

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
3 1761 01952770 4

OTHER GOSPELS
OR
LECTURES ON ST. PAUL'S
EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS



REV. W. HUMPHREY,

TRANSFERRED



OTHER GOSPELS.

By the same Author.

THE DIVINE TEACHER.

Price 2s. 6d.

THE WRITTEN WORD

OR

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.

Price 5s.

MARY MAGNIFYING GOD.

MAY SERMONS.

Price 2s. 6d.

MR. FITZJAMES STEPHEN AND CARDINAL
BELLARMINE.

Price 1s.

LONDON: BURNS AND OATES.

OTHER GOSPELS

OR

LECTURES ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

By WILLIAM HUMPHREY,

PRIEST OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS.



LONDON: BURNS AND OATES.

1879.

FEB - 4 1957

PREFACE.

THE differences which divide Catholics from those who still profess Christianity, yet remain outside the Catholic Church, are far from superficial.

They have their roots in a fundamental difference which lies deeper down than is generally supposed.

That difference is as to the Messianic or Apostolic character and office of the Incarnate Word.

Catholics and those who, while claiming the name of Christian, are not Catholics, are at issue not only as to the past aspect of the temporal mission of the Son of God, but also as to the nature of His *present* work on earth, and as to the mode of His *present* influence on the souls of men.

Agreement on this fundamental issue would, by the grace of God, speedily result in agreement with regard to those points of difference which lie upon the surface and more readily strike the eye.

The difference is commonly supposed to concern principally the constitution of the Christian Church, as it is the mystical Body of Christ. The writer believes that it rather concerns, and concerns primarily, Christ Himself, as He is the Head of that Body.

This conviction has led him to publish the following considerations in the hope that, in these days of inquiry and of doubt, they may aid 'men of good-will' on their way towards the possession of that 'peace of believing' which springs from the 'obedience of faith.'

The lectures have in substance been delivered in the churches of the Society at Edinburgh and at Oxford.

Oxford, Pentecost 1879.

CONTENTS.

I.

THE REALITY OF ST. PAUL'S APOSTLESHIP.

	PAGE
1. St. Paul's assertion and proof of his Apostleship	1
2. The Apostleship of Jesus Christ	15
3. The Apostolic Character of His One Church	23

II.

THE ONENESS OF ST. PAUL'S GOSPEL.

1. The Gospel of God in the One human Mind of Christ	34
2. The Gospel of Christ in the One collective Mind of the Apostolic College	41
3. The Gospel of the Apostles in the One collective Mind of the Catholic Church	48

III.

ST. PAUL'S RELATION TO ST. PETER.

1. The state of the Church, and the progress and influence of Christianity at the date of Saul's conversion	61
2. The nature and constitution of the Church as estab- lished by Jesus Christ, and as Paul found it at his entrance into it	70
3. His consequent relation to it, and to Peter	79

IV.

ST. PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

	PAGE
1. The meaning of the terms <i>Justification</i> and <i>Faith</i>	107
2. The mysterious character of the Gospel, and the necessity of Divine faith	119
3. Motives of credibility, and grounds of faith	123
4. Hindrances to faith, and reasons why men do not believe	133

I.

THE REALITY OF ST. PAUL'S APOSTLESHIP.

Paulus, Apostolus, non ab hominibus, neque per hominem, sed per Jesum Christum et Deum Patrem.

Paul, an Apostle, not from men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father. *Galat. i. 1.*

IN order that we may grasp and penetrate the scope and meaning of any book, epistle, or document which has fallen into our hands, we must first have sufficient knowledge of the writer, of the person or persons addressed, of the reasons which called forth the document, and of the circumstances under which it was written.

Before, then, entering on our consideration of this Epistle to the Galatians, let us set clearly before our minds who and what manner of man St. Paul was, and who and what manner of men those Galatians were.

St. Paul, to quote his own words from another epistle of his written to the Philippians, was a man 'of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews, according to the law a Pharisee,' or, as he declared before the

Council and the high-priest Ananias, 'a Pharisee and the son of Pharisees.' In this Epistle to the Galatians, speaking of himself, he says, 'You have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the Church of God and wasted it; and I made progress in the Jews' religion above many of my equals in my own nation, being more abundantly zealous for the traditions of my fathers.'

He was, as he declared to the multitude at Jerusalem on that day when he was apprehended and carried before the tribune, 'a Jew born at Tarsus in Cilicia' (and so 'a citizen of no mean city'), 'but brought up in the city (of Jerusalem), at the feet of Gamaliel, taught according to the truth of the law of the fathers, and zealous for the law.'

He goes on to tell them whither this zeal carried him, how he 'persecuted unto death, binding and delivering into prisons both men and women.' Of this persecution we have an account given to us by St. Luke in his Book of the Acts of the Holy Apostles. In it we first hear of St. Paul, then known as Saul of Tarsus, as present at the stoning of his kinsman the protomartyr St. Stephen the Deacon. He is there described, not only as consenting to that bloody deed, but as keeping the garments of the witnesses who slew Stephen.

Thereafter we read of him as making 'havoc of the Church, entering in from house to house, and dragging away men and women and committing them to prison;' and again, as 'breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord.'

In pursuance of what he had made the purpose of his life, he obtained letters from the high-priest to the synagogues at Damascus, that if he found there any men or women who were Christians, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem to be punished. As he went on his journey, and drew nigh to Damascus, suddenly and at mid-day a great light from heaven shone round about him. He fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying to him, 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?' He answered, 'Who art Thou, Lord?' The voice replied, 'I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest.' And when Saul, trembling and astonished, said, 'Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?' the Lord said to him, 'Arise, and go into the city, and there it shall be told thee what thou must do.' There he was told that the God of his fathers had preordained him that he should know His will, and see the Just One, and hear the voice from His mouth, for he should be His witness to all men of those things which he had seen and

heard. Of this Saul the Lord said to Ananias, whom He sent to instruct and baptise him, 'This man is to Me a vessel of election, to carry My Name before the Gentiles and kings and the children of Israel; and I will show him how great things he must suffer for My Name's sake.'

