts" and "the infallible interpretation of Scripture given by Scripture itself."

It is noteworthy at the outset that no evidence whatever is presented from the Old Testament. If, as the prosecution claim, Isaiah wrote all of the book that bears his name, and Isaiah lived and wrote in the age of Hezekiah in the midst of the literary and historical development of Israel, is it not very remarkable that they should find no evidence from the literature and history of the Old Testament in support of their thesis? I shall endeavor to supply this lack and to show you that there is a great mass of evidence in the Old Testament to show that "Isaiah did not write half the book that bears his name."

But first let me call your attention to the fact that the earliest rabbinical authority to which we have access does not attribute the book of Isaiah to Isaiah as its exclusive author. In the Baba Bathra, it is said: "Hezekiah and his company wrote Isaiah, Proverbs, Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes." This probably implies editorship rather than authorship. But the association of Isaiah with Proverbs in connection with the so-called college of Hezekiah implies at least editorial work on the part of that college in connection with Isaiah as well as with Proverbs, and so far impairs the integrity of the book and raises the question what share Isaiah had in the book and what share this college had in it.

This theory of the composition of Isaiah was probably due to the circumstance which the most superficial student can

hardly fail to notice, that there are four historical chapters in the middle of the book (xxxvi.–xxxix.) which were doubtless taken from the book of Kings, with which they agree, except for minor editorial changes and the insertion of the song of Hezekiah. These chapters, depending on the book of Kings, must have been given their present position some time after the composition of the book of Kings. It was easy for the ancient rabbins to think that the college of Hezekiah wrote this section of the book of Kings on the theory of a succession of prophets each contributing a part of the histories until they were all completed; but no modern scholar could entertain such a theory. These chapters imply, to any one who understands the composition of the book of Kings, an exilic or post-exilic editor who gave them their present place.

It is also of some consequence to notice the order of the prophets in the most ancient list of the sacred books, namely, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and the Twelve. The later Gemara or commentary upon this early Beraitha shows that later rabbins were troubled by this arrangement. The question is raised: "How is it? Isaiah was before Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Ought Isaiah to be placed before at the head?" It is answered: "Since the book of Kings ends in ruin, and Jeremiah is all of it ruin, and Ezekiel has its beginning ruin and its end comfort, we join ruin to ruin and comfort to comfort." It is possible that some of you may be satisfied with this explanation. And yet you should not blame me if I conclude that their order was due to an early traditional consciousness that Isaiah was a collection of writings rather than, like Jeremiah and Ezekiel, the work of a single author, and that therefore it was more appropriately placed after Ezekiel and before the collection of the twelve minor prophets. At least there was a consciousness that Isaiah had to do with the restoration from exile, and therefore that it more naturally followed Ezekiel than preceded Jeremiah. In later times when this primitive tradition was lost and the explanation of the Gemara was followed, the Massorites adopted the order, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, which we now follow. When now we look at the book of Isaiah, we see that the ancient rabbins were entirely correct in their arrangement; for the longest and most magnificent prophecy in the Old Testament is

given in the last twenty-seven chapters of the book. This great prophecy and several lesser anonymous prophecies have for their theme the destruction of Babylon and the restoration of the Jews. Accordingly one feels that the logical order is certainly Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Isaiah, and the question springs into the mind, and it cannot be restrained, Was not that the chronological order likewise?

It does not seem reasonable to suppose that an exilic or post-exilic editor would insert the four historical chapters in the midst of the prophecies of Isaiah. He would append the historical chapters to the prophecies if those prophecies had indeed come down to him in a book bearing the name of Isaiah. He would not tamper with its structure. If, however, we suppose that this editor did not have before him a book of Isaiah's prophecies containing all these prophecies, and that the editor collected all these prophecies and issued them in the form in which we now find them, how do we know that he edited them as Isaiah's prophecies? How do we know that he did not edit them as a collection of prophecies, giving those of Isaiah first and afterward others of other unknown prophets?

The title at the beginning of the book of Isaiah is as follows:

"The vision of Isaiah the son of Amos, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem, in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah."

This is appropriate to the first collection I.–XI., but certainly has no propriety of reference to the second collection of messages to the nations or to the other and later parts of the book; and then again we have no clew to the historical value of this title. It has been shown, many times, that the titles of the Psalms and of other portions of the Old Testament writings are often mere conjectures of late scribes, and that these are not to be considered as a part of the inspired Scriptures. But whatever we may think of this matter, this title does not cover the whole of the present book, as its contents show.

The great prophecy in the last twenty-seven chapters bears no title: it is anonymous. There is nothing about it, therefore, to indicate that its editor or original author designed that it should be regarded as by Isaiah. Is it not the more natural supposition that this great prophecy was at first apart by itself

and that the collection originally closed with the four historical chapters; and that in the first arrangement of the second division of the canon into the four prophetic histories and the four prophetic writings, as the twelve were grouped into one book, so the prophecy of the Great Unknown was joined to the collection of prophecies embracing the first thirty-nine chapters of Isaiah so as to make the four books as nearly as possible equal in size? Let me give you a general statement of this wonderful prophecy.

I.—The Prophecy, Isaiah xl.-lxvi.

Isaiah xl.-lxvi. is a book of comfort, cheering the exiles of Israel with the promise of the advent of Yahweh to redeem them from bondage and restore them to their holy land. It is a further unfolding of Jeremiah's book of comfort. The apocalypse of Isaiah xxxiv., xxxv. is its prelude, but it differs from that apocalypse in that the order of judgment and redemption is inverted. The judgment of the nations is separated from the judgment of Babylon, and is associated with the new Jerusalem in a final conflict there after the model of Ezekiel. This is given in the appendix to the prophecy, and does not enter into the unfolding of its great theme. The prophecy itself is rather a presentation of the glories of redemption. The author stands on the loftiest peak of prophecy. He masses more Messianic predictions in his book than any of the prophets that preceded him. He carries the Messianic idea to a much higher stage of development, so that he becomes the evangelical prophet, who seems to be the nearest to the Messiah and the theology of the new Covenant. The circumstances of the exile were favorable to this. It is doubtful whether it was possible for a prophet living in the land of Israel, in the use of the ceremonial of the temple of Solomon, or the temple of Zerubbabel, to attain those profound spiritual conceptions of God and divine things that pervade the whole of this sublime poem. Even Ezekiel was too near the old temple to escape altogether from the influence of its institutions. But the prophecy of the Great Unknown reflects the experience of a prophet who had lived long in exile. To him the worship of Yahweh consists in prayer and fasting, in

observance of the Sabbath, and keeping pure from the abominations of the heathen.* By these more spiritual religious exercises the faithful people of God could testify their attachment to the religion of their fathers, without any sacred places or sacred institutions. They were thereby brought into closer communion with their God, when priestly mediation and ceremonial access were out of the question.

This marvellous prophecy is certainly in its present form a single composition, and yet it is difficult to show any close connection between its parts. Many of them can be removed without disturbing the flow of its thought and emotion. There is indeed a lack of connection in several places that has attracted the attention of critics, and has led to the conjecture that the prophet uses several more ancient prophecies. This should not surprise us, for it is characteristic of the writers of the period to use older prophets. There are not a few citations from earlier writings that are evident.† These examples suggest that there are others that are not so evident, but that may be detected by the methods of literary criticism.

The prophecy is divided into three sections of nine chapters each by the refrains,‡ xlviii. 22, lvii. 20, 21, lxvi. 24.

But these refrains are more suited to the last chapter than to the body of the prophecy. We should expect that the refrains of the prophecy would emphasize rather its great theme. A closer examination of the piece discloses just such refrains as we should expect in xlii. 14–17, xlviii. 20–22, lii. 11, 12, lvii. 14–21, lxii. 10–12. These all involve the divine advent and the deliverance from Babylon.

The last of these refrains corresponds so closely with the introduction to the prophecy xl. 1–12 that we may regard it as the original conclusion. This is in accord with other peculiarities of the closing section. The little piece, lxiii. 1–6, is of earlier date. It has no sort of connection with its present context. And the section lxiii. 7–lxvi. betrays a later period of composition and a different train of thought from that which pervades the body of the prophecy. The division of the

*See especially Isa. lii. 11, lvi. 1–8, lviii., lxvi. 17.

†See Isa. li. 11, lxv. 25.

‡See Delitzsch, "Isaiah," ii. p. 129.

prophecy into three parts seems to have come from the final arrangement when the appendix was added.

A careful examination of the body of the prophecy discloses other features that show earlier and later sections. There are differences in rhythm—trimeters, pentameters, and hexameters.* These differences might have been designed to give variety of movement to a poem of such great length. But there are certain facts that seem to imply that the trimeters were originally a prophecy by itself. The introduction, the conclusion, and the intervening refrains have the longer movement. If there be a difference in date, the trimeters must be earlier than the framework of the prophecy that incloses them. There are also several long pieces of the pentameter movement and lyrics in the hexameter movement. But there are several other important differences, among which we may mention—(1) That the great theme of the trimeters is the divine advent for the deliverance of the servant of Yahweh, and that in the pentameters and hexameters the wife and mother, Zion, takes the place of the servant in a parallel representation; (2) that the great conqueror who is to be the divine instrument in the deliverance of Israel is referred to in the trimeters in general terms, but in the other part of the poem is named by his name, Cyrus;† (3) that the pentameters use quite frequently the divine name 'Adonay Yahweh. It seems to me, therefore, that there was an earlier prophecy with the trimeter movement, whose great theme was the divine deliverance of the servant of Yahweh, and that this was taken up into a larger prophecy in a second edition and associated with a parallel theme, the divine deliverance of Zion, the wife of Yahweh.

The trimeter poem that constitutes the original basis of the prophecy of the Great Unknown seems to have had its own divi-

---

* "It is not always easy to distinguish hexameters from trimeters, for he cæsura of the hexameter usually falls in the middle of the line dividng it into two trimeters. But they may be distinguished in part by the occurrence of the cæsura sometimes after the second accent and sometimes after the fourth accent; and in part by the fact that the second half of the hexameter line is complementary to the first" ("Biblical Study," p. 283).

† Isa. xliv. 28, xlv. 1; comp. xlvi. 11.

sions. We may distinguish five parts: (1) xl. 12–xli. 10, xli. 13–xlii. 13; (2) xlii. 18–xliv. 23; (3) xlviii. 1–11, xlix. 1–13; (4) lii. 13, liii., lv.; (5) lviii.–lix., lxi. These parts close with little hymns or pieces of similar character. The theme of these trimeters is the deliverance of the servant of Yahweh.

The second edition of the prophecy is a book of comfort to Zion, who is personified and represented as the wife of Yahweh and the mother of its inhabitants. The introduction, the conclusion, and the four intermediate refrains, together with the several pieces with which they are connected, all set forth the same theme. The advent of Yahweh is at hand. He comes to comfort Zion and restore her wastes. His people are to go forth from Babylon and pass through the wilderness to the Holy Land. The scenes of the exodus from Egypt are to be transcended in marvellous transformations of nature and by the wonders of the divine guidance. Zion is the central figure of this second edition of the prophecy, as the servant of Yahweh is the chief feature of the first edition.

The prophecy of the Great Unknown was finally issued with an appendix embracing chaps. lxiii.–lxvi. This is composed of one little piece of trimeter poetry of an early date, already considered in an appropriate place, and two larger pieces of longer rhythm. The earlier of these, chaps. lxiii. 7, lxiv., is a lamentation and supplication. The latter, chaps. lxv., lxvi., is apocalyptic in character, resembling those apocalypses that we have considered at the opening of this chapter. The judgment is here a discrimination between the righteous and the wicked without regard to nationality.

The internal evidences for the exilic composition of this great prophecy are overwhelming.

(1) *The argument from language.*

This is so well presented by Canon Driver in his "Isaiah, His Life and Times," that I beg leave to call your attention to his word lists. He gives thirty-seven items of words and phrases of the Isaiah of the age of Hezekiah and thirty-one items of words and phrases of the Great Unknown, which show unmistakably that these are not only different writers, but writers far apart in time.

I shall mention a few of the more striking examples.

As Driver says, the figure of "Yahweh's hand 'stretched out' or 'swung' over the earth, and bearing consternation with it," is applied by Isaiah with singular picturesqueness and force: v. 25; ix. 11, 16, 20; x. 4; xiv. 26, 27; xxiii. 11; xxxi. 3; xi. 15; xix. 16. It is used so often as to be characteristic.

The Great Unknown uses often the "Arm of Yahweh:" xl. 11; xxviii. 14; li. 5, a and b, 9; lii. 10; liii. 1; lix. 16 b (cf. xl. 10); lxii. 8; lxiii. 5, 12. It is one of his characteristics. This last is used in Isaiah only in xxx. 30; xxxiii. 2.

(2) אדני as a divine name is used in Isaiah nineteen times, but in the Great Unknown only in xlix. 14, and here apparently not as a divine name, but as an address—my lord. אדני יהוה צבאות is used eight times in Isaiah, but is not in the Great Unknown. יהוה צבאות appears thirty-three times in Isaiah, but only six times in the Great Unknown. האדון יהוה צבאות is characteristic of Isaiah: i. 24; iii. 1; x. 33; xix. 4 (אֲדֹנָי x. 16 in common M. T.; not Massora, doubtless scrib. error), but is not used by the Great Unknown. אדני יהוה is used in the Great Unknown fourteen times, but in Isaiah only in vii. 7; xxviii. 16; xxx. 15. The usage of Isaiah agrees with Amos, whereas the Great Unknown agrees in usage with Ezekiel. *Elohim* alone is used but once in Isaiah and *Elohim* with suffixes four times. But in the Great Unknown *Elohim* is used nine times alone and twenty-nine times with suffixes, showing a tending to the later post-exilic usage.

(3) Several Aramaic words are to be noticed in the Great Unknown, *e.g.* בחר *to test, try* for בחן xlviii. 10; and כְּאֲחָד Aramaic יְחַדָּא lxv. 25 for יַחְדָּו of Is. xi. 6, 7.

(4) The Great Unknown shows a fondness for the particles אף (fourteen times), בל (ten times), ימין (fifteen times), as is noted by Dillmann.