The result of Saul's conversion was that immediately he preached Jesus in the synagogues, that He is the Son of God, and he openly professed that 'faith which once he impugned.' He was now at one with Peter in his belief and in his teaching,—that Jesus of Nazareth, crucified on Calvary, was indeed 'the Christ and the Son of the living God.'

This truth he taught first to the Jews in their synagogues, and thereafter to the Gentiles in many lands. Amongst other places he taught it in Galatia.

Having seen who and what manner of man St. Paul was, and how he who had been a persecutor of what he regarded as the irreligious sect of the Nazarenes became a preacher of the doctrines of their Founder, we inquire who and what manner of men those Galatians were, to whom he wrote this Epistle, and what were the circumstances which moved him to address them.

The Galatians were converts to Christianity

and of St. Paul's own teaching. They were converts, not from Judaism, but from Paganism. By race they were not Jews, they were Greeks.

Galatia, the country in which they lived, was a district of Asia Minor. It lay between Cappadocia, Bithynia, Pamphylia, and the Black Sea. It was called Galatia by reason of the origin of its inhabitants. They were Gallo-Greeks; that is to say, men who had come from Gaul and settled in Greece. Hence the district which they colonised came to be called Gallo-Grecia. This name was, in course of time, softened down into Galatia.

St. Paul had preached throughout Galatia, and his preaching had borne abundant fruit in the conversion of multitudes. They had embraced his belief in the Divinity of Jesus of Nazareth, in His mission to men from the Eternal Father, and in the Divine truths which He proclaimed as His Father's message to the human race.

Not only had they believed, but their faith had been at first so firm and fervent, that it had its result in their reception of two great and special graces which are fruits of faith. They had had power given them to work miracles—a grace which is an effect as it is an evidence of faith possessed and exercised in no ordinary degree.

They had received the farther and still greater grace of an heroic courage and constancy to suffer and to endure, and that gladly, many things for the Name of Christ and for the sake of His Gospel.

St. Paul reminds them of this in his third chapter, where he speaks of the Spirit who was given to them and wrought miracles among them, and also of the so great things which, when they began in that Spirit, they had suffered.

But after St. Paul's departure from them to preach the Gospel in other regions, there arrived in Galatia certain false teachers. Those men had been originally not Gentiles, as were the Galatians, but Jews. They had embraced Christianity, and they still professed to be Christians. They had put on Christianity, but they had not put off Judaism as such. They were Christians in name and by profession; they were Jews at heart and in their practice. They did not regard Judaism in the light of Christianity; but they regarded Christianity in the light of Judaism. They did not see that the law was but a pedagogue to lead men as disciples to the feet of the Divine Teacher Jesus Christ. They did not see that the law was of its very nature transitory, and must pass away in its fulfilment by the everlasting Gospel. They did not see that the law was but a shadow of the

‘good things to come,’ and that in presence of the reality the shadow must necessarily disappear. They did not see that the Law was laid but upon one people, while the Gospel was to be preached to all nations, and to be the possession of the entire human race.

They believed, then, and taught an adulterated Gospel. Their Gospel was as it were a religious alloy, compounded partly of Judaism and partly of Christianity. Their doctrinal system consisted, not of Judaism as interpreted and fulfilled and quickened by Christianity, or of Christianity as foreshadowed by and founded in that Judaism which it completed and crowned, but of Judaism and Christianity as really and essentially distinguished the one from the other.

They held that men, to be Christians, must become also and previously Jews. They maintained that, to be members of the Christian commonwealth, they must be aggregated to the Jewish people. They insisted that even Gentiles on becoming Christians should be circumcised, and taught that they were bound by all the ceremonial precepts, and were obliged to observe all the practices of the Law of Moses.

Now this teaching was in direct contradiction to the doctrine of St. Paul, and to that Gospel

which the Galatians had heard from his lips, which he had taught them as the Gospel of Jesus of Nazareth, and in which as such they had believed.

St. Paul had taught them that Jesus Christ had fulfilled the Law, and that consequently the Law was swallowed up and comprehended in the Gospel. He had declared to them that whatsoever in the Law remained binding on men's consciences was contained also in the Gospel; that all outside the Gospel was no longer of obligation; and that the Law, as such, or as distinct from the Gospel, had been abrogated, and was now of none effect.

Such was the difference between the doctrine of St. Paul and that of those false teachers. He taught the one Gospel, pure, unadulterated, and unalloyed, as it had been taught by, and as he had received it from, Jesus Christ Himself. To this Gospel those men added; and so adding, they had transformed it into another Gospel, and into a Gospel which, whatever it was, was not the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Now in order to effect their purpose, to disseminate their doctrines, and to persuade the Galatians to adopt their system, those false teachers had recourse to a crafty expedient. It was singularly unscrupulous, but cleverly devised. They

determined to undermine the authority of St. Paul, and so to destroy his influence with the Galatians.

To this end they brought against him three false charges. They asserted, in the first place, that he was not an Apostle, but only a disciple of the Apostles; secondly, that, in any case, his doctrine was not that of the other Apostles; and thirdly, that his doctrine differed according to the character of his audience, and that what he taught at one place he denied at another.

The Galatians fell into the snare. Their faith in St. Paul's apostolic authority was disturbed and shaken. They fell away from his doctrine, and embraced that of the false teachers who had lied against him. They permitted themselves to be circumcised, and began to observe 'days and months and times and years.' They were led into combining with the commandments and obligations of the Gospel the precepts and practices of the old Law as necessary to salvation.

St. Paul, hearing of their defection, wrote to them from Ephesus this Epistle. It is one of the most vehement of all his Epistles, and is full at once of sorrow and of a holy anger or righteous indignation. 'O senseless Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that you should not obey the truth?'

He does not hesitate to denounce their error as an apostasy from Christ, and as a perversion of Christ's Gospel.

His motive, then, in writing this Epistle was his desire to recall them to their former faith, to a belief in the pure and unmingled Gospel of Jesus Christ. To this end, and in order to reëstablish his influence with them, he sets himself to rehabilitate in their minds his authority. Before therefore entering on the doctrinal question, he rebuts the calumnies so impudently circulated against him by the false teachers.

Their first charge was that he was not an Apostle, but only a disciple of the Apostles. Hence he begins his Epistle with these words: 'Paul, an Apostle, not *from men*, neither *by man*, but *by Jesus Christ* and God the Father, who raised Him from the dead.'

He sets forward the reality of his Apostolate by declaring the source of his mission.

He denies the source assigned by his malicious enemies the false teachers, and he asserts the true source, namely, Jesus Christ.

He goes farther, and tells them that not only was he an Apostle as really as were the others, but that in one way—that is, as to the manner of his mission, or as regards the circumstances under

which he received his Apostolic authority—he had præminence even over them.

He says: ‘Paul, an Apostle, *not from men* ;’ that is to say, not by human appointment or by his own usurpation. Those are apostles *from men* who have not been sent by their Maker to teach their fellow-men. It matters not whether they have taken this office upon themselves, or whether they have had it committed to them by human authority, they are at most apostles *from men*. If they teach of their own accord, and without being sent by others or by another, they are not even apostles. If they have been sent to teach by any authority, public or private, academical or civil, however high but less than Divine, they still remain apostles *from men*.

Again he says, ‘Paul, an Apostle *not by man* ;’ that is to say, an Apostle commissioned and sent directly and immediately by God, *without any interposition of man*.

He does not deny that a man may be really and truly an Apostle, on whom Apostolic authority has been bestowed, not directly by Jesus Christ Himself in the flesh, but from Him by means of His Apostles whom He had instructed and invested with power for this purpose.

This was the case of Matthias. He entered

on that place in the Apostolic College from which Judas by transgression fell, and in the stead of the traitor he was numbered with the eleven Apostles. Matthias was an Apostle, not indeed *from* men, for his election was of the Holy Ghost; but he was notwithstanding an Apostle *by* man, for it was through the instrumentality of men that the will of the Holy Ghost was signified and accomplished.

But with St. Paul it was otherwise. He, as he tells us, was not in the same position, as regards the reception of Apostolic authority, with his fellow Apostle St. Matthias. He received his mission and authority, not from men, neither by man, but straight from Jesus Christ Himself. He received his Apostleship as directly and immediately from his Incarnate and Crucified God as did Peter, James, and John, who were His disciples and daily associates during the years of His public ministry, and who were the preordained witnesses to His resurrection from the dead.

There was this difference between his commission and theirs as to the manner and circumstances of its bestowal—they received their Apostolic authority from Jesus Christ while He was yet in the estate of His humiliation, passible and mortal like themselves, the Man of Sorrows, and

subject to the law of suffering and of death; he received his Apostolic authority from the same Jesus Christ, but from Him in the estate of His exaltation, after He had risen gloriously and triumphed over death and the grave, after He had ascended into heaven and been enthroned in majesty at the right hand of the Eternal Father. Hence St. Paul adds: 'An Apostle . . . by Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised Him from the dead.'

Jesus Christ, in all the brightness of His glory, Paul had seen on the way from Jerusalem to Damascus. With the eyes of his body he had gazed on the Sacred Humanity, with his own ears he had heard the words of Jesus. The same voice familiar in the ears of the other Apostles said to Saul, 'I am Jesus, whom thou dost persecute.' Faith came by hearing, and by the hearing of the words of Christ. Saul professed himself a disciple, and Jesus made him also an Apostle.

No sooner had he received his Apostolic commission than he commenced his Apostolic work and entered on his Apostolic labours. He went not, as he writes to the Galatians, to Jerusalem to the Apostles who were before him, to receive commission from them as did Matthias; for his Apostolic authority he had already received from the same

source from which they had derived theirs, directly and immediately from Jesus Christ Himself.

This was the first condition required to constitute him an Apostle, even as they were Apostles.

The second was supplied by the fact, that although Paul had never seen Jesus as they had seen Him during the years of His mortality, or during the forty days after His resurrection from the dead; yet he had seen, as really as they had seen, the Risen Jesus, and he had seen, moreover, that which they had not seen, the Ascended and Exalted Jesus, His Sacred Body bearing on it the testimonies to its crucifixion, the seals of the Five Wounds, and shining with all the blinding brightness of its celestial glory.

Thus was fulfilled that condition of the Apostolate to which Peter referred at the election of Matthias—‘that he might be made a *witness* with us *of the Resurrection* of Jesus.’

Hence St. Paul in another Epistle, writing to the Corinthians, distinguishes between his own personal unworthiness to be an Apostle and the reality of the Apostleship which nevertheless he had received. In one place he says, ‘I am the least of the Apostles, who am not worthy to be called an Apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God;’ but, he adds, ‘by the grace of God I am

what I am' (1 Cor. xv. 8). And in another place, 'Am I not an Apostle? Have I not seen Christ Jesus our Lord?' (1 Cor. ix. 1.) 'Last of all He was seen by me, as by one born out of due time' (1 Cor. xv. 9); and again, 'In nothing have I been inferior to those who were above measure Apostles, although I am nothing' (2 Cor. xii. 11).

2.

Such, then, was the reality of St. Paul's Apostleship, denied by those false teachers in their endeavour to pervert his Galatian converts, and which, in his Epistle to them, he asserts and establishes, in order, by reëstablishing his authority in their minds and regaining his influence over them, to bring them back to their former faith in the one pure and unalloyed Gospel of Jesus Christ.

But now we ask ourselves,—What was the precise nature and character of that Apostolate to the possession of which St. Paul ascribes so much importance? What was the office; what were the functions of an Apostle? What was the relation of an Apostle to Jesus Christ on the one hand, and to his fellow-men on the other?

Rightly, clearly, and adequately to understand these relations of an Apostle, and the office founded upon them, we must first rightly, clearly, and

adequately comprehend the relations and office of Jesus Christ, as He was the Messiah or Sent of God.

To do this we must go still farther back and consider that Divine Person, God the Father, to Whom, as the primary source of all mission or apostleship, St. Paul refers, when he describes himself as an Apostle 'from Jesus Christ and God the Father, who hath raised Him from the dead.'