(5) Driver calles attention to the fact that in relative clauses the relative is omitted by Isaiah only six times, whereas in the Great Unknown it is omitted nearly sixty times.

(6) I have noticed a syntactical usage which, so far as I know, others have not mentioned. Quite frequently in the Great Unknown there is a departure from classic usage in that the weak waw with the imperfect is used for the waw consecutive of the perfect of the classic style. This corresponds

with the usage of Ezekiel, who gives the weak waw with the perfect for the waw consecutive of the imperfect.

II.—Argument from Style

The argument from style is so well stated by Driver in his comparison of Isaiah with the Great Unknown that it is sufficient to quote him:

"There are also literary features of a more general character, which differentiate the author of c. 40–66 from Isaiah. Isaiah's style is terse and compact: the movement of his periods is stately and measured; his rhetoric is grave and restrained. In these chapters a subject is often developed at considerable length; the style is much more flowing; the rhetoric is warm and impassioned, and the prophet often bursts out into a lyric strain (42, 10 f. 44, 23. 45, 8. 49, 13), in a manner to which even Isa. 12 affords no parallel. Force is the predominant feature of Isaiah's oratory; persuasion sits upon the lips of the prophet who here speaks; the music of his eloquence, as it rolls magnificently along, thrills and captivates the soul of its hearer. So, again, if the most conspicuous characteristic of Isaiah's imagination be *grandeur*, that of the prophet to whom we are here listening is *pathos*. The storms, the inundations, the sudden catastrophes which Isaiah loves to depict are scarcely to be found in this prophecy. The author's imagery is drawn by preference from a different region of nature altogether, viz., from the animate world, in particular from the sphere of *human emotion*. It is largely the figures drawn from the latter which impart to his prophecy its peculiar pathos and warmth (see 49, 15. 18. 61, 10[b]. 62, 5. 66, 13). His fondness for such figures is, however, most evident in the numerous examples of *personification* which his prophecy contains. Since Amos (5, 2) it became habitual with the prophets to personify a city or community as a *maiden*, especially where it was desired to represent it as vividly conscious of some keen emotion. This figure is applied in these chapters with remarkable independence and originality. Zion is represented as a widow, a mother, a bride, *i.e.*, under just those relations of life in which the deepest feelings of humanity come into play; and

the personification is continued sometimes through a long series of verses. Nor is this all. The prophet personifies *nature:* he bids heaven and earth shout at the restoration of God's people (44, 23. 49, 13; cf. 52, 9. 55, 12); he hears in imagination the voice of invisible beings sounding across the desert (40, 3. 6. 57, 14); he peoples Jerusalem with ideal watchmen (52, 8) and guardians (62, 6). Akin to these personifications is the *dramatic* character of the representation, which also prevails to a remarkable extent in the prophecy (see 40, 3 ff. 49, 1 ff. 50, 4–9. 53, 1 ff. 58, 3ᵃ. 61, 10 f. 63, 1–6)."

III.—The Argument from Biblical Theology

The theology of the Great Unknown is so far above the theology of Isaiah that it is difficult to see how any who compares them can doubt that there has been a great theological development in the interval between them. I shall present a few specimens.

(1) The doctrine of God in the Great Unknown is even more exalted than in the book of Job. Any one who can believe that Job was written by Moses might also believe that the great prophecy we are considering was written by Isaiah, but it is impossible for a man who knows that Job was not written earlier than the age of Josiah to suppose that the Great Unknown was written earlier than the age of Josiah. (*a*) The Great Unknown emphasizes the doctrine that Yahweh is the only God in a heaping up of expressions of great variety:

"Thus saith Yahweh, the King of Israel, and his redeemer Yahweh Sabaoth: I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God. . . . Is there a God beside me? yea, there is no Rock; I know not any" (xliv. 6, 8 b).

"I am Yahweh, and there is none else; beside me there is no God: I will gird thee, though thou hast not known me: that they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside me: I am Yahweh, and there is none else" (xlv. 5, 6).

"Surely God is in thee; and there is none else; there is no God. Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself, O God of Israel, the Saviour. . . . And there is no God else beside me: a just God and a Saviour; there is none beside me. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else" (xlv. 14 b, 15, 21 b, 22).

"Neither hath the eye seen a God beside thee" (lxiv. 4 b).

This doctrine was appropriate for an exilic prophet brought face to face with the religions of the great nations of the Euphrates. But Isaiah has no such statements. They were not needed in his time. He had to emphasize the majesty and sanctity of God.

(*b*) The Great Unknown emphasizes the doctrine that Yahweh was "the first" and Yahweh was "the last," and that He was "the same:" "I Yahweh the first, and with the last, I am the same" (xli. 4 b). "I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God" (xliv. 6 b). "I am the same; I am the first, I also am the last" (xlviii. 12 b).

These expressions have nothing to correspond with them in Isaiah.

(*c*) The doctrine of the divine Spirit in Isaiah is still the ancient doctrine. It was to be poured on the Messianic King to endow Him with the sevenfold endowment for His reign of peace (Is. xi. 2). It was to be poured on the land to transform it from a wilderness to a garden (Is. xxxii. 15), and without guidance by the divine Spirit apostate children add sin to sin (Is. xxx. 1); but in the Great Unknown the doctrine reaches a height which has no parallel except in the late 139th Psalm. The divine Spirit endows the Messianic Servant in xlii. 1; lxi. 1; and will revive the nation, xliv. 3; it accompanies the ministry of the prophets, xlviii. 16. But in chapter lxiii. 10, the Spirit is named the Holy Spirit, an epithet used elsewhere in the Old Testament only in Psalm li. 13. It is personified beyond any other passage in the Old Testament. It is represented that He was grieved by the rebellion of the Israelites in the wilderness, that He led them in their journeys to the Holy Land, and that He was in the midst of them. Thus the Holy Spirit is assigned the work of the theophanic angel of the historical narrative of JE, and especially as bearing with Him the divine face or presence as in the document J. The Holy Spirit is associated with the theophanic angel here, just as in the book of wisdom, Proverbs, 1st chapter, the divine Spirit and the divine Wisdom are associated. This conception of the divine Spirit shows a marked advance not only beyond Isaiah, but also beyond Ezekiel.

(*d*) The doctrine of creation in Isaiah is confined to a use of

the verb יצר in Isaiah xvii. 7, where God is represented as the Maker of man; ברא is used in Isaiah iv. 5 with reference to the cloud and fire which are to protect redeemed Jerusalem. But the doctrine of creation is one of the most characteristic doctrines of the Great Unknown. He heaps up terms and descriptive epithets to set it forth in xl. 12 f, 26–28; xlii. 5; xliii. 7, 21; xliv. 2, 21, 24; xlv. 7, 9–11, 12, 18; xlviii. 13; xlix. 5; li. 13; liv. 16; lvii. 16, 19. In his doctrine he transcends every pre-exilic writer. The late word ברא is used by the Great Unknown twenty times. No other writer can compare with this.

(2) In the doctrine of redemption, a more spiritual conception pervades the Great Unknown than any pre-exilic writer. Yahweh often names himself or is called "Saviour" (xliii. 3, 11; xlv. 15, 21; xlix. 26; lx. 16; lxiii. 8) and "Redeemer" (xli. 14; xliii. 14; xliv. 6, 24; xlvii. 4; xlviii. 17; xlix. 7, 26; liv. 5, 8; lix. 20; lx. 16; lxiii. 16)—phrases unknown to Isaiah.

The verb גאל is not in Isaiah at all, but is found in the Great Unknown. God's people are גאולים "*redeemed*," Is. li. 10; lxii. 12; lxiii. 4; an expression found elsewhere only in Is. xxxv. 9, which also is exilic as we shall see, and Ps. cvii. 2. The doctrine of salvation is sung with every variety of the sweetest expressions that the poet can conceive of, to such an extent that this prophecy is recognized as the gospel in the Old Testament. The conception of redemption in Is. lvii. 15 and lxvi. 1, 2 is unspeakably sublime:

"For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy: I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones."

"Thus saith Yahweh, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: what manner of house will ye build unto me? and what place shall be my rest? For all these things hath mine hand made, and so all these things came to be, saith Yahweh: but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and that trembleth at my word."

This doctrine is divine and not human. It could hardly have been conceived prior to the experience of Israel in exile when they were excluded from sacred places and ceremonial religion,

and were compelled to a spiritual religion. These passages are re-echoed in the 51st Psalm.

(3) In the Messianic idea the Great Unknown advances far beyond Isaiah, Jeremiah, and even Ezekiel. These are all presupposed in his great prophecy, as I have shown in the chapters devoted to the subject in my "Messianic Prophecy."

(*a*) The most characteristic feature of this Messianic prophecy is the servant of Jahveh and especially of the suffering Servant. Let me repeat from my "Messianic Prophecy." The exile was a bitter experience for the pious Israelite. It transcended the woes of the Egyptian bondage. For then the Holy Land was a bright prospect that had not yet been attained; but now the Holy Land had been lost through the sin and folly of the people of God. The pious keenly felt that they were deprived of blessings which they ought to have inherited. They needed redemption of sin even more than deliverance from oppressors. The pious were indeed the greatest sufferers, for they shared in the persecution to which Jeremiah and others like-minded had been subjected by the wicked princes and their followers among the people. Piety was now synonymous with affliction and sorrow. The ideal of the suffering Messiah had its genesis in these circumstances, and yet it was not without connection with earlier Messianic prophecies. The ideal man of the poem of the creation and of the codes of the Pentateuch had not been realized in the experience of Israel or mankind. The curses were earned and the blessings were forfeited. The problem of redemption was no longer simply the education of the race for its attainment of the divine ideal, or the training of Israel in the sacred institutions of redemption; but first of all they must be delivered from the curse of sin and the penalties of broken covenants and vows. The problem of redemption became complicated owing to the fact that not only did the sinner suffer for his evil deeds, but the righteous man who strove to serve God, to attain the divine ideal, and to gain the promised blessings, increased his sufferings and sorrows thereby. He separated himself from his evil surroundings only to incur enmity and persecution. He suffered no longer for sin, but for righteousness' sake. Ideal manhood is to be gained only through the real manhood of fortitude, perseverance, and the

patient endurance of persecutions even unto death. This conception is found in germ in the protevangelium. The conflict with Satan and the forces of evil was accompanied with peril, and the victory was to be gained only through suffering. It is also contained in the covenants with Abraham and David. What Egypt was to the seed of Abraham, that the exile became to the seed of Abraham, David, and the children of Israel. The wilderness was the way to the Holy Land of redemption, and the entrance was through the vale of tribulation. But the circumstances of the exile, and especially the experience of the persecuted Jeremiah and his associates, taught the people of God lessons they had never learned before. The sufferings of the nation in exile were to discharge the penalties of its transgressions, but were not to result in ultimate ruin. The nation had indeed died, but it was to rise again in a great resurrection. The faithful prophets, the teachers of the nation, are not to suffer persecution and death in vain; they are to earn and receive the rewards of their faithfulness. There are several psalms of the exile that present to our view a great sufferer who can hardly be any other than the Messiah. It seems probable that Jeremiah was the type of the great sufferer, for he was the hero of the exiles, the great historical sufferer for God. But even this prince of sufferers does not attain the heights of the ideal of these psalms. He is the basis of the representation, but the divine Spirit guided the psalmists to discern and describe a sufferer whose experience was vastly more bitter than that of Jeremiah, and whose sufferings were rewarded with a redemption which Jeremiah did not gain (pp. 320–322).

On the basis of this suffering the great prophet of the exile constructs his image of the servant of Yahweh.

In Is. 61 the idea of the servant of Yahweh reaches its climax. It was not without reason that the Messiah recognized Himself more distinctly in this picture, and employed it in His discourse in the synagogue of Nazareth to explain His mission to His unbelieving kindred and townsmen, for here we see the Messiah preaching the gospel of redemption that he has already achieved, enjoying the fruits of his ministry, and rejoicing in the accomplishment of his work. He is anointed with the divine Spirit, as in the first passage, Is. xlii., and becomes a gentle

preacher. There he was unostentatious and meek in his entire work, not breaking off the broken reed or putting out the faint wick, but yet releasing the captives. Here he has the same work, but as he describes his own mission and work he enlarges upon this feature of it, and we see him binding up the broken-hearted, comforting mourners, giving them festal robes instead of the ashes and sackcloth of humiliation and mourning. There he was the light of the nations, as well as the covenant of Israel. This feature was enlarged in the second representation (xlix. 1–7). He raises up the tribes of Jacob, restores them to their own land, and becomes salvation to the ends of the earth. Here this is still further enlarged. The redeemed become like terebinths of righteousness, they build the wastes of Judah and Jerusalem, they become the priests of the nations, and the nations become their servants. Thus they realize their original ideal as set forth in the covenant of Horeb. They are recognized by the nations as the seed that enjoy the blessing of Yahweh, and thus attain the Abrahamic covenant. They enjoy the new covenant with its everlasting joy and prosperity, which is now familiar to us from the representations of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Great Unknown himself. This prophecy thus sums up in itself, and enlarges upon all the previous descriptions of the servant, with the exception of those relating to the suffering substitute. That picture presented fully the servant's condition of humiliation. It mentioned the servant's exaltation only at the beginning and at the conclusion. That which was left undeveloped there is here the subject of the picture. The servant is here not engaged in the work of substitution and interposition, but he is employed in proclaiming the results of it, and in applying the fruits of it, in the preaching of the gospel of redemption to the poor and miserable. The sin-bearing servant needs as his counterpart the joyful preacher of the glad tidings of a redemption that has been accomplished. The servant no longer bears the name of servant, he is preparing the poor and sorrowful for the festival of redemption of the year of grace. It is most fitting, therefore, that the prophecy should conclude with a song of joy in the mouth of the great preacher. He has accomplished his mission, and is entitled to its rewards, and the saddest of all sor-

rows has been transformed into the purest and loftiest joy (pp. 371–373).

The prediction of the suffering Messiah stands out most naturally upon the background of the exile. The royal Messiah, the prince of peace, appears in the frame of the age of Isaiah. The Messianic servant is as appropriate to the exile as the Messianic king to the reign of Hezekiah. We cannot transpose them or put them side by side in the same author and the same period without impairing their historic value and their predictive verisimilitude.