It is a revealed truth that in the Unity of the Divine Essence there are three distinct Divine Persons. Of these Three it is also revealed, and it is therefore divinely certain, that Two have been both *sent* and *seen*, and that One who never has been seen has also never been sent. That one is the First Divine Person, the Eternal Father. Him 'no man hath seen at any time.' As the Father and Fount of Deity, He is the Source of Mission. He has *sent* the Son, eternally begotten of Him; and with that Son also sending, He has *sent* the Holy Ghost, who eternally proceeds from Both.

The Father sent His Son in the Incarnation of that Son. He sent Him to take man's nature upon Him, to be born of a woman, to be a member of our race, to belong to the one human family, to be subject to the universal law of labour, of

suffering, and of death under which mankind lay ; to be in all things made like unto His brethren according to the flesh.

When the Eternal Father so sent His Son, He, the Son of the Living God, became also Son of Man. He was God and Man, possessing two distinct natures, the Divine Nature and a human nature, God's and our own, in the unity of one Person, and that one Person a Divine Person.

This was done in such wise as that it may be said, and must be said, that the Word was made Flesh, and that God was Incarnate. God was conceived and born, lived with a human life, thought and willed and spoke and acted as men think and will and speak and act, laboured as men labour, suffered and sorrowed and died as men suffer and sorrow and die. The Sacred Humanity was a nature of God, belonging to, and personally possessed by God, and subsisting in a Divine Person as the Divine Nature also subsisted in that Person. The Body of Jesus was the Body of God, His Blood was the Blood of God, and Mary His Mother was therefore Mother of God. His created and human Soul was the Soul of God; His human Life was the Life of God, and when He laid it down His Death was the Death of God.

In this way, by means of this hypostatic or

personal union of those two distinct natures, the Divine and the human, He, the God-man Jesus Christ, the Word Incarnate and *as Incarnate* became the One Mediator of God and men.

He, and He alone is *by nature* Mediator between God and men. Other men may be mediators *by office*, as was Moses between God and His chosen people of Israel; but Jesus Christ stands alone in His relation of Mediator by nature. The oneness of His Mediatorship lies parallel to the oneness of His Divine Sonship. Other men may become sons of God by adoption; He stands alone in the position of Son of God by nature. This is true of Him, even as to His Sacred Humanity, or as He is the Man Jesus of Nazareth. Of that Man, externally undistinguishable from His fellowmen as He emerged from the waters of Jordan, the Voice said from heaven, 'This is My Beloved Son.'

On this mediatorial relation rest all those offices which belong to Jesus Christ in order to the accomplishment of that Divine purpose for which He was sent into the world.

He, the Messiah and Christ of God, was anointed and sent to be the one Prophet of God, to be the one High-priest of God, and to be King of kings and Lord of lords. He was sent to teach men Divine Truth, to offer for man a Divine Sacri-

fiice, to rule and govern men with Divine Authority, and in accordance with Divine Law.

For our present purpose, and following the argument of this Epistle, we confine our consideration to His office of a Prophet or Teacher sent by God to teach men divinely and therefore of necessity infallibly.

Not only was every word of His teaching divinely true, but He Himself was divinely sent to teach it. Nay, more, the words which He uttered were the human words of a Divine Person. They were therefore the human words of God.

They were words of God not merely in the sense that they were according to the will of God, and represented the mind of God; they were words of God inasmuch as they were uttered by that human voice of God which issued from the human lips of God.

There was this difference between Jesus of Nazareth as a Prophet and the prophets who went before Him, that while they spoke in the name and with the authority of God, and could preface their teaching with the words, 'Thus saith the Lord,' when He spoke it was the Lord Himself who spoke. When men listened to Him they heard God Himself speaking; when men were taught by Him they were 'taught of God.'

This was the ground of their faith, of that faith which cometh by hearing, and by hearing the words of God from the Incarnate Word of God.

Furthermore, Jesus was sent as the Messiah of God and as the Prophet of God, not as Moses was sent to one people, or to the men of one age: He was sent to the human race. His words were to penetrate to every land, and to extend throughout every century, even to the consummation of the world.

His mission was to teach the nations, and His mission was to endure through all the ages, and continue to the end of time. On this His mission, or, on the fact that He had been *sent* to teach, He was ever insisting. He was ever speaking of the Father who had sent Him; and of His own teaching He said, 'My doctrine is not Mine, but His who *sent* Me;' and of His work, 'I came down from heaven, not to do My own will, but the will of Him who *sent* Me.'

Further, we find that what He did in His own person immediately and directly, He did also by means of other men whom He associated with Himself. He associated men with Himself in order to the extension and continuance of His work as He was the Messiah of God. He did this in particular in order that by means of them He

might teach everywhere, and ever continue to teach mankind, and so teach men of every succeeding age and in all lands as that they should individually be 'taught of God.'

Multitudes of men who heard His teaching, and saw the miracles wrought by Him for a testimony, believed in His Divine mission, and therefore embraced His doctrine as Divine. That doctrine comprehended the revealed truths of His own divinity, and of His oneness with but personal distinction from the Father, as that Father's Begotten Son and eternally uttered Word. Men became His disciples, believing and professing that He was not only a Prophet and *the* Prophet, that He was not only the Messiah and the Christ, but that He was also the Son of the Living God.

From among the number of His disciples He chose twelve men, whom He constituted and called His Apostles. He gave them commission: 'Go and teach all nations.' This was to be their *office*—they were to be Divine Teachers or Prophets of God. But the foundation of this office was that *relation* to Himself in which He established them. He associated and identified them with Himself in His own Divine mission from the Father. He said to them, in words which are plain and unmistakable in their meaning, definite, precise, and

clear, 'As the Father sent Me, so send I you' (St. John xx. 21). Here He traces His mission to its source in the Eternal Father. He devolves that mission upon them, and declares that they possess it as He possesses it, with the same fulness as Himself: 'As the Father sent Me, so send I you.'