(*b*) The second most prominent feature in this great prophecy is the comfort given to Zion, who is personified and represented as the wife and mother of its inhabitants. It is easy to show that this representation presupposes the book of comfort of Jeremiah 30, 31 and the predictions of Zephaniah and Ezekiel as well as of Hosea, and that it transcends them all in its exhibitions of the tenderness of the marital relation between Zion and Yahweh and of the beauty and glory of the new Jerusalem. Take for example:

"And the foreigners who join themselves unto Yahweh to minister to him,
And to love the name of Yahweh, to become servants unto him,
Every one keeping the Sabbath from polluting it, and those who are firm in my covenant,
I will bring them unto my holy mountain, and I will make them rejoice in my house of prayer;
Their burnt-offerings and their peace-offerings will be for acceptance upon mine altar,
For my house will be proclaimed a house of prayer for all peoples."
—Isa. lvi. 6, 7.

This passage is the most advanced of all those that we have met, relating to the share of the nations in the redemption of Israel. Isaiah predicts that Egypt will serve Yahweh with peace-offerings, vegetable-offerings and votive-offerings (xix. 21); and in Zephaniah the Cushites bring incense-offerings and the Libyans vegetable-offerings (iii. 10). So here foreigners in general will bring burnt-offerings and peace-offerings to the divine altar and find acceptance. The temple is no longer a merely Jewish temple, it has become a universal temple. As such it is more than a place of sacrifice, it is a place of prayer. The

prophet rises above the conception of Ezekiel to the idea of a universal religion. The sacrifices are still here, for the Old Testament point of view cannot yet be abandoned; but the sacrifices are in the background. As the qualifications for participation in the blessings of redemption are no longer national, but covenant-keeping and Sabbath observance, conditions that all nations might fulfil, so the most significant feature of the new worship is prayer, and the world-wide name of the temple of Yahweh will be house of prayer for all peoples ("Mess. Proph.," p. 392).

IV.—The Historical Situation

The argument from the historical situation is so well stated by Canon Driver that I shall again venture to quote him:

"Three independent lines of argument converge to show that this prophecy is not the work of Isaiah, but, like 13, 2–14, 23, has for its author a prophet writing toward the close of the Babylonian captivity. (1) The *internal evidence* supplied by the prophecy itself points to this period as that at which it was written. It alludes repeatedly to Jerusalem as ruined and deserted (*e.g.* 44, 26[b]. 58, 12. 61, 4. 63, 18. 64, 10 f.); to the sufferings which the Jews have experienced, or are experiencing, at the hands of the Chaldæans (42, 22. 25. 43, 28. [R.V. *marg.*] 47, 6. 52, 5); to the prospect of return, which, as the prophet speaks, is imminent (40, 2. 46, 13. 48, 20, etc.). Those whom the prophet addresses, and, moreover, addresses *in person*—arguing with them, appealing to them striving to win their assent by his warm and impassioned rhetoric (40, 21. 26. 28. 43, 10. 48, 8. 50, 10 f. 51, 6. 12 f. 58, 3 ff., etc.)—are not the men of Jerusalem, contemporaries of Ahaz and Hekeziah, or even of Manasseh; they are the exiles in Babylonia. Judged by the *analogy of prophecy*, this constitutes the strongest possible presumption that the author actually *lived* in the period which he thus describes, and is not merely (as has been supposed) Isaiah immersed in spirit in the future, and holding converse, as it were, with the generations yet unborn. Such an immersion in the future would be not only without parallel in the O.T., it would be contrary to the nature of prophecy. The prophet speaks always, in the first instance, to his

own contemporaries; the message which he brings is intimately related with the circumstances of his time: his promises and predictions, however far they reach into the future, nevertheless rest upon the basis of the history of his own age, and correspond to the needs which are then felt. The prophet never abandons his own historical position, but speaks from it. So Jeremiah and Ezekiel, for instance, predict first the exile, then the restoration; both are contemplated by them as still future; both are viewed from the period in which they themselves live. In the present prophecy there is no *prediction* of exile; the exile is not announced as something still future: it is *presupposed*, and only the *release* from it is *predicted*. By analogy, therefore, the author will have lived in the situation which he thus presupposes, and to which he continually alludes" ("Lit. of O. T.," pp. 223, 224).

To these words of Driver let me add the following:

This wondrous prophecy, as it has expanded in three successive editions, finds its only appropriate historical situation in the exile. Looking forward from thence it builds on all the previous prophets, and transcends them all in the bulk and grandeur of its representations. It is related to the book of Ezekiel as the inner to the outer; as the essential spirit and substance to its formal envelope. It seems to me that Ezekiel could never have written his apocalypse if he had seen or heard of the doctrines of Isa. xl.–lxvi. It is indeed not at all strange that some Jewish rabbins and some modern scholars have doubted the inspiration of Ezekiel, who differs so greatly from the Mosaic codes on the one side and from Isa. xl.–lxvi. on the other. The difficulty is resolved only when we see that Ezekiel stands on a lower stage in the development of the Messianic idea than the Great Unknown, who had Ezekiel and Jeremiah, the exile and the body of ancient prophecy behind him; and thus could grasp the whole doctrine of his predecessors, and rise from it to greater heights of prediction ("Mess. Proph.," pp. 408, 409).

We have now gone over the argument from the book of Isaiah itself and have seen that the great prophecy in the last twenty-seven chapters is from a great unknown prophet writing during the exile.

V.—*The Testimony of the New Testament*

We are confronted by testimony from the New Testament presented by the prosecution. We have already considered under the previous Charge the principles which should determine the evidence to be derived from the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament. We have only to consider the passages themselves. There are six of them. None of them give the words of Jesus. Two are the words of the evangelist Matthew, two give the words of Luke, one the testimony of John, and one of Paul. The passages referred to in the book of Isaiah are chapters vi. 9, 10; ix. 1, 2 of the earlier collection, and five well-known passages of the great prophecy of the exile, namely, xl. 3–5; xlii. 1–3; liii. 1; lxi. 1, 2; lxv. 1, 2. The two passages from the earlier collection are not in question, because I do not deny that Isaiah wrote them; but only those from chapters xl.–lxvi. If these New Testament writers testify that Isaiah wrote these passages, then the testimony of the New Testament is against the opinion that I have expressed that Isaiah did not write half of the book that bears his name; but these writers testify no such thing. Their language is precisely the same in form as that we have considered in connection with similar passages relating to the Pentateuch. In the original specification we find a reference to "the roll of the prophet Isaiah" of Luke iv. 17, 18, which Jesus took when He expounded the 61st chapter from it. This has been omitted from the Amended Specification. It certainly does not imply any more than that it was the roll which bore the name of the prophet Isaiah. We may interpret in several ways: either that Isaiah wrote it all, as the prosecution hold, or that he wrote the earlier portions of it, and so the prophecies appended by later editors to the book did not change its name; or that it came down by tradition associated with the name of Isaiah, having been edited under his name when the second canon was established. It no more implies authorship than the book of Ruth or the book of Esther imply authorship by Ruth or Esther.

"The book of the words of Isaiah the prophet" (Luke iii. 4) is only an enlargement of the previous phrase by the insertion of the term "words;" but it does not prove authorship any

more than the previous phrase. It may be explained in the same way.

"Spoken through Isaiah the prophet," of Matthew xii. 17; "word of Isaiah the prophet," of John xii. 38; "Isaiah said," John xii. 41; "Isaiah saith," Rom. x. 16, 20, do not imply any more than "the book of Isaiah saith," "spoken through the book of Isaiah," "word of the book of Isaiah," and they have as their exact parallels, "All the prophets from Samuel and them that followed after, as many as have spoken they also told of these days," Acts iii. 24.

It is quite possible that I may not be able to convince this court that my interpretation of these references to the book of Isaiah in the New Testament is the true one, and that you may prefer the interpretation which the prosecution put upon these words. But have you any right to force your interpretation upon me? No Church in Christendom has decided the interpretation of these passages. There is no interpretation given of them in the Westminster Standards. You have your right of free interpretation under our Constitution. I also have my right which you cannot legally take from me, unless you can put your interpretation into our Constitution by the lawful process of revision. I am within my rights in giving you the interpretation I have given. But this is not all I have given. I have shown you that you cannot take the interpretation of the prosecution without bringing these five passages of the New Testament into conflict with the weight of the testimony of the Old Testament itself. The testimony of the Old Testament makes it altogether probable that my interpretation of these passages is the true one. Our Confession gives us a safe rule to follow in such cases of apparent difference:

"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 may be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly" (I. 9).

The prosecution put this rule in their Charge, but they made no use of it in their argument. I insist upon its application to the matter in hand.

You must follow this rule recognized by the prosecution in this Charge, or else go against the express requirements of the

Confession. This rule sustains me in my doctrine. The places that speak more clearly are those I have given you from the Old Testament. The passages where there is a question about "the true and full sense" are these five passages from the New Testament quoted by the prosecution. You must interpret them by the clear passages of the Old Testament. Therefore you should acquit me and pronounce the prosecution in error.

Other Anonymous Prophecies in Isaiah

I might rest my case here, were it not that I said that Isaiah did not write half the book that bears his name.

I have thus far shown that Isaiah did not write thirty-one chapters of the sixty-six in the book of Isaiah. It is necessary, therefore, that I should consider the remaining thirty-five chapters in order to establish my position. I am here confronted with no evidence presented by the prosecution. I have only to present the positive arguments.

(1) Is. xxiv.–xxvii. is one of the finest pieces of poetry in the Old Testament. It is composed of twelve strophes in the hexameter movement, and is remarkable for its alliteration, rhyme, and play upon words; in all these respects transcending every other piece of Hebrew poetry. Its doctrines of the divine judgment, of the evil angel princes and their imprisonment in Sheol, and of the heavenly elders, its prediction of the abolition of death and sorrow, and of the resurrection of Israel, the corpse of Yahweh, and the wide extent of the divine judgment, have nothing to correspond with them in Isaiah; they presuppose Ezekiel and are in some respects nearer to the Apocalypse of Daniel than to any other writing in the Old Testament.

(2) Is. xxxiv., xxxv.: resembles Is. xl.–lxvi. It seems to be an earlier piece of the same author, the prelude and outline of that great composition.

(3) Is. xiii., xiv. 23, is a beautiful pentameter poem, predicting the destruction of Babylon by the Medes and the judgment of the world. It is the prelude to the judgment upon Babylon by Cyrus, chaps. xl.-xlviii., and is possibly one of the earlier predictions referred to therein. It is true that it bears the title, "The message to Babylon which Isaiah, the son of Amoz, did

see," but the very form of expression shows that this title does not come from Isaiah, but from the compiler of this collection, who wrongly attributes it to Isaiah, as internal evidence shows. Like the titles of the Psalms it is not entitled to the attribute of inspiration.

This prediction was placed at the beginning of Isaiah's collection of messages against the surrounding nations, fourteen in number, xiv. 24–xxiii., which are probably Isaiah's. There is also a group of woes upon Israel and Judah, chaps. xxviii.–xxxiii., which may be attributed to Isaiah also. The great collection of Isaiah's prophecies is, however, i.–xi., relating to divine judgments upon Judah and Israel. There were two editings of this group by Isaiah or his disciples. Chaps. ii.–v. were first published, and then the larger collection, chaps. vi.–xi., was appended and chap. i. was made the introduction to the whole. Chap. xii. is an exilic or post-exilic hymn, as Dr. Francis Brown has shown, resembling the little hymns in the Great Unknown. It was doubtless appended to the first collection by the post-exilic final editor, who thus arranged the book of Isaiah in a pentateuch of Prophecy as follows:

(1) Chaps. i.–xi., Isaiah's, to which the exilic hymn, chap. xii., was added.

(2) Chaps. xiii., xiv. 23, an exilic apocalypse, was prefixed to a collection of fourteen messages of Isaiah xiv. 24–xxiii., and the exilic apocalypse, xxiv.–xxvii., was given as the conclusion of this section.

(3) Chaps. xxviii.–xxxiii., a collection of woes by Isaiah, to which was joined as an appendix an exilic apocalypse in chaps. xxxiv., xxxv.

(4) The exilic historic section, xxxvi.–xxxix.

(5) The prophecy of the Great Unknown, xl.–lxvi.

Thus of the sixty-six chapters we may attribute to Isaiah not more than twenty-seven chapters. Thirty-nine chapters, making the larger half of the book, were not written by him, as all critics acknowledge. My thesis is therefore proven, that Isaiah did not write half of the book that bears his name.

Let me sum up my arguments on the Charges IV. and V.

(1) There is no lawful bridge by which these specifications,

"that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the Charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

(2) The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful case against me in the Presbyterian Church.

(3) The testimony of Holy Scripture in the passages adduced does not show that Moses wrote the Pentateuch and that Isaiah wrote the book that bears his name. Therefore my statements are not in conflict with Holy Scripture and there is no valid case against me on the ground of Holy Scripture.

(4) Holy Scripture makes it evident that Moses did not write the Pentateuch and that Isaiah did not write half of the book that bears his name. Therefore my statements are true and the prosecution are in conflict with Holy Scripture.

In the fear of God and in the light of the evidence you should decide. You cannot decide on the basis of your opinions and prejudices, without violating the laws of the Church and the law of God.

VIII

PROGRESSIVE SANCTIFICATION AFTER DEATH

CHARGE VI.:

"The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America charges the Rev. Charles A. Briggs, D.D., being a Minister of the said Church and a member of the Presbytery of New York, with teaching that Sanctification is not complete at death, which is contrary to the essential doctrine of Holy Scripture and of the Standards of the said Church that the souls of believers are at their death at once made perfect in holiness."

This Charge states (1) that it is an essential doctrine of Holy Scripture and of the Standards "that the souls of believers are at their death at once made perfect in holiness." But no proof is offered for this essential doctrine under the charge. We shall consider whether there is any proof for it whatever in

Holy Scripture and the Standards. (2) The Charge states that Dr. Briggs teaches "that Sanctification is not complete at death." This I may accept as a fairly good statement of my doctrine. (3) The Charge states that my doctrine is contrary to the essential doctrine of Holy Scripture and of the Standards. This statement we shall have to consider. But let me warn the court again that they must confine themselves to the question at issue. They have no right to condemn me on account of any other doctrines taught in the citations from my Inaugural, except the doctrine attributed to me in the Charge, namely, "that Sanctification is not complete at death." My doctrine is clearly stated in the following words of the Inaugural cited by the prosecution as part of their specification:

"There is no authority in the Scriptures, or in the creeds of Christendom, for the doctrine of immediate sanctification at death. The only sanctification known to experience, to Christian orthodoxy, and to the Bible, is progressive sanctification. Progressive sanctification after death is the doctrine of the Bible and the Church."

I.—The Doctrine of the Westminster Standards

It is claimed by the adversaries that this statement is against the Westminster Standards, which teach "that the souls of believers are at their death at once made perfect in holiness." They cite from the Confession, chapter xxxii. (1), from the Larger Catechism, Ques. 86, and from the Shorter Catechism, Ques. 37. But Dr. Birch in his argument made no use whatever of these passages from our Standards; and Mr. McCook used only one of them, Question 27 of the Shorter Catechism, in order to state that it teaches a doctrine directly contrary to my doctrine. But that was a mere assertion without proof, and no proposal was made to show that that doctrine is an essential doctrine of the Standards. Therefore I ask that you decide in accordance with law and usage in courts of justice and throw out the Charge which is so destitute of proof. But inasmuch as I desire that you should know what is the precise relation of my doctrine to the Westminster Standards, I shall consider these passages. (1) It is true that it is taught in the Shorter Catechism that "the souls of believers are at their

death made perfect in holiness" (37); but it is not said that at their death believers are immediately, in a moment of time, "*at once*" by divine transformation, made perfect in holiness. I can say at their death made "perfect in holiness" because I believe that the souls of believers at death enter the Middle State, in which state they are made perfect in holiness by progressive sanctification. "At their death" does not necessarily imply "in the very moment of the transition from life to death," or in the exact second of time after the spirit has departed from the body; but "at their death" is in antithesis with "in this life," and means nothing more than "in the state of death." "Made perfect in holiness" does not necessarily imply "that the sanctification of the soul is instantaneously, in the moment of time after it leaves the body, perfected and completed;" but it is consistent with the belief that the soul is made perfect in holiness in the state of death. The Larger Catechism teaches that—

"The communion in glory with Christ, which the members of the invisible church enjoy immediately after death, is in that their souls are then made perfect in holiness, and received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory; waiting for the full redemption of their bodies" (86).

It is not said that their souls are made immediately perfect in holiness after death any more than it is said immediately received into the highest heavens. This question speaks of the communion in glory with Christ which the members of the invisible church enjoy immediately after death. Is that communion limited to the moment of time at death? Does it not rather continue during the whole time in that state, beginning immediately after death? Immediately after death in this passage means the whole state which begins immediately after death, during which the communion is enjoyed, as we might infer also from the clause "waiting for the full redemption of their bodies." What therefore is affirmed as happening immediately after death is affirmed as happening during that state of communion and waiting which begins immediately after death; and not in the moment of time that begins that state. The four affirmations are not of successive chronological events, but of

parallel events: (1) "made perfect in holiness,"(2) "received into the highest heavens," (3) "behold the face of God in light and glory," (4) "waiting for the full redemption of their bodies;" all alike refer to the communion in glory with Christ, which continues throughout this entire state from death to the resurrection. There is nothing in the text or the context of this passage, or in the proof texts of the Confession cited to sustain it, to indicate that "made perfect in holiness" applies only to the moment of time when the Middle State begins, or that it confines the communion with Christ in the long period of the state which follows the moment immediately after death, to the single thing "waiting for the full redemption of their bodies."

This interpretation of the phrase "immediately after death" is made probable when we put Question 86 in its context in the midst of the group of Questions 82–90. Question 82 asks:

> "What is the communion in glory, which the members of the invisible church have with Christ?" The answer is: "The communion in glory, which the members of the invisible church have with Christ, is in this life, immediately after death, and at last perfected at the resurrection and day of judgment."

Here then are three states in which this communion with Christ is enjoyed: (1) this life; (2) immediately after death; (3) at the resurrection and day of judgment. The communion with Christ is evidently not limited to the point of time immediately after death, but to the state beginning immediately after death and extending up to the day of judgment; for "in this life" clearly refers not to any single moment in this life, but to the whole Christian state in this life from the moment in which Christian life begins in regeneration until the soul departs from the body at death. So "at the resurrection and day of judgment" is not limited to a moment of time when the resurrection and the judgment may take place; but refers to the final state of communion with Christ beginning with resurrection and judgment but extending through all eternity. Accordingly, "immediately after death," which intervenes between this life and "at the resurrection and day of judgment," is not limited to the moment of the soul's departure into the Middle

State, but comprehends the communion with Christ which is the experience of believers from the moment of death till the day of resurrection. The scope of the question makes this certain. Observe the question is: "What is the communion in glory, which the members of the invisible church have with Christ?" It is extremely improbable that the Westminster divines would limit that communion in the future state to two points of time—first, the moment of death, and second, the moment of resurrection, and leave entirely out of view the millenniums of the Middle State and the eternities of the Ultimate State.

In accordance with this general statement of Question 82, which we have thus analyzed, there follow separate questions as to each one of these states:

(83) "What is the communion in glory with Christ, which the members of the invisible church enjoy in this life?"

(86) "What is the communion in glory with Christ, which the members of the invisible church enjoy immediately after death?"

(90) "What shall be done to the righteous at the day of judgment?"

The "immediately after death" of the specific question has the same meaning as the "immediately after death" of the general question; and the meaning of the "immediately after death" of the answer must be the same, all therefore referring to the state immediately after death, and not to the point of time at death. Therefore there is no proof that the clause "then made perfect in holiness" is to be limited to the very moment of death.

Furthermore, there are several expressions in these questions and answers which do not agree with the doctrine of immediate and perfect sanctification in the moment of death. The statement "at last perfected at the resurrection and day of judgment" indicates that the glory of the Middle State is intermediate glory and not perfected glory. The statement "waiting for the full redemption of their bodies" shows that the redemption was not yet full nor yet perfected at death, that it could not be full, could not be perfected till the day of judgment. And Question 90 tells us that the righteous will be openly acknowledged and acquitted at "the day of judgment," not

before; that they "shall be received into heaven, where they shall be fully and forever freed from all sin and misery; filled with inconceivable joys; made perfectly holy and happy both in body and soul, in the company of innumerable saints and angels, but especially in the immediate vision and fruition of God the Father, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, to all eternity. And this is the perfect and full communion, which the members of the invisible church shall enjoy with Christ in glory, at the resurrection and day of judgment."

Such expressions as these with reference to the day of judgment indicate that "the perfect and full communion with Christ in glory" is not enjoyed until that time; that then, first, believers will "be openly acknowledged and acquitted;" that not till then shall they "be fully and forever freed from all sin;" that not till then shall they "be made perfectly holy."

It is evident, therefore, from these statements of our Standards, that perfect holiness, perfect redemption, perfect communion with Christ in glory, cannot be enjoyed until the decisions of the day of judgment. How can any one be perfectly sanctified who has not attained "perfect and full communion with Christ in glory," who has not yet been "openly acknowledged and acquitted," and who still has to look forward to the resurrection when for the first he will be "fully and forever freed from all sin" and made "perfectly holy and happy both in body and soul"? Those who teach immediate sanctification at death are in irresistible conflict with these statements of the Confession; whereas those who teach progressive sanctification after death and regard the state immediately after death as a state during which men are made perfect in holiness, which progress in perfection reaches its end at the day of judgment, reconcile all these statements of the Larger Catechism into a higher unity, where there is complete and perfect harmony.

I am well aware that these statements are obscure and capable of such interpretation as to involve them in many inconsistencies. I do not claim that the Westminster divines were altogether clear themselves as to these difficult questions of eschatology. I am also aware that many citations can be made from their writings which teach immediate sanctification at death. I have doubtless seen the most, if not all such extracts

as can be adduced. But whatever the opinions of any or all of them were on this subject, when they constructed the careful statements of our Standards, they were obliged to keep close to the doctrines of Holy Scripture, and thus it is that their statements, though indefinite and obscure, in no wise come in conflict with the doctrine of progressive sanctification after death, and in no wise teach the error of immediate sanctification at death. The Westminster divines shared the common fault of the Protestantism of the 16th and 17th centuries in that having thrown aside the Roman Catholic doctrine of Purgatory, and having neglected to revive the ancient Catholic doctrine of the Middle State, they left the Middle State between death and the resurrection in their definitions, but did not carefully distinguish it from the Ultimate State. Accordingly in their creeds, neglecting to make important distinctions and yet adhering closely to Scripture, they did not fall into statements of error; but in their writings failing to observe the distinction made in Holy Scripture between the Abaddon of the Middle State and the Gehenna of the Ultimate State, and between the heaven of the Middle State and the heaven of the Final State, they said many things of the one that belong properly to the other. When therefore, in accord with many modern Protestant theologians, I advance into this unexplored territory of the Middle State and go beyond the Westminster Confession in my statements and definitions, follow in the lines drawn by the ancient Church and gather together all the teachings of Holy Scripture, and so more carefully distinguish between the Middle State and the Ultimate State, I do not violate the statements of the Confession; I go into regions of liberty and extra-confessional dogma, and in those regions pursue the scientific, historical, and Biblical methods of investigation and statement.

(2) If any one insists upon rejecting the proof that has been given with regard to the proper interpretation of the phrase "made perfect in holiness," his attention is invited to the Westminster doctrine of sanctification and he is asked, if there be an inconsistency between the two chapters, which is the more important chapter of the Confession, the one giving the general doctrine of progressive sanctification or the one giving the specific doctrine of immediate sanctification at death under the

head of the doctrine of the Middle State? The chapter on sanctification knows no other sanctification than progressive sanctification. Listen to this doctrine:

"I. They who are 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, by his word and Spirit dwelling in them: the dominion of the whole body of sin is destroyed, and the several lusts thereof are more and more weakened and mortified; and they more and more quickened and strengthened, in all saving graces, to the practice of true holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.

"II. 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.

"III. 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" (Chap. XIII.).

This chapter is one of the choicest productions of the Westminster divines. It sets forth truly and accurately the doctrine of Holy Scripture. If the Presbyterian Church had bound this 13th chapter on their heart instead of the 3d chapter, and had made the Scriptural doctrine of sanctification their article of the standing and falling Church, rather than the scholastic dogma of reprobation, what a glorious history they might have had in the last two centuries! There would have been no need of the agonies of the present revision movement. It seems sometimes as if those who insist upon immediate sanctification at death were using the term sanctification in a different sense from the Westminster Standards. Sanctification is sometimes used in the Scriptures and also in theological literature and debate, for that cleansing from sin which takes place in the laver of regeneration; and again for that induction into a higher Christian life which is effected by the power of the Holy Spirit upon the souls of men at certain crises of their history. I do not question that men are sanctified in the sense that they are washed in the laver of regeneration clean from every corruption, taint, and defilement of sin. I do not doubt that the

fountain which flows from the Redeemer's side cleanseth from all sin in the hour of death as in any hour of life, when the sinner opens his heart in faith and repentance to the saving love of Jesus. So again I do not question the higher life that men may attain in this world, when throwing aside every weight of besetting sin, tearing away all the bands of evil habits and associations, dissolving every other tie which might restrain them from God and duty, they consecrate themselves to the service of the Redeemer and with fresh courage strain every nerve of holy resolution, striving for the love of Christ in the passion of self-sacrificing devotion to the Master's service. The divine Spirit lifts up such consecrated ones to a higher plane of religious experience and fills their souls with joy and holy endeavor. I firmly believe that such transformations, long prepared by the Spirit's secret workings upon the soul, may take place immediately in a moment of time, in a happy hour which seems like a second birth, a second resurrection. It is the shooting of the plant of grace above the ground after the long season of sowing and germination in the secret recesses of the heart. It is the springing forth of the blossom in the spring-time after a long winter's secret preparation. That there will be such a transformation at death, the spring-time of a new life, I do not doubt. I firmly believe that then there will be a transformation greater than any that is possible in this life. You may call this sanctification if you will, you may say that this is "being made perfect in holiness," if that is your meaning; but if you do you have a very meagre and inadequate conception of the sanctification taught in the Holy Scripture and in the Westminster Confession. Christian sanctification is vastly higher, grander, and more glorious than this. According to the Westminster Confession, it is not merely cleansing from sin and rising to a higher grade of Christian life and experience, "it is being more and more strengthened in all saving graces, to the practice of true holiness." How can there be the practice of true holiness except in time of duration? How can there be the practice of true holiness without holy conduct? How can there be holy conduct without Christian activity? How can there be Christian activity without doing and working and serving Christ and the brethren? The practice of

true holiness, therefore, must follow the transformation that takes place at death—it cannot be a part of it. It is conceivable that believers at their death may be immediately so strengthened in all saving graces as to be perfectly endowed for the practice of true holiness, but it is inconceivable that the practice itself could be immediately imparted. The practice of true holiness cannot be given by God; it must be the exercise and work of man, under the influence of the divine Spirit, and must follow any influence of sanctification at death. But inasmuch as the practice is an essential part of the sanctification and there can be no completeness of sanctification, no perfection in holiness without the practice of true holiness, the completion of sanctification at the moment of death is impossible.

The Westminster Confession also teaches that "this sanctification is throughout in the whole man." The text cited in proof of the position is:

"And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" (I. Thess. v. 23). It is manifest that according to this text and this statement of the Confession, sanctification embraces the body as well as the soul. Sanctification cannot be completed without the body. It is clearly taught in the Confession, XXXII., that believers are waiting in the Middle State "until the day of judgment for the full redemption of their bodies." So the Larger Catechism states that then at the day of judgment "they shall be fully and forever freed from all sin and misery, filled with inconceivable joys, made perfectly holy and happy both in body and soul." Wherefore according to the Westminster Standards, the full redemption of their bodies, the sanctification of their bodies, "made perfectly holy in body and soul," does not take place until the day of judgment. Therefore sanctification is not throughout in the whole man until the day of judgment. Man cannot, therefore, be immediately and completely sanctified at death. That measure of sanctification which he receives at death is intermediate between the sanctification in this life and the complete sanctification at the day of judgment. It is furthermore evident that the apostle, in the text cited, is praying, not that God would sanctify the Thessalo-

nians wholly at death, or present them blameless at the hour of death, but "unto the coming of our Lord Jesus," that is, the second advent; and what is that but the day of the resurrection of the body and the final judgment?