The consequences of this association of them with Himself in His Divine mission, of this identification of them with Himself in His Messianic character as the Sent of God, and, in particular, of their oneness with Him in His prophetic office and teaching authority, He declares in another place. There speaking, not to the twelve Apostles as such, but to the seventy-two disciples whom He sent before His face into every city and place whither He Himself should come, He said, 'He that heareth you heareth Me, and he that despiseth you despiseth Me, and he that despiseth Me despiseth Him that sent Me' (St. Luke x. 10).

Here again we find Him tracing His own mission to its source, and declaring their oneness and identification with Him in that mission by the consequence that when men heard them it was the same as if they had heard Him: 'He that heareth you heareth Me.'

This, then, is what St. Paul meant by his

Apostleship—his oneness with Jesus Christ in His Messiasship—his identification with Him in His Divine mission to teach men Divine truths—‘Paul, an Apostle by Jesus Christ and God the Father.’

This, and nothing less than this he claimed, as is clearly evidenced by his words to the Galatians in this Epistle, when, speaking of his preaching to them in former days and of their faith, he says, ‘You received me as an Angel (or Messenger, or Messiah) of God—even as Christ Jesus’ (iv. 14).

3.

And now, in how far and in what way is all this practical to ourselves? It is of all subjects most practical, for it discovers to us, and sets clearly before our minds, the foundations and motives of our faith, the grounds and reasons why we believe.

St. Paul tells us in his Epistle to the Romans (of which this Epistle is doctrinally an epitome) that ‘faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ.’ That the word of the Apostles was in reality the word of Christ is evident from what, referring to them, he adds: ‘Their sound went out into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world’ (Rom. x. 17, 18). And again, if faith cometh by hearing, ‘how shall

they hear without a preacher, and how can they preach unless they be sent?' (vers. 14, 15.)

The reason why we believe is because we hear the *words of God* uttered in our ears *by those whom God has sent.*

We believe in the Gospel of Christ because we previously believe that the man Jesus of Nazareth, whom men see no longer here upon earth, is yet Himself exercising His ministry, and executing His office of a Prophet, and teaching mankind, just as really as when, centuries ago, He executed that office and taught men by means of Peter, James, and John, or by means of that Paul who was an Apostle, not from men, nor by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father.

We believe, in a word, the Gospel of God because we believe in the Church of God.

We believe in the one Church of the one God, which is not only Holy and Catholic, enduring throughout the ages, and the teacher of all nations, but which is also Apostolic, as possessing that Divine mission which Jesus possessed, as He was the Messiah of God.

When, in the celebration of the Sacred Mysteries, we solemnly, before God and His Christ, before men and angels, profess our faith and say that we believe in an '*Apostolic Church,*' we

mean not merely in a Church which can lineally trace descent to one or other or to all of the twelve Apostles, but in a Church which is identified and one with that Man Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah of God, whom St. Paul calls the '*Apostle and High-priest of our confession*' (Heb. iii. 1).

This Man, says St. Paul, 'was counted worthy of greater glory than Moses, by so much as he that hath built the house hath greater honour than the house. . . . Moses indeed was faithful in all his house as a servant, . . . but Christ as the *Son in His own House*, which House are we' (vers. 3, 5, 6). St. Paul sets before us the true and adequate idea of the Church as it is 'Apostolic,' and as it is also the Church 'of Christ.' It is the Church 'of Christ,' not only as founded and made by Christ, as the House builded by Christ, and so as belonging to and possessed by Christ, but also as it comprehends within it and *includes* Christ. It belongs to and is possessed by Christ, but not as that thing belongs which is external to him who possesses it. It belongs to and is possessed by Him as that belongs to a man which is comprehended within the circle of his human existence, which exists within the unity of his personal being. He is the *Lapis Angularis* or chief corner-stone of that House of God into which we

have been builded as living stones. He is the human Head of that Body of Christ of which we are members. He the Son is not only Lord and Master of that House which He has builded for a House of God to the honour of His Eternal Father, and to the greater glory of the Divine Majesty; but He the Son *is in His own House*, which House are we. Hence, by reason of this oneness of His Church with Himself, is that Church truly and adequately *Apostolic*. He is the one *Apostle of God*, and the Church is Apostolic because it is *one with Him*.

Hence also we see the reason for its necessary and indivisible *oneness*.

By one Church, and by one alone, can this Divine mission be possessed. One Church, and one only, can have Apostolic authority to teach Divine truth. There may be many churches which are churches 'from men;' but, as God is one, and as Christ is one, there can be but one Church which is Apostolic in the sense of the Apostle, that is,—which is 'from Jesus Christ and God the Father.'

As Jeremias foretold, so has it come to pass: 'I did not send prophets, yet they ran. I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied' (Jerem. xxiii. 21). Jesus foresaw the rise of false teachers, and

He forewarned men against them. 'Beware,' said He, 'of false prophets. . . . Many will say to Me in that day, "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Thy name?" . . . and then will I profess to them, "I never knew you"' (St. Matt. vii. 15, 22, 23). And again: 'There shall arise false christs and false prophets. . . . Behold, I have told it to you beforehand' (St. Matt. xxiv. 24, 25).

Here we have distinctly foretold to us, by Jesus Christ Himself, that which we see around us in our own day. The world is cumbered with a multitude of sects and societies of men, separated one from the other, and each severed from that one Church which alone can trace its line unbroken down to the twelve Apostles, and through them to the one 'Apostle of our confession,' Jesus of Nazareth, the Son and Messias of God.

Each several sect professes to be Christian—either itself to be or to belong to the Church of Christ. Well may we exclaim with St. Paul, writing to the Corinthians and warning them against the sectaries and schismatics of his day, 'Is Christ divided?' (1 Cor. i. 13;) for this is certainly what it comes to. Given that those sects either are severally churches of Christ, or belong to, or together compose the one Church of Christ—that Church being, as St. Paul tells us, His

Body and His one Body ; and they being severed one from another,—the inevitable consequence is that ‘Christ is divided ;’ and He Himself has said, ‘Every kingdom divided against itself shall be made desolate, and every city divided against itself shall not stand. . . . He that is not with Me is against Me, and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth’ (St. Matt. xii. 25, 30).