If therefore, by any confusion of mind, the Westminster divines have taught in Chapter XXXII., and the corresponding questions and answers of the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, the doctrine of immediate sanctification at death, they have thereby through inadvertence taught a doctrine which is irreconcilable with and contrary to and in conflict with their doctrine of sanctification and their doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and their doctrine of the day of judgment. Can any doubt, in such a case, which passage must give way? Shall we give up three doctrines of greatest importance for the sake of one doctrine of lesser importance?

(3) I freely grant that the most natural interpretation of the phrases of the Westminster Standards, "at their death made perfect in holiness," or "immediately after death," is in favor of the doctrine of immediate sanctification at death, though I think that the contexts of the Larger Catechism and the Confession disprove that interpretation. But granting that my interpretation is wrong, the question arises whether the doctrine of immediate sanctification at death is an essential doctrine of the Westminster Confession. Can you regard the doctrine as essential to the Westminster system of doctrine? It is a doctrine in the difficult field of eschatology, where there must be liberty for investigation, statement, and debate, until the Church has matured its Christian experience and defined more closely its faith.

Is the Presbytery ready to take the position that the dogma of immediate sanctification at death is an essential doctrine of the Presbyterian Church, so that no man can become a Presbyterian minister who does not hold it? If so, you stretch and strain the line of cardinal and essential doctrines to an extent that will be destructive of the peace and prosperity of the Church. I doubt whether the superior courts will sustain you in such a position, and if they should do this wrong to the Church of God, the Christian world will regard them as breaking the bonds of catholicity.

II.—The Doctrine of Holy Scripture

I shall now endeavor to show you that the doctrine of immediate sanctification at death is against the Holy Scriptures. Nowhere in Scripture is death the crisis for which men are to prepare themselves. It is always the day of judgment, the advent day, the resurrection day, which is the goal of hope or of fear, of aspiration or of dread, of harvest or of doom.

A large number of the passages which were cited in the original Charge have nothing to do with the matter in hand. All of these have been abandoned in the present Charge but two. I would limit myself to these two were it not that under the clause with which they close their Charges, they claim the right and you have granted them the right to offer in evidence the "whole of the Holy Scriptures," and they have brought many of them in again in argument against me. I shall therefore test them all.

(1) Let us first consider the passages which have nothing to do with the future life as such. (*a*) Jesus is "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world" (John i. 29); but this fact is not inconsistent with progressive sanctification in this life. How then can it be inconsistent with progressive sanctification in the Middle State? (*b*) It may be often said of us as Jesus said to Peter in Gethsemane, "The Spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Matt. xxvi. 41). But this does not imply the Manichæan heresy that the seat of sin is in the flesh and that therefore the disembodied spirit will be perfect. Such a doctrine is far from the thought of these words of Jesus. (*c*) The prayer of the apostle for the Ephesians, "that he would grant you according to the riches of his glory, that ye may be strengthened with power through the Spirit in the inward man" (Eph. iii. 16), as the context shows implies progressive sanctification in this life, and therefore would imply that this progressive sanctification would be continued until perfect sanctification has been reached. There is nothing in text or context to suggest that this perfect sanctification is reached in the moment of death.

(2) We shall next consider the passages cited by the prosecution which relate to the second advent and the resurrection day

and which have nothing to do with the Middle State. (*a*) The awards to him that overcometh (Rev. iii. 5) are the awards of the judgment day. (*b*) The multitudes clothed in white robes and with victor's palms (Rev. vii. 8–14) are the redeemed of the last great day. (*c*) The clothing of the bride in the righteousness of the saints (Rev. xix. 8) is at the bridal of the Messiah. (*d*) The mysterious change in a moment of time (I. Cor. xv. 51, 52) is the resurrection change. (*e*) The rapture of the saints to be forever with the Lord (I. Thess. iv. 16, 17) is the rapture of the second advent. None of these passages have anything to do with the doctrine of the Middle State, except so far as they show that as death is the entrance into the Middle State, the resurrection, second advent, and the day of judgment are the exit from the Middle State upon the Ultimate State.

(3) We shall now consider two passages at greater length. (*a*) The advice of Paul to Timothy (I. Tim. iv. 8), "Exercise thyself unto godliness: for bodily exercise is profitable for a little; but godliness is profitable for all things, having promise of the life which now is, and of that which is to come," is an advice to progressive sanctification without any hint that sanctification stops at death. If he could say, "Exercise thyself unto godliness, for it is profitable, having promise of the life which now is, and also the life which is to come," does this imply that the exercise unto godliness was to be limited to this life? If the exercise unto godliness was not to cease during "the life which now is," even after its profit and promise were realized in part, why should it cease in "the life which is to come," when its profit and promise were in process of realization there? The exhortation is rather to go on in the exercise of godliness in "the life which now is," and also in "the life which is to come," and win by your exercise its profitableness and its promise in both lives. (*b*) The rest granted to the blessed dead (Rev. xiv. 13) doubtless refers to the Middle State—but it teaches simply rest from labor, the enjoyment of the fruits of the works which follow them, and blessedness; it does not teach that these blessed dead cease from the practice of true holiness, abandon the exercise unto godliness, leave off Christian ministry, and no longer grow in knowledge, in grace, and in sanctification. (*c*) The Middle State is graphically presented to us by our Lord

in the story of Dives and Lazarus (Luke xvi. 22–26). This is the Middle State during the old dispensation before the descent of Jesus into the abode of the dead and His resurrection to the heights of heaven. I shall not raise the question whether Jesus by His resurrection from Hades made essential changes in the Middle State or not. It is sufficient for my purpose here to call your attention to the fact that it is not said that the sanctification of Lazarus was completed the moment when angel hands placed him in Abraham's bosom. It rather favors the continuation of the work of sanctification, because he there enjoyed communion with Abraham. Was there no pious instruction for him to receive, no holy example for him to follow, no holy gratitude to express, no holy service to render, no holy conduct for this poor beggar to practise in Abraham's bosom? Did he learn no lessons of the justice of God, of the evil of sin, of the delights of righteousness and of holy sanctification in the conversation with Dives? How can we conceive of such an experience without growth in holiness on the part of the redeemed beggar? John Wesley uses these wise words on this passage:

"Can we reasonably doubt but that those who are now in Paradise in Abraham's bosom, all those holy souls who have been discharged from the body from the beginning of the world unto this day, will be continually ripening for heaven, will be perpetually holier and happier, till they are received into the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world?" ("Works," CXXVI., Sermon on Faith).

(4) Paul expresses the desire to depart from this earthly life into the presence of Christ in heaven:

"For we know that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens. For verily in this we groan, longing to be clothed upon with our habitation which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For indeed we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but that we would be clothed upon, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life. Now he that hath wrought us for this very thing is God, who gave unto us the earnest of the Spirit. Being therefore always of good courage, and knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord (for we walk by faith, not by sight); we are of good courage, I say, and are willing rather to be absent from the body, and to

be at home with the Lord. Wherefore also we make it our aim, whether at home or absent, to be well-pleasing unto him. For we must all be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (II. Cor. v. 1–10).

In this passage there is contrast between life in the body and life apart from the body, life in this world away from the Messiah and life in the heaven of the Middle State with the Messiah, between the earthly body and the heavenly body. The apostle does not leap in thought over the Middle State to the Ultimate State, because he has in mind the departure from the body in order to be in the heavenly region of the Middle State. He is not thinking of the advent of Christ while he remained in the body, or of a resurrection of the body, but of his going away from the body to the presence of Christ, just as in the epistle to the Philippians he longs to depart and be with Christ, which was much better for him than life in this world (i. 23). He expresses the confidence that when he dies he will depart to the heaven of the Middle State to be with Christ, to receive a heavenly body suitable for his abode there. That this is the mind of the apostle is clear from the subsequent context. He aims to be well-pleasing to the Messiah whether at home with Him in the heavenly state or absent from Him in this world, because he sees at the end of the Middle State as well as at the end of the course of this world the judgment-seat of the Messiah, before which everything will be made manifest for final decision. A similar doctrine is taught in Rom. xiv. 7–12:

"For none of us liveth to himself, and none dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord: or whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ died, and lived again, that he might be Lord of both the dead and the living. But thou, why dost thou judge thy brother? or thou again, why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of God. For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, to me every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then each one of us shall give account of himself to God."

The goal of the apostle's striving, therefore, is to be well-pleasing to Christ, when he is made manifest with all his works before the judgment-seat at the day of judgment; and therefore

he has this one aim, whether at home with Christ after death in the Middle State, or absent from Him in this world, to be well-pleasing to Him. Aiming to please Christ in the Middle State in order to be accepted in the day of judgment, what else can it be but pursuing the path of Christian sanctification? How else could the apostle hope to persevere in that aim through all the ages of the Middle State, unless the divine Spirit of Christ was carrying on and perfecting the work of sanctification in him in the Middle State as well as in this life?

(5) The apostle John tells us:

"Beloved, now are we the children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him; for we shall see him even as he is. And every one that hath this hope set on him purifieth himself, even as he is pure" (I. John iii. 2, 3).

"Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because his seed abideth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother" (I. John iii. 9, 10).

The prosecution omit verse 3, a passage that is relevant to verse 2; but give verses 9 and 10, which have no manner of relevancy to the matter in hand; for the doctrine that "whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin" is a doctrine that applies no more to the Middle State after death than it does to the life prior to death. The apostle evidently has in mind this life in these verses and not the future state. It is perfectly evident, moreover, that the manifestation of "what we shall be," of verse 2, and "he shall be manifested," of verse 3, both refer to the second advent of our Lord, and not to any manifestation of Him to us or of us to others in the Middle State. This passage looks forward to the second advent of Christ with earnest hope. This hope, set on the appearing of the pure Christ, is a purifying hope, a sanctifying hope. But the goal of the hope is when Christ shall be manifested. Then first the apostle will be like Him; will be as pure as He is pure. This postponement of the being like Christ, pure as Christ is pure, till the second advent, makes it evident that there can be no completion of the work of sanctification until the second advent, or in

other words that the effort to purify one's self "even as he is pure" continueth in the Middle State just as in this life until the goal of every effort is reached at the manifestation of the pure and perfect Christ in glory. The doctrine is plain: Paul teaches that his one aim is to be well-pleasing to Christ, at the day of judgment. That was to be his aim in the Middle State as well as in this world. John teaches that his one hope was to be pure like Christ when He should be manifested at the second advent, and with this hope he purifieth himself until the appearing of Christ, when first he will see Him in his real purity and become wholly like Him in purity.

(6) Paul represents that Christ so loved the Church as to give Himself up for it; "that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, that he might present the Church to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish" (Eph. v. 26, 27). The glorification of the Church is the ideal aim of Christ. The accomplishment of this glorification is first at the bridal of the Lamb. This bridal takes place not at the death of the believer, but at the second advent of the bridegroom. The work of Christ until the second advent is summed up in the work of "sanctifying and cleansing the church by the washing of water with the word." Is the work of Christ for the Church confined to the Church on earth? Has Christ no work to do for the Church of the Middle State? Does the work of preparation of the individual member of the Church cease at death and continue only for those who are left behind in this world? This passage teaches no such doctrine. The presumption is all the other way, that the work of Christ in perfecting His Church goes on for the whole Church, those remaining in this world and those who are in the Middle State, so that the whole Church, which is one organization embracing the living and the dead, may advance together toward its perfection. The doctrine of immediate sanctification at death dishonors Jesus Christ, for it confines His heavenly reign and mediation to the Church in this world.

What practice have infants and imbeciles when they enter the Middle State? How far short in practice do the best of men fall? Are they no longer to have an opportunity for the

practice of true holiness? Will there be no chance to learn what true holiness is? The Middle State must, from the very nature of the case, be a school of sanctification.

It was a profound saying of Henry B. Smith that eschatology ought to be Christologized. It is greatly to be regretted that he did not turn his own attention to that theme and give us the fruit of his investigations. Dr. Schaff gave his attention to this subject many years ago in his book on the Sin against the Holy Ghost, and has added not a few valuable hints in his later publications.

Christ is the mediator between God and man in the exercise of His offices as prophet, priest, and king. Those who passed a few years in this world, and then went into the Middle State and have been there for centuries, have not passed beyond the need of His mediation. The interval between death and the judgment has its lessons and its training for them as well as for us. The prophetic office of Christ continues to those who are in the Middle State. After His own death He went to the abode of the departed spirits, and preached unto them his gospel. He ascended into heaven, taking His redeemed with Him. All those whom He has purchased with His blood ascend to Him to abide with Him. The redeemed robber is not the only one to whom He has something to say in the Middle State. All believers enter His school and are trained in the mysteries of His kingdom. Those mysteries are not cleared up by a flash of revelation; they are revealed as the redeemed are able to apprehend them and use them. It is improbable that Augustine, Calvin, and Luther will be found in the same class-room as the redeemed negro slave or the babe that has entered heaven to-day. The fathers and doctors of the Church will be the teachers of the dead, as they taught the living.

Christ's priestly office continues for them. They who enter the Middle State still need His blood and righteousness. Even if they commit no positive sin they do not reach positive perfection until their sanctification has been completed in the attainment of the complete likeness of Christ. They need the robe of Christ's righteousness until they have gained one of their own. He is still their surety, who has engaged with them and with God to present them perfect in the last great day.

But, above all, Christ is a king in the Intermediate State. Here in this world His reign is only partial; there it is complete. Here His kingdom is interwoven with that kingdom of darkness. There it is apart from all evil and hindrance. His reign is entire over His saints, and they are being prepared by Him for the advent in which they will come with Him to reign over the world. The Church is chiefly in the Intermediate State. The Church on earth is only the vestibule of it. In this world we have learned to know in part the Messiah of the Cross; there in the Middle State the redeemed know the glory of the Messiah of the Throne. There the Church is in its purity and complete organization, as the bride of the Lamb. There Christ the head and His body the Church are in blessed unity. We have glimpses in the Apocalypse of the vast assemblies of the saints in heaven about the throne of the Lamb. And the epistle of the Hebrews gives us a picture of their organized assembly on the heights of the heavenly Zion. It is important for the Church on earth to have a better apprehension of its relations with the Church in the Middle State. The Protestant branch of Christendom is weaker here than the Roman Catholic. It is high time to overcome this defect, for it is not merely agnosticism, it is sin against the mysteries of our religion. The modern Church ought to return to the faith of the ancient Church, and believe in the "Communion of Saints."

We have developed the doctrine of the Middle State in the light of other established Christian doctrines. If the Church has rightly defined these, then it results from them that we must take that view of the Middle State that they suggest. If we are not prepared to do this we cast doubt upon the legitimacy and competency of these doctrines. We confess them inadequate and insufficient. The Calvinistic system, with its principle that salvation is by the divine grace alone, and that this grace is ever prevenient, enables us to believe that the *ordo salutis* begins for all who are saved by the regeneration of the Holy Spirit in this life. This regeneration begets the seeds of a perfect Christian life. For some the *ordo salutis* makes no further advance in this life; for others it advances in different degrees and stages; but for all the redeemed the Middle State is of vast importance as the state in which our

redemption is taken up where it is left incomplete in this life and then carried on to its perfection. This view of the Middle State gives it its true theological importance. It enables us to look forward with hope and joy for an entrance upon it. This life is an introduction to it.

(7) The epistle to the Hebrews gives us a glimpse of the Church in the Middle State in these words:

> "But ye are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable hosts of angels in general assembly and to the church of the first-born who are enrolled in heaven; and to God of all the Judge, and to the spirits of just men made perfect; and to Jesus the mediator of a new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better than that of Abel" (Heb. xii. 22–24).

This passage is cited by the Westminster divines in proof of their phrase "made perfect in holiness." And it is their only proof text. Let me call your attention again to the principle laid down in my preliminary objection, that even if the Westminster divines meant to teach the doctrine of immediate sanctification at death, yet if the passage of Holy Scripture on which they rely for proof teach a different doctrine, we are obliged by our subscription vows and by the doctrine of the Westminster Standards to follow Holy Scripture rather than the Confession, and you must judge by Scripture rather than by the Confession. This is said as a guide to those who may not be convinced by the argument I have given you as to the doctrine taught in our Confession. I shall now endeavor to show you that this passage of Holy Scripture does not teach the doctrine of immediate sanctification at death. (*a*) Observe that we have in this passage a scene of great magnificence and glory, an assembly in the heavenly Jerusalem on the heavenly heights of Zion, of the God of all, Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, the general assembly of innumerable hosts of angels, and the church of the first-born, the spirits of just men made perfect. This festal assembly in the new Jerusalem is in antithesis to Sinai blazing and quaking with terrors. What is there in text or in context to suggest that this is a scene which immediately follows the death of every individual, or that immediately after death every believer is ushered into this festal assembly? What is there in text or context to imply that these first-born from

among men, these just men, these spirits perfected, embrace all believers that have departed this life? What is there in text or in context to imply that these perfected spirits attain their perfection at the precise moment of their death? The prosecution will have to prove these three questionable propositions ere they can use this passage as an evidence that all believers are immediately sanctified in the moment of their departure from this life. They cannot give you any such proof. (*b*) Listen to the opinions of distinguished commentators on this passage. Calvin is one of the commentators who interpret "spirits of just men made perfect" of the fulfilment or completion of their earthly life. If John Calvin, the father of Calvinists, the prince of interpreters among the Reformers, be correct in his interpretation, this passage has nothing whatever to do with the question whether sanctification is immediate or progressive after death. Calvin, however, gives his opinion on sanctification after death in his comment upon another passage, where he says:

"As, however, the spirit is accustomed to speak in this manner in reference to the last coming of Christ, it were better to extend the advancement of the grace of Christ to the resurrection of the flesh. For although those who have been freed from the mortal body do no longer contend with the lusts of the flesh, and are, as the expression is, beyond the reach of a single dart, yet there will be no absurdity in speaking of them as in the way of advancement, inasmuch as they have not yet reached the point at which they aspire, they do not yet enjoy the felicity and glory which they have hoped for, and, in fine, the day has not yet shone which is to discover the treasures which lie hid in hope. And in truth, when hope is treated of, our eyes must always be directed forward to a blessed resurrection as the grand object in view" (Calvin on Phil., I., 6).

(*c*) De Wette represents many commentators who think that these perfected spirits are the martyrs of the old dispensation, the theme of Heb. xi., of whom it is said:

"And these all, having had witness borne to them through their faith, received not the promise, God having provided some better thing concerning us, that apart from us they should not be made perfect" (verses 39, 40).

There can be no doubt that our passage is based upon that passage, not only because of the term "perfected," but also because of the "better thing" which appears in both passages.

The "better thing" of xi. 40, is referred to as that in which Hebrew and Greek martyrs share alike and at the same time; but what it is, is not distinctly stated. In our passage, however, it is the new covenant of Jesus, the Mediator, and His blood of sprinkling. Therefore we must extend the reference of the perfected spirits to the New Testament martyrs as well as to the Old Testament martyrs. The blood of sprinkling gives us the clew to the meaning of perfected here. As Weiss says, the entire usage of the Epistle refers this perfection to that attained through Christ and His sacrifice. We are not to think of moral perfection. Let us recall this usage for a few moments. There are four passages which teach that perfection was not through the Levitical priesthood or the sacrifices prescribed in the law (vii. 11, 19; ix. 9; x. 1). It is then said in antithesis but "by one offering he [Christ] hath perfected forever them that are sanctified" (x. 14). The "sanctified" here are, as the present participle shows, to use the words of Bishop Westcott, "all who from time to time realize progressively in fact that which has been potentially obtained for them." The perfected spirits here are therefore those who have been perfected by the mediatorial intercession and cleansing of the blood of Christ, and not those who have attained moral perfection, or who have completed once for all their sanctification. It is possible that the prosecution understand by "perfect in holiness" just this cleansing by the blood of Christ and this equipment in the righteousness of Christ. If this be their meaning I shall not dispute their doctrine, so far as it goes. But the doctrine of sanctification which is in Holy Scripture and in the Westminster Confession is vastly higher than this. It is not merely cleansing from sin; it is the infusion of habits of holiness. It is not merely clothing in the righteousness of Christ; it is the habitual practice of holy conduct and the attainment of an indelible holy character.

This festal assembly of angels and perfected spirits reminds us of several similar gatherings in the Apocalypse with which this passage seems to be in parallelism:

"And when he opened the fifth seal, I saw underneath the altar the souls of them that had been slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held: and they cried with a great voice, saying, How

long, O Master, the holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And there was given them to each one a white robe; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little time, until their fellow-servants also and their brethren, which should be killed even as they were, should be fulfilled" (Rev. vi. 9-11).

"And I saw, and behold, the Lamb standing on the mount Zion, and with him a hundred and forty and four thousand, having his name, and the name of his Father, written on their foreheads. And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder: and the voice which I heard was as the voice of harpers harping with their harps: and they sing as it were a new song before the throne, and before the four living creatures and the elders: and no man could learn the song save the hundred and forty and four thousand, even they that had been purchased out of the earth. These are they which are not defiled with women; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were purchased from among men, to be the first fruits unto God and unto the Lamb. And in their mouth was found no lie: they are without blemish" (Rev. xiv. 1-5).

"And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and such as worshipped not the beast, neither his image, and received not the mark upon their forehead and upon their hand; and they lived, and reigned with Christ a thousand years. The rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years should be finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: over these the second death hath no power; but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years" (Rev. xx. 4-6).

In all these passages the martyrs of the martyr age of the Church are conceived as the first fruits, or the first-born, or partakers of the first resurrection. They have been faithful and true in their testimony even unto death, they have kept themselves undefiled and without blemish from contact with idolatry, they are virgins as the bride of the Messiah and have not committed fornication with heathen gods, they are clad in the white robes of the priests of God, they live and reign with Christ in the heavenly Zion throughout the complete period of His mediatorial reign, they share the Redeemer's blessedness and glory. But for all this it is not said that they cease to progress in sanctification, or that they have attained moral perfection, or that they have gained that Christlikeness and Godlikeness which is the final goal of redemption and which

alone can come according to the apostle John, when the Messiah is manifested in glory at His second advent when the saints are manifested with Him. Then for the first time the rays of the sun of righteousness will shine through every saint and not a mote will be found in those sunbeams.

Bishop Westcott gives a wise word here:

"The perfection (τελείωσις) of the individual Christian must in its fullest sense involve the perfection of the Christian society. The 'perfection' which Christ gained for humanity in his person (ii. 10; v. 9; vii. 28; x. 1, 14) must be appropriated by every member of Christ. In part this end has been reached by the old saints in some degree, in virtue of Christ's exaltation (c. xii. 23), but in part it waits for the final triumph of the Saviour, when all, that we sum up in confessing the truth of the resurrection of the body, is fulfilled. Primasius interprets the gift of the white robe in Apoc. vi. 11 (ad. 40 c.) of that endowment of love whereby the waiting souls gladly accept the postponement of their own consummation" (382, 383).

The invariable statement of the New Testament is that the second advent of Jesus Christ is the goal of sanctification. In addition to the passages already considered, I would refer to Rom. viii. 29, 30; I. Cor. i. 8; Eph. iv. 13–16; Phil. i. 6; I. Thess. iii. 13; v. 23; II. Peter iii. 13, 14. There is not a passage in the Bible that teaches either directly or indirectly immediate sanctification at death, or that the completion once and for all of the holy advancement of mankind is accomplished in a moment of time by a magical transformation in the dying hour. The Christian Church has always taught the doctrine of the Middle State between death and the resurrection; and of progress in the holy life after death, in that state. There have been those who taught the sleep of pious souls. Dr. Birch seems to hold that opinion, for he said in his argument: "All dead Christians are asleep. When we are asleep we show the rest which consists in the inaction of mind and body" (Stenographer's Report, p. 631). Others have held that departed spirits pass a dreamlike existence, with powers of memory of the life in this world, and of anticipation of the resurrection of the body and the judgment-seat of God; but without real activity or change of condition throughout the entire period. But these opinions have always been rejected by the orthodox.

Those passing into this Middle State pass into a higher and more active condition than their condition in this world. What then is the nature of this activity? There are several different opinions: (1) The Roman Catholic doctrine of Purgatory teaches that those who enter the Middle State imperfect have their imperfections removed—(*a*) by purgatorial fires, which are of the nature of chastisement, discipline, and penance for sin; (*b*) by the efficacy of prayers for the dead and the sacrifice of the altar. This doctrine of purgatorial fires and sacrifices for the dead I reject in common with the reformers and all Protestants. I am not surprised that the theologian who speaks in Mr. McCook prefers this doctrine of Purgatory to my doctrine of Progressive Sanctification after death; for he will have magic of some kind, and if he cannot have a magical transformation without means, he will take a magical transformation by the use of means. He cannot understand growth in holiness, or the ethical progress of holy souls, or the transformation which takes place by the constant influence of the spirit of Christ upon the spirit of man.

(2) The common traditional doctrine among Protestants is that believers are by a divine transformation immediately sanctified and judged by the private judgment at death and thereafter continue in a perfectly sanctified condition. This doctrine is set forth in its grossest form by Cotton Mather where he says:

"Death like an hot and strong forge has run out of these holy souls, all the dross which all the ordinances and all the calamities formerly employed upon them, had left remaining in them" ("Hades Looked Into," p. 12. 1717).

This doctrine makes death itself the purgatory, and represents death as more potent for the salvation of men than Bible and Reason, Church and Sacrament all combined. This doctrine lies at the other extreme from the doctrine of Purgatory, and is equally erroneous. (3) The true doctrine, which is older than Purgatory and which has ever been taught by the soundest divines, is that believers after death advance in the holy life, and make progress in sanctification until they attain Christ-likeness and perfect purity and holiness at His second advent.

when body and soul are united in the resurrection, and the whole man for the first time attains complete redemption and glorification. Sanctification begins in justification and attains its end only in the glorification of the judgment day.

My honored teacher and friend Dr. Dorner, now in the company of the blessed, gave an orthodox statement when he said:

"As for the pious, intercourse with the ungodly, to which they were subject on earth, ceases after death; they suffer nothing more from them, not even temptation. The connection of believers with Christ is so intimate that death and Hades have no power over it. On the contrary death brings them an increase of freedom from temptations and disturbances, as well as of blessedness. For believers there is no more punishment, but there is growth, a further laying aside of defects, an invigoration through the greater nearness of the Lord which they may experience, and through the more lively hope of their consummation." . . . "In this life, the realities of the sensuous world are the objects of sight, the spiritual world is the object of faith. Then, when the physical side is wanting to the spirit, these poles will be reversed. To the departed spirits the spiritual world, whether in good or evil, will appear to be the real existence resting on immediate evidence. Since, then, such internal soul-life unveils the ground of the soul more openly, the retiring into self has for believers the effect of purifying and educating. It serves to obliterate all stains, to harmonize the whole inner being, in keeping with the good disposition brought over from the other life or later acquired; thus there will be for them no idle waiting for the judgment but a progressing in knowledge, blessedness, and holiness, in communion with Christ and the heavenly company" (Dorner's "Future State," pp. 106–108).

This is the orthodox doctrine of progressive sanctification after death. It is the progressive sanctification after death of those whose sanctification has been begun in this world by regeneration and justification. It has nothing whatever to do with the doctrine of future probation. Those who hold future probation may believe this doctrine or they may not believe it; for that doctrine has to do with the regeneration and justification after death of those who leave this world impenitent, unjustified, and unregenerate. This doctrine I have never taught.

When I indorse the doctrine of Dorner as regards the progressive sanctification of believers after death, that does not imply that I hold with him that those who die impenitent here and go to the world of the lost may yet be redeemed from their

lost condition in the Middle State. Many holy and wise men hold that doctrine, and God forbid that I or any other should challenge their right to their opinion. O that I could agree with them! I would gladly make many sacrifices if I could honestly indulge in such a comfortable hope. But I do not, I cannot. I exercise my right in disclaiming this opinion, and I also exercise my right of Christian charity in refusing to condemn them as enemies of Christ on account of it.