Wherefore, ‘I beseech you, brethren,’ writes the Apostle to the Corinthians, ‘by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you ; but that you be perfect in the same mind and in the same judgment’ (1. Cor. i. 10).

One Church, then, and one only, can be *Apostolic*, in the sense of the Apostle. One such Church there must be upon earth now, and one such Church must exist upon earth all days to the end of time ; and this not only that the prediction of Jesus may be verified, and that His promises may not come to nought, but also if Jesus of Nazareth is to remain a power upon the earth, and an influence on the minds of men, teaching them ‘as one having authority, and not as the scribes ;’ and so that men taught by her should be taught by Him, and thus ‘taught of God.’

That such a Church does exist in this our own

day, that against it the gates of hell shall never prevail, that no power of man shall have might against it for its overthrow, that, while kingdoms and commonwealths may fall around it, it shall survive in all its vitality and all its vigour, and that it shall be found upon earth by the Son of Man when He comes again in majesty and in great glory, Catholic and Apostolic, Infallible and Divine, even as He left it—we believe, and that with the absolute, undoubting, and unhesitating certainty which is rooted and grounded in Divine faith. With a like certainty of the same faith do we also believe and know that the one indivisible Church of Christ is that Church which has for the seal of its Apostolic character what is signified by that name of ROMAN in which it glories.

Of all the cities in which Apostles preached Rome remains the one only Apostolic See. Other Apostles left successors behind them when they passed away, but one Apostle, and one only, has had in his successors one unbroken line. There has never failed a man to sit upon the throne of Peter; and there, in that city where Peter shed his blood, Peter perseveres and lives. In the Roman Pontiffs, his lineal successors, Peter reigns and rules; he confirms his brethren, and he feeds his flock. The Roman Pontiffs may be driven by

the powers of darkness and by the might of men from the City into the wilderness; they may live and die without ever once in their lives setting foot within its walls, without once gazing on its glories—nay, the Holy City may become itself a desert and a howling wilderness—and yet Rome shall endure as the Eternal City to the end of time; for its Bishops are by birthright the sons of the Fisherman, and the line of his succession cannot fail. And why? Not for this reason only—that the Roman Pontiffs are Peter's successors; but for that other reason that, as Peter's successors, they are the Vicars upon earth of Jesus Christ. Hence is their see truly Apostolic, for in that see reigns the representative to mankind of the one 'Apostle of our confession.' The Roman Pontiff is the visible head here on earth of that one Body, with its one Spirit, which possesses the one faith, because it has the 'mind of Christ.' Living with His life, identified with Him in His mission, it possesses, and preserves, and proclaims His one Gospel in all its fulness, pure and unalloyed as Paul preached it to the Galatians nearly nineteen centuries ago.

Thanks be to God, who has called us into the society of His Son, so that we are brought in contact with Him; and albeit we may not now

behold His face, we yet hear His voice teaching within the precincts of that Church which He built upon the foundation of the Apostles and the Prophets, He Himself being its chief corner-stone.

II.

THE ONENESS OF ST. PAUL'S GOSPEL.

Aliud evangelium, quod non est aliud.

Another gospel, which is not another. *Galat. i. 6, 7.*

WE have considered the reality of St. Paul's Apostleship, as set forth in his assertion that he was an Apostle, not from men, neither by man, but from Jesus Christ and God the Father. He was not an Apostle *from men*, as were pretenders and impostors, schismatics and false teachers—men without mission, or whose mission was merely human—who had either usurped the office of teacher of divine things by entering upon it un-called and of their own accord, or had been appointed to it by their fellow-men. He was not an Apostle *by man*—that is, through the instrumentality or interposition of men—as in the case of Matthias, who, although really and truly an Apostle, had received his Apostolic commission and authority, not directly and immediately from Jesus Christ present to him in the flesh, but from Him by means of His Apostles, whose election

and action in the bestowal of the Apostolate was under the assistance and direction of God the Holy Ghost. He was an Apostle *from Jesus Christ and God the Father*—from the First Divine Person, who, as He is the Eternal Father and Fount of Deity, is the Source of all Divine mission; and from the second Divine Person, His Incarnate Son, who, as Incarnate, was Himself the Messiah or Sent of God.

We have considered, moreover, this Apostleship, on the possession of which, in order to the preaching of the Gospel, St. Paul lays so much stress; and we have seen that its essential character consists in association and identification with Jesus Christ in His Divine mission, in His mediatorial relation to God and men, and so in His prophetic or teaching office.

We have considered, finally, the Apostolic character of the one Catholic and Roman Church of God. We have seen the necessity for such a Church, if Jesus Christ was to extend and continue His work upon the earth, throughout the ages and in every land; and, at the same time, the impossibility of there being two or more or many churches of the one Christ, without Christ being 'divided' as an inevitable consequence.

We come now to consider that Gospel of God

to the preaching of which Divine mission or Apostolic authority was and is, according to St. Paul's doctrine, absolutely necessary.

1.

And, first, we ask ourselves the question, What is the Gospel of God? We find the answer to this, as to all other questions which concern religion, by consideration of Jesus Christ as He is the Incarnate Son and, as such, the Messias or Sent of God.

He, the Second Divine Person, assumed and possesses not only a human body of flesh and blood in all respects and precisely the same as our own, but He possesses also a human soul tenanting that body, and the source and cause of its human life. This soul is, like our souls, created and finite. It once was not; at a given moment or point of time it began to be. By a creative act of Divine omnipotence on the part of the Triune God, it sprang from nothingness into being. Its faculties, capacities, and powers are the same as those which belong to our souls. Like our souls, His Soul possesses three spiritual powers common to every human being—a human memory, a human mind, and a human will.

The human mind of Jesus Christ is the storehouse of His human knowledge. With His *human* knowledge only are we for the present concerned. Besides it He possesses a Divine knowledge, which is infinite. He knoweth all things with that knowledge which He had with His Father before the world was. But this knowledge belongs to Him in virtue of His Divine Nature; and, as being infinite, it can in no way be contained or comprehended within the limits of His finite human soul.