The doctrine of progressive sanctification after death raises many important and difficult questions with regard to the Middle State, which I am no more bound to answer than are others. I have stated my views so far as I see my way and no farther. I see that believers enter the Middle State imperfect, but they are cleansed by the blood of Christ from all sin, and are therefore sinless. They are justified by the grace of God, and are therefore guiltless; they are by the immediate influence of the divine Spirit raised to a higher and nobler life and more blessed experience of redemption. But so soon as the redeemed soul begins its active practice, conduct, and service in the Middle State the question presses itself upon us what that conduct, practice, and service will be. Will it be immediately after and forever perfectly holy, or will there still remain some degree of imperfection in their practice of true holiness? To those whose ideas of holiness are low, and measured only by innocence, holy intention, and resolution, or who think of human models of a holy life, it may not seem unnatural that believers should at once become alike perfect in holiness and that their practice of true holiness should be invariably free from imperfections of any kind. But to that man who considers how weak and imperfect the greatest saints and martyrs have been when they left this world; how far from perfection the best of our friends have been when they left us; and then compare them with the sublime ideals of perfect likeness to the pure and holy Jesus, entire likeness to God the Father in perfect conduct, it will seem incredible that the man who leaves this world so imperfect should in a moment of time leap to this perfection of practice. We need some very clear and express teaching in Holy Scripture to justify such a belief. And we have it not.

It is to be feared that those who are thinking of immediate sanctification at death are not thinking of the sanctification set forth in Scripture; but of a merely negative sanctification, such as consists in the absence of positive sin. Sanctification embraces this as one of its elements certainly, but Christian sanctification is vastly more than this—it is the positive attainment of perfect practice. It is not only the non-commission of sin; it is not only the doing of holy deeds under favorable circumstances; it is not merely the accumulation of holy strength, purpose, resolution, and character such as make it easy to resist sin; but it is vastly more than that—it is the attainment of the masterful experience and practice of Jesus Christ, so that the saint rises superior to every temptation or any possibility of temptation; and attains such a height of Christlikeness and Godlikeness that it will be absolutely impossible for him to commit sin, so to say, as impossible as for Christ to be stained with guilt or for God to commit iniquity, and in which the entire character, conduct, and practice are as perfectly holy as the character and conduct of God, pure as Christ is pure, perfect as God is perfect. Does any one suppose that such purity, such perfection, can be gained in the moment of death? Such a sanctification is the goal of that progressive sanctification that begins with regeneration in this life and is carried on until the resurrection and the judgment day.

The doctrine that has been unfolded removes difficulties from many other doctrines. (*a*) It enables us first to understand the doctrine of the universal salvation of infants and incapables. It seems most probable that the God of all grace begins their redemption in this world by an act of regeneration, takes it up when they die at that point, and carries it on in the Middle State through all the subsequent steps of sanctification. Dr. Strong, the eminent Baptist divine, says:

"Since there is no evidence that children dying in infancy are regenerated prior to death, either with or without the use of external means, it seems most probable that the work of regeneration may be performed by the Spirit in connection with the infant soul's first view of Christ in the other world" (A. H. Strong's "Systematic Theology," p. 357. Rochester, 1886).

I do not share Dr. Strong's opinion, and yet I decline to say

that he is heterodox; for the reason that this is a question of speculative theory to which the Bible gives us no decisive answer. I prefer to think of children as the sweet singer Ephraim the Syrian thinks of them, when he sings:

"Our God, to thee sweet praises rise
From youthful lips in Paradise;
From boys fair robed in spotless white,
And nourished in the courts of light.
In arbors they, where soft and low
The blessèd streams of light do flow:
And Gabriel, a shepherd strong,
Doth gently guide their flocks along.
There honors higher and more fair
Than those of saints and virgins are;
God's sons are they on that far coast,
And nurselings of the Holy Ghost." *

How can we think of such a mechanical act, such a magical change, as the transformation of a new-born heathen babe into the perfect likeness of Jesus Christ in the very moment of death? No passage of Holy Scripture teaches such a doctrine. (*b*) This doctrine of progressive sanctification after death also relieves the doctrine of the salvation of some of the heathen and of the heathen world. We can now see that those who have been enlightened by the Logos and born again of the Holy Spirit, among any of the religions of the world, having the root of the matter in them, the vital tie of union with the Deity, enter the Middle State, where they enjoy all the training they need for their progressive sanctification. Israel was able to do his mediatorial work for the nations only imperfectly in this world. It seems probable that Israel has ever carried on that mediatorial work as the religious teacher of mankind, when the patriarchs and prophets, the sages and the singers received the pious heathen into the school of holiness that lay beyond the grave. And so it is with the ministry of the Church. The Church has only in part carried on its ministry in this world. Its greatest ministry has ever been in the Middle State, in training the departed babes and pious heathen in the holiness and

* See article "Infant Salvation," by G. L. Prentiss, "Presbyterian Review," iv., pp. 569 seq.

blessedness of the heavenly state. As our Lord descended into Hades to preach the gospel there, so the ancient Church conceived the apostles and teachers as carrying on His work. There is an apostolic succession of ministry which is not confined to this earth, but embraces in its redemptive scope the realm of the living and the dead, as Christ is the king and judge of the living and the dead, and His Church is composed of the living and the dead.

I believe that this doctrine of progressive sanctification after death is of great practical importance.

(*a*) It fills up the Middle State for us with an attractive, industrious, holy life, a progress in grace, in knowledge, in holiness, in all perfections. We realize that our departed friends are not asleep, but awake in the most active of lives. We see our babes growing in the divine life. We see our beloved in the companionship of prophets and apostles, of saints and martyrs, and of the Holy Jesus. We know that they have not forgotten us, that they are praying for us, and are waiting to welcome us into the world of the redeemed. Death loses its terrors—and becomes only a gateway into a better country, into a brighter and purer life.

(*b*) It incites to holy endeavor. The doctrine of immediate sanctification at death cuts the nerves of Christian endeavor and dries the sap of holy activity. What is the use, says the sluggish soul, in my striving so hard for holiness, when I shall receive it all in an instant whatever my life has been? All I need is pardon, to get into the kingdom at the eleventh hour. If I can only crawl through just at the moment the gate of death creaks on its hinges, I shall be as holy and as blessed as the greatest martyr and the most self-sacrificing of missionaries.

No such doctrine was known to the martyr age of the Church. Those who hold such views are not the stuff martyrs are made of. There would have been no martyrs, there would have been no Church, if Christianity had built on such a foundation. Those who, with Paul and John, keep their eyes fixed upon the perfection of God, the likeness of Christ, and make it their one aim, their one hope, to attain that perfection and likeness at the resurrection and the advent—those will purify themselves in this world that they may enter the next world with as great

an advancement as possible. For if there are grades of service and advancement here, there will be still greater differences of grade there; and the honors of heaven will be apportioned in accordance with the self-sacrificing ministry of earth. The holy deeds done in the body are the sacred nucleus of the holy practice of the Middle State.

The doctrine of progressive sanctification is in accordance with the laws that God has established in the ethical constitution of man. The conscience speaks the categorical imperative in the first dawn of the moral consciousness, and it pronounces its decision in the light of the training that men receive in their successive stages of advancement in morals.

The Church and the Bible give their potent aid to the conscience in the ethical elevation of humanity. It is always, everywhere, and in every variety of form and education, a training. Shall all this ethical training cease at death, all the varied stages of progress in the different periods of life, of culture, of racial and national advancement, be reduced to a common level and made of none effect, by a mighty transformation that will deal with the race, father and child, mother and babe, master and scholar, self-sacrificing missionary and pagan convert, the devoted evangelist and the thief and murderer turning in his last hour to Christ from the shadow of the gallows—all as one undistinguishable mass? Such a doctrine strikes a deadly blow at the moral nature of man, the ethical constitution of society, the historic training of our race, and the moral government of God.

The doctrine of progressive sanctification after death harmonizes Christian faith with Christian ethics, and both of these with the ethics of humanity and the ethics of God. It enables us to comprehend the whole life of man, the whole history of our race from its first creation until the day of doom, and all the acts of God in creation and providence, under one grand conception, the divine sanctification of man.

I have gone over all the Charges made against the doctrines set forth in my Inaugural Address. I have shown that the doctrines taught by me are not contrary to the Westminster Confession, but that they are in accord therewith; that they are

not irreconcilable with the Scriptures, but are the product of a comprehensive study of the Scriptures. They set forth the doctrines of the Bible, which have been made of none effect by the traditions of men. It is now for the Presbytery of New York to make its decision. I pray God you may make no mistake, but that you may stand firmly by the Word of God and the Constitution of our Church and so deliver a righteous verdict.

Additional Remarks made during the Delivery of the Argument for the Defence.

P. xiv, line 1, after "once more" insert "the words with which this sentence begins."

P. 103, line 11, after "irreverent" insert "But in what ancient language do the prosecution find dotted i's and crossed t's? In the Aramaic letters which took the place of the original Hebrew letters we find the little yodh, but in the ancient Hebrew alphabet the yodh was as long and broad as any other letter. Possibly the prosecution have found some original autograph unknown to the rest of the world which they are suddenly to spring upon us. We shall calmly wait for its disclosure."

P. 161, line 22, after "whether" insert "the prosecution have any right to force their interpretation upon me. I have a right to my interpretation even if you think it a wrong one. The prosecution have no more legal right to their interpretation even if it be the right one. It is plainly a difference of interpretation; for the prosecution put their interpretation into the charge, by inserting the two little words 'at once.' They have no right to make the Westminster Standards responsible for their 'at once.' They have no right to exact of me that I should say 'at once,' or to condemn me because I refuse to make this addition to our Standards. But even granting that you have a right to insist upon the insertion of 'at once' into our Standards and to claim that the interpretation contained in these words is the true interpretation, is this." Omit "the" before "doctrine" and "is" between "death" and "an essential" and insert an interrogation mark after "Westminster Confession" in the clause beginning with "the doctrine" and closing with "Confession;" lines 22, 23.

P. 175, line 16, after "means" insert "in Purgatory."

Concluding Remarks upon the New Matter introduced by the Prosecution into their Argument in Rebuttal.

Mr. Moderator, Ministers and Elders of the Presbytery of New York:

The Biblical scholar (and may I also say, the historian?) of the prosecution has spoken. He has done precisely what the defendant, prior to the delivery of the argument for the defence, intimated to the Presbytery that he would do. He has disregarded the evidence as set forth in the Amended Charges and submitted to the Presbytery, and has introduced a large amount of new evidence. He has ignored the case as presented by the real chairman of the prosecution, as well as by the ostensible chairman, in their opening arguments. He has not considered the argument for the defence as worthy of rebuttal. He has introduced such a large amount of new matter as to make an entirely new case. The ostensible chairman of the prosecution promised that the prosecution would introduce no new matter. But this promise, like many others from that same source, was a disguise of its fulfilment. Dr. Lampe has done precisely what was promised and agreed he should not do. He has trampled under foot the rights of the defendant, the precedents which govern all trials, and the rulings of this court. The injustice and the wrong have been done. The court has permitted them. The argument goes up on the Stenographical Report to the higher courts to the injury of the defence. What shall the defendant do under the circumstances? Shall he claim the right to make a new argument against this new case? He might justly do so. And yet the time already given to this trial has been so extended, the strength and patience of the court have been so strained, the health of some of the dearest friends of the defendant has become so imperilled, and his own vigor is so much impaired, that he does not hesitate to say that he would rather be convicted than undertake a new argument at this stage. It has come to this pass, that members of the court

are saying, If such things can be done in the name of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, it costs more to be a Presbyterian than it is worth.

It is necessary, however, that I should say a few words.

(1) *The new evidence.* The new evidence introduced by the prosecution ought to have been offered as rebuttal evidence, in accordance with the Book of Discipline, § 23; so that the defendant might test it in his defence. Inasmuch as this was not done and the defendant has excepted to it, you cannot lawfully allow it or consider it. But as many members of this court are not accustomed to sit as judges and jurors, and we have no presiding judge who can give a final statement of the case for your guidance, let me say in brief:

(*a*) That the new evidence from Luther and Calvin is irrelevant. It does not show that the great reformers held to the modern dogma of inerrant original autographs. Let me cite from Köstlin, the most competent authority on Luther now living. With the permission of the court and to save my strength, I will ask my friend Dr. Brown to read this and another extract for me. Will Dr. Brown please read the translation from the German?

DR. BROWN: The book is entitled "Köstlin's Luther's Theologie." I translate from the second volume, page 280:

"But especially there meet us utterances (of Luther), which belong here, on passages of Scripture about which the question arose, whether the one does not testify against the truthful contents of the other. Now, here we have carefully to distinguish between testimonies of the Scripture concerning the truth of salvation (Heilswahrheit)—which forms, for Luther, the object of religious belief—and external historical statements. As far as concerns the former there is conceivable for Luther no contradiction whatever, and nothing incorrect in the canonical Scriptures which have proceeded from the Spirit. . . . But the case is different with declarations of the second kind. Here, too, he is indeed concerned, with conscientiousness and acuteness, to remove the difficulties (die Anstosse zu beseitigen). The Commentary on Genesis offers many examples of this. . . . But even contradictions, in which the evangelists seem to be involved with one another, as in regard to the time of the cleansing of the Temple, or in regard to the place of the denial of Peter, occasion him no great concern (machen ihm doch keine grosse Sorge); in the second case he says of John, that he makes confusion here (dieser mache hier eine Verwirrung); that perhaps he has not observed

the exact order in speaking, but as he declares, not much depends on such questions. . . . Finally he does not shrink from explicitly recognizing plain mistakes; and indeed he finds such mistakes in the mouth of a man whom he expressly holds to speak full of the Holy Spirit, namely, in the speech of Stephen. According to Stephen (Acts of the Apostles vii. 2) Abraham was called while still in Mesopotamia—according to Moses, in Haran; Luther is aware that a double call is on this account commonly assumed; but he does not seek this solution; it has rather (he says) happened with Stephen, as it often happens when we cite something casually, without carefully regarding all the circumstances, while Moses, on the other hand, narrates as a historian."

Dr. Briggs: (*b*) The evidence from divines of the 17th century, adduced by Dr. Lampe, was adduced to show that they held to verbal inspiration and dictation; he has not shown that they teach that there are no errors in Holy Scripture, or that the original autographs were inerrant. The extent of Dr. Lampe's knowledge of the Westminster Divines may be measured by his statement that John Ball "was one of the leading Westminster divines." John Ball is an author whom I greatly admire, and whose writings are ever at hand in my study; but he was not a Westminster divine. He died October 20th, 1640. The Westminster Assembly convened July 1st, 1643. In order to know the views of the Westminster divines something more is necessary than a resort to a few passages of their works under the guidance of a dogmatician who is himself a tyro in that department. Let me quote from Alexander F. Mitchell, the best authority on the Westminster divines now living, from his introduction to his published minutes of the Westminster Assembly. Will Dr. Brown please read?

Dr. Brown: I read from the minutes of the Westminster Assembly, Introduction, page 49 seq.:

"If any chapter in the Confession was more carefully framed than another, it was this, 'of the Holy Scripture.' It formed the subject of repeated and earnest debate in the House of Commons as well as in the Assembly; and I think it requires only to be fairly examined to make it appear that its framers were so far from desiring to go beyond their predecessors in rigor, that they were at more special pains than the authors of other Confessions. 1. To avoid mixing up the question of the canonicity of particular books with the question of their authorship, where any doubt at all existed on the latter point. Any one who will

take the trouble to compare their list of the canonical books with that given in the Belgian Confession or in the Irish Articles, may satisfy himself that they held, with Dr. Jamieson, that the authority of these books 'does not depend on the fact whether this prophet or that wrote a particular book or parts of a book; whether a certain portion was derived from the Elohist or the Jehovist; whether Moses wrote the close of Deuteronomy, Solomon was the author of Ecclesiastes, or Paul of the Epistle to the Hebrews; but on the fact that a prophet, an inspired man . . . wrote them, and that they bear the stamp and impress of a divine origin.' 2. To leave open all reasonable questions as to the mode and degree of inspiration which could consistently be left open by those who accepted the Scriptures as the *infallible rule* of faith and duty. 3. To refrain from claiming for the text such absolute purity, and for the Hebrew vowel points such antiquity, as was claimed in the Swiss *Formula Concordiæ*, while asserting that the originals of Scripture are, after the lapse of ages, still pure and perfect for all those purposes for which they were given. Not even the text they adduce in proof of this statement will suffice to fix down their meaning to the sense which Lee and others have sought to impose on it; for Lightfoot, who in matters critical was regarded as one of their highest authorities, has expressly stated that the words one *iota* or one tittle are by our Lord himself used interchangeably with 'one of the least of these commandments;' and that his meaning in both cases is not that no letter or part of a letter should be lost or corrupted, but that not a particle of the divine meaning should be so 'eonsque in corruptam immortalitatem ac puritatem textus sacri asserere et *non peritura sit ulla sensus sacri particula* a capite legis ad calcem.' To the same effect Vines says that the Scripture stands not *in cortice verborum*, but *in medulla sensus;* and shows that he not only knew of *variæ lectiones* in the Hebrew, but held that some in the margin were 'truer' than those in the text. Tuckney expresses himself in similar terms, and so does Ussher in his famous letter to Cappellus. 4. To declare that the sense of Scripture in any particular place is not manifold, but one, and so raise an earnest protest against that system of spiritualizing the text which had been too much countenanced by some of the most eminent of the fathers, and many of the best of the Mystics." *

Dr. Briggs: The passage from Rutherford, as cited in my evidence, speaks for itself. It may be colored and warped by the glasses through which Dr. Lampe and his guide look at it; but he cannot color it and warp it for you. I have the book in my hand, and I could read the whole passage, but it would take twenty minutes to do it. I have gone over it again very care-

* Minutes of Westminster Assembly, 1644–1649 (Introduction, Alex. F. Mitchell, pp. 49 seq.).

fully, and the statements of the passages which I have given in the evidence adduced are exactly as they are in the book.

I shall cite a few words from John Ball and from John White. Let me say that I introduce this evidence because the prosecution have introduced new evidence and it is necessary for me to rebut it; but all of the evidence that I am using in rebuttal was in the evidence which I introduced, with the exception of that passage from Köstlin which Dr. Brown has read. All the rest was cited by me as parts of my evidence at the beginning.

A few words from John Ball. Dr. Lampe cited and read from John Ball a question with reference to Holy Scripture:

"Q. How may it be proved that those books are the word of God immediately inspired by the Holy Ghost to the prophets and apostles?

"A. First, By testimony of the Church; secondly, Constancy of the saints; thirdly, Miracles wrought to confirm the truth; and fourthly, By the antiquity thereof."

And he stopped there, as if these were the evidences adduced by John Ball for Holy Scripture. He overlooked the fact that John Ball proceeds very much in the same way as the Westminster Confession proceeds. The next question is:

"Q. How else?

"A. By the stile, efficacie, sweet consent, admirable doctrine, excellent end, and the witnesse of the Scripture itselfe" (p. 15).

And then finally he goes on:

"Q. These reasons may convince any, be he never so obstinate, but are they sufficient to perswade the heart hereof?

"A. No; the testimony of the Spirit is necessary, and onely all sufficient for this purpose" (p. 28).

Now let me read several passages additional further on:

"Concerning the Scripture, we must put difference betweene the doctrine therein contained, and the writing; for the signe is for the sense, and the knowledge and faith of both is not alike necessary" (p. 9).

And again:

"The Spirit of God doth assuredly perswade our consciences that the Scriptures are of God, by enlightning our eyes to behold the light, writ-

ing the Law in our hearts, sealing up the promises to our consciences, and causing us sensibly to feele the effects thereof" (p. 29).

"The testimonie of the Spirit doth not teach and assure us of the Letters, syllables, or severall words of holy Scriptnre, which are onely as a vessel, to carry and convey that heavenly light unto us, but it doth seale in our hearts the saving truth contained in those sacred writings into what language soever they be translated. The Spirit doth not lead them in whom it dwelleth, absolutely, and at once into all truth, but into all truth necessary to salvation, and by degrees, so that holy men partakers of the same Spirit, may erre in many things, and dissent one from another in matters not fundamental" (pp. 30, 31).

A passage of more importance, from John White, which was introduced by myself, and also by the prosecution, in evidence, is:

"Nay, if he should goe a steppe further and beleeve any thing that is written in the Scriptures, for the Testimony of the Scriptures, yet still he beleeves upon an Humane testimony, because he beleeves the Scriptures themselves upon Humane testimony, as upon the generall consent of the Church which receives the Scripture as the Word of God; or upon the probability and reasonableness; or of the things therein delivered, lastly, upon the observation of the Truth of those holy writings in most things, which makes them beleeved to be true in all. For the Assent unto one thing for another, is built upon that, to which we first give our Assent. As a stone in a wall though it lies immediately upon that stone that is next under it; yet is indeed supported by the foundation which beares up all the building" (White's "A Way to the Tree of Life," 1647, p. 98).

Now this seems to me to express exactly the attitude of this prosecuting committee over against myself; for I build entirely upon the Divine testimony in the Holy Scripture.

I could go over all this evidence and show you that it is irrelevant; but what is the use? The prosecution live in the cavern of a dogmatic faith, and everything they read in the Bible, or in the Confession, or in Christian writers, is seen in that cavernous light. They are as blind as owls and bats to the truth of history and the facts of the world of reality. If any of you see as they do, I greatly regret it.

(2) *The new matter.* I have specified this new matter, in part, in the exceptions which I have filed. It is impossible for me to review it without taking a large amount of your time, and in my judgment, to little purpose. I shall briefly refer to

these matters. (*a*) A long argument has been made on verbal inspiration and the theory of dictation and the inspiration of the concept only. But there is no charge against my theory of inspiration. Charge III. is not that I deny verbal inspiration, or that I claim that only the concept is inspired, but definitely this and this alone, that I teach that "errors *may* have existed in the original text of the Holy Scripture as it came from its authors." It is not claimed in the Charge that I teach that errors *did* exist, or *must* have existed in the original text of the Holy Scripture as it came from its authors. This I have repudiated. I have declined to say whether the original autographs were inerrant or not. That is the extent of my fault as stated in the Charge and so stated in my defence. This alone is on trial before you. When the prosecution go further than this in their argument and charge me with teaching that we have an errant Bible, and so endeavor to envelop the real offence in a cloud of prejudice against me on other matters, they are guilty of inexcusable misrepresentation of me, and of a gross offence against the intelligence of the court, by making a more serious charge than that offered for probation.

(*b*) When Dr. Lampe argues that I teach the errancy of Jesus, he argues on a much more serious matter than any contained in the Charges, and in such a way which shows that he knows but little of the true doctrine of the personality of our adorable Saviour. I am not surprised that a man who can speak of the hours of prayer and religious meditation as *lonely* hours should know so little of Jesus Christ. When we are apart from the world and present with Jesus we have companionship which is richer and more glorious than that of all the world beside. My argument was simply this, that Jesus never said that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote all of the book which bears his name; and that He was not obliged to correct all the errors of his contemporaries. This argument the prosecution did not attempt to rebut, they did not refer to it; but, in place of rebuttal, charge me with a more serious error than anything contained in the Charge. How can this court look upon such conduct with any degree of toleration?

(*c*) Almost the entire argument of Dr. Lampe is directed against the views of rationalistic critics, with the implication

that I am responsible for their opinions. The prosecution had in their hands my printed argument on the authorship of the Pentateuch and the book of Isaiah. They have not paid the slightest attention to anything in my argument. As I stated at the close of my argument on the Pentateuch, I defend the historicity of the Pentateuch no less than the prosecution; and I defend it on better grounds and with far greater hopes of success when I recognize parallel narratives of the same event in the history contained in the Pentateuch. The court should recognize all this irrelevant argument and rule it out of court, and confine themselves to the specific matters contained in Charges IV. and V., and determine whether a man who denies the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and asserts that Isaiah did not write half the book which bears his name, has taken a contra-confessional position and is thereby ruled out from the Presbyterian Church.

(3) I have taken exception to much the *greater portion of the argument* of Dr. Lampe, as in no sense a rebuttal, but a new case against me. It is impracticable for me to go over all the argument at this time. Let me take one glaring specimen. He puts in my mouth (p. 16) the statement: "Newman could not find certainty and God in the Bible striving never so hard, but found a place among the faithful through the institutions of the Church. Martineau could not find God in the Bible but did find Him enthroned in his own soul." This is a misrepresentation. The passages from the Inaugural referred to (pp. 25, 27) say no such thing. They say: "Martineau could not find divine authority in the Church, or the Bible; but did find God enthroned in his own soul" (p. 27). "Newman, who could not reach certainty, striving never so hard, through the Bible or the Reason, but who did find divine authority in the institutions of the Church" (p. 25).

I did not say that Newman and Martineau did not *find God* in the Bible. That statement the prosecution, and they alone, are responsible for. To find God is one thing, to find divine authority in that in which we find God, is another and a different thing. The difficulty with the prosecution is that they seem incapable of making distinctions and seeing differences in the fields of theology which are so unfamiliar to them.

It is not necessary to first accept the doctrine of the inspiration of Holy Scripture, and the divine authority of Holy Scripture, before we can find God and His Christ in the Scriptures. For most people this order is reversed. We find God and Christ in the Bible before the question of the inspiration and authority of the Bible are raised to us; and in fact most men accept the Bible as the Holy Book of God just for this reason, that they have found God and Christ in it and through it. But if some men like Martineau have found God in the Bible without going on to the further stage of recognizing the divine authority and inspiration of Holy Scripture, shall we say on that account that they did not find God in the Bible? I decline to say it. You may say so if you can, but you have no right to convict me of heresy because I refused to share your opinion in this particular. To know God and the Christ He has sent is the Christian religion, even if men doubt the inspiration of Holy Scripture or deny the infallibility of the Bible.

(4) Finally, let me call your attention to the fact that this afternoon Dr. Lampe has reiterated the argument on the seventh Charge that you threw out, and has reiterated it in a most offensive form. Do you allow a committee claiming to be appointed by this Presbytery, and to represent you, to override a ruling which you have distinctly made? I call for the justice of the court. I appeal to the sense of honor of the judges. In this argument on the seventh Charge (which was ruled out) he attributes to me the words of my beloved teacher Dr. Dorner, when I have expressly disclaimed in my argument, as you will remember, holding that particular phase of his doctrine. It is true that in my book entitled "Whither?" on pages 260 and 261, I quoted an extract from Dr. Dorner with reference to those who had passed into the middle state, in which he said a few words about the condition of the impenitent there, and expresses the hope that some of them may be saved; but as the greater part of the extract (and that is the reason why I cited it) refers to the progressive sanctification of believers who have gone into the middle state, I did not in "Whither?" indorse every word that Dr. Dorner said, nor did I think it necessary for me to disclaim that portion of his doctrine when I said,

"Lest any one should stumble at these excellent thoughts, owing to the name of Dorner, I shall conclude with the wise words of John Wesley." The previous context in which this passage was contained shows sufficiently well that I had been teaching the doctrine of progressive sanctification of believers after death, and had not thought of any change for unbelievers so far as their redemption is concerned. And in the argument which I made before you I took the precaution, lest any one should misunderstand me, when I quoted this extract from Dorner again, to disclaim that specific teaching of Dorner which Dr. Lampe has again, and in spite of my disclaimer, attributed to me this afternoon.

Much more might be said; but I forbear. The Charges are in your hands. You have my defence. You should read it again in order that you may see how little attention has been paid to it by Dr. Lampe in his argument before you during the three days in which you have heard him, and in order that you may find therein an answer to all these misrepresentations, which are thick in the argument that you have heard from his lips. You have heard the argument of the prosecution. Once more I challenge you before God to judge me by the Holy Scripture and by the Westminster Standards, not by your own opinions, not by any dogmatic system of theology, not by anything attributed to me by the prosecution—but by the Holy Scripture and by the Standards; and then you will give a righteous verdict, to which I shall submit.

Date Due