But besides this infinite knowledge, which with His Infinite Divine Nature from eternity He possessed, He possesses also, as given to Him and bestowed upon Him, and that in time and with His human nature, a *finite* knowledge. As His two natures subsist distinct, and remain unmingled in the unity of His one Divine Person, so may the knowledge which belongs to each be distinguished from that which belongs to the other; for in reality both are as separate and distinct, the one from the other, as is the infinite from the finite, or as is the Divine from the human. Both are knowledges of God, because both belong to a Divine Person; but the one is limitless, like the Divine Nature, the other is bounded by the conditions of His created human nature. The one

knowledge He has in common with the Father and the Holy Ghost; the other He has in common with ourselves. Between His human knowledge and our human knowledge there may be and there is a difference *in degree*, but both are alike *in kind*. His human knowledge is of the same kind as that which we as human beings possess, or *may* one day possess, or at least *might* possess, or, in a word, which we are capable of possessing.

This human knowledge possessed by Jesus was of various kinds, corresponding to the various conditions or states of His human being, and to the various offices which, as Mediator of God and men, He was sent to fulfil.

He had, for instance, that human and finite, albeit supernatural, knowledge of God and of the things of God which is the result of the Beatific Vision. This Vision His human soul enjoyed in the instant of its creation, and therefore this knowledge He possessed in the first moment of His human existence. This knowledge was the same in kind with that which we hope one day to possess, and which the Saints of God in glory possess now.

Besides this knowledge, which was absolutely supernatural, He had a preternatural infused knowledge, such as that which was bestowed by

God upon the first Adam. This belonged to Him as He was the Second Adam, or the human father in the supernatural order of the family of the sons and daughters of God. As their Father it became Him to have knowledge of His children; even as it became Him, as He Himself tells us, as He is the Good Shepherd, to know the several members of His flock. He knows His sheep, and He knows them 'by name.' As a fruit of this knowledge He has prepared for each of them a *locus nominatus*, or place assigned to each by name, in the kingdom of His Father.

But besides these various human knowledges there is yet another, and it is that which belonged to Jesus Christ, as He was the Messiah and Prophet of God—as He was sent by God to teach mankind those things which God willed that mankind should know.

Among these were certain truths which man could never have discovered for himself, of which he would have never heard save for a Divine revelation, and which he could know only by God revealing them to him. And yet these truths God willed that men should know, and that in order to His own greater glory and their salvation; and therefore He sent His Son as a Prophet to teach those truths to men.

Among such truths were, for instance, the mysteries of the Trinity of Divine Persons in the Unity of the Divine Essence, and the Incarnation of the Second Divine Person, the mystery of man's redemption through the Sacrifice of the Cross, the means whereby grace is bestowed and sin destroyed, the Resurrection of the Body, and the Beatific Vision.

Such truths, and other truths connected with them, Jesus Christ came to reveal and make known to men; and in order to this it was necessary that He Himself, as He was man, as He was Mediator and Messiah, should first have knowledge of them.

Now He, being God, might have Himself selected from the treasury of His Divine knowledge such truths as He willed to be the possession and heritage of mankind. But albeit God and a Divine Person, He was not the First but the Second Divine Person; He was not the Father, but the Son; He was not the Unseen and the Unsent, but He was that Person who, when made visible to human eyes by His assumption of our humanity, was *sent* as the Messiah and Prophet of God.

Therefore it was that He received of the Father that which He was to bestow. He brought

from the Father the message of the Father. He said, 'My doctrine is *not Mine*, but *His* who sent Me' (St. John vii. 16). And again: 'I have not spoken of Myself, but the Father who sent Me. *He gave Me commandment* what I should say and what I should speak. The things therefore that I speak, *even as the Father said* unto Me, so do I speak' (xii. 49, 50). 'The Word which you have heard is *not Mine*, but *the Father's* who sent Me' (xiv. 24). 'The things I have *heard* of Him that sent Me, these same I speak in the world. . . . As the Father hath *taught* Me, these things I speak. . . . I speak that which I have *seen* with My Father. . . . I have spoken the truth to you which I have *heard of God*' (vii. 26, 28, 38, 40).

This, His doctrine, the Message of His Father, the Gospel of God, was contained within His human mind, even as the doctrine of every teacher must be contained within the mind of that teacher before it can issue from his lips.

As so contained, the Gospel of God is called by St. Paul 'the Gospel of Christ.'

Now this Gospel was not a heterogeneous collection of isolated statements and unconnected truths. It was an organic system, a body of doctrine. Every truth contained within it had its relation to, its connection with, and its dependence

on the other truths which as parts made up together with it one whole.

Hence the doctrinal unity of the Gospel of God. It was as essentially one as the doctrine of every teacher must necessarily be one. It is impossible for any human mind to hold at one and the same time contradictory doctrines on the same subject; and as the mind of Christ was a human mind, and as He had but one human mind, therefore that Gospel which it contained, of which it was the storehouse, was necessarily one.

Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ and Son of the Living God, was the one Messiah and Prophet of God, and His one doctrine was the one doctrine of God.

He bestowed His one Apostolate upon twelve men, whom He associated with Himself and identified with Himself in His Divine mission to *teach*.

They were twelve branches bearing fruit, and whose leaves were for the healing of the nations; but He was the One True Vine, in whom they lived, and from whom they derived at once their individual spiritual life, and their collective Apostolic authority and power.

They were the twelve living foundations of the One Catholic Church; but of that House of God He was the One Living Corner-Stone.



They were twelve streams to fertilise and make glad the City of God ; but He was their One Fountain and Central Source.

They were set by Him to feed the Flock of God ; but He remained the One Good Shepherd.

And as He was the root of all their Apostolic authority, so was He to them the source of all Gospel truth.

2.

This brings us to our second point, which is the oneness of this Gospel of God and of His Christ, as it was possessed and proclaimed by the Apostles of God and Christ, and as that oneness is set forth by St. Paul who, equally with them, had received from the same source the same Apostleship and the same doctrine.

This Gospel, which the mind of Christ contained, the voice of Christ transferred and conveyed to the minds of His Apostles, so as that it should exist and be contained in their minds even as it was in His.

We read that when oftentimes He spoke to the multitudes in parables, to His Apostles He spoke openly. 'To you,' He said to them, 'it is given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of God.' During forty days after His resurrection from the dead He appeared to them at frequent

intervals, and communed with them, and gave them charge in matters pertaining to His Kingdom, and to the Gospel of the Kingdom.

When He spoke to them of the Third Divine Person whose mission to them, and descent upon them, and abode with them He predicted and promised, He spoke of Him as the Spirit of *Truth*, who should lead them into all truth, and should bring to their remembrance all things whatsoever He (Jesus) had said unto them.

This, then, was the office of God the Holy Ghost:—to complete and seal up within the minds of the Apostles that organic system or body of Divine doctrine which was the Gospel of Christ.

There were certain truths which Jesus told them that they could not bear then during His mortal lifetime and while He was yet among them, but which should be revealed to them when they were endued with power from on high. The Holy Ghost descended, even as Jesus had foretold, and the result of His advent was twofold;—it had regard both to the Apostolic authority with which they had been invested, and to that Gospel of God with which they had been entrusted.

It had regard to their Apostolic authority, or to their Divine mission, in this way. We have already seen that not one only, but two Divine

Persons have received mission, or have been *sent*, —the Son and the Holy Ghost. The Incarnate Son devolved upon His Apostles that Divine mission which, in His Incarnation, He received from the Eternal Father. To the same Apostles the Holy Ghost was sent at Pentecost to rest upon them and to abide with them. They were thus the subjects of a *twofold* Divine mission. In them centred the mission of the Son and the mission also of the Holy Ghost, whom the ascended Son sent to them from the Father.

Not without reason, therefore, are they called not only Apostles of Christ, but Apostles of God —‘Apostles by Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised Him from the dead.’ The risen and ascended Jesus, with His Father, sent them that Spirit who eternally proceeded and proceeds from Both. As from Both He proceeds as from one principle, so by Both was He sent as by one sender. He came upon them as He is the Lord the Life-giver, and as He is the Spirit of Light and Truth and Strength and Power.

Thus did they receive Apostolic authority or Divine mission in its completeness, in all its fullness. To this end were they straitly charged by Jesus to remain at Jerusalem, not to depart thence, and not to enter on their Apostolic work

until they had been endued with power from on high. The same Holy Ghost whose advent bestowed upon them the fulness of their Apostolic power, completed also within their minds or understandings that Gospel of God which they were to deliver to the nations. Thus on the day of Pentecost they were thoroughly furnished for entrance on their Apostolic career. They had in their minds that message in its entirety which they were to deliver to mankind, as they had received also their mission to proclaim it in the name and with the authority of the Three Divine Persons—of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The Spirit of the Lord was upon them; they were anointed with His Divine unction to preach unto men the Gospel of God.

Now as it was with that Gospel in the human mind of Jesus, the Messiah of God, so was it with the same Gospel in the minds of His Apostles; or rather, so to speak, in the one collective mind of the Apostolic College—that Gospel *was one*.

As we shall see by and bye, the twelve Apostles received their Apostolic authority not as they were twelve individual men separated the one from the other, and independent of each other; but, on the contrary, as they were *one*—one college, one society, one body of men, in connection, in union,

and communion each with the other, and all, save one, in subordination to that one, as to their common head. There was one Body and there was one Spirit, as St. Paul wrote to the Ephesians (iv. 4), describing the Church of Christ; and consequently there was also one faith. To this St. Luke refers in his Book of the Acts of the Apostles, where he says, 'The multitude of the believers had but one heart and one soul' (iv. 32).

The unity of the teachers' doctrine was reflected in the unity of the faith of those whom they taught. The unity of belief which, as Apostles, they possessed, had power to generate a like unity of belief in their disciples. These were to the Apostles as is the impression to the seal which gives it form. They were to the Apostles as is the epistle to its writer. This they were as the result of the oneness of the Word of Truth and of the operations of the one Spirit of Truth. Hence, says St. Paul to the Ephesians, 'In Christ you also, after you had heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation, were signed with the Holy Spirit of promise' (i. 13). And again, to the Corinthians: 'You are our epistles, known and read by all men. You are the epistle of Christ, ministered by us, and written not with ink but with the Spirit of the Living God' (2 Cor. iii. 2, 3).

And once more to the same Corinthians, in another Epistle: 'We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, a wisdom which is hidden; but to us God hath revealed by His Spirit. . . . We have received the Spirit that is of God, that we may know the things that are given us from God, which things also we speak. . . . We have *the mind of Christ*' (1 Cor. ii. 7, 10, 12, 13, 16). We see, then, from St. Paul's doctrine and from what we read both of the Apostles' teaching and of their disciples' faith in which it was reflected, that the one Gospel of God lay in the one collective mind of the Apostolic College, as it had lain in the one human mind of Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah of God, and the one 'Apostle of our profession.'

Now this was that Gospel which St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians asserted and maintained that he also taught. He tells them the source whence he derived it. It was the same source as that from which he had derived his Apostleship. His Apostleship and his Gospel he received alike, directly and immediately, from the risen and ascended, exalted and glorified Jesus of Nazareth. His words are, 'I give you to understand, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached by me is *not according to man*. For neither did I receive it *from man*, nor did I learn

it, but *by the revelation of Jesus Christ* (i. 11, 12). As his Apostleship was neither from men nor by man, so neither from men nor by man did he receive or learn his Gospel. He proves this;—‘I went not,’ he says, ‘to the Apostles who were before me; . . . and I was unknown by face to the Churches of Judæa, which were in Christ. They had heard only that he who persecuted us in times past doth now preach the faith which once he impugned; and,’ he adds, ‘they glorified God in me’ (i. 17, 22-24).

Finally, to complete the proof of the oneness of his Gospel with that of Peter and the other Apostles, and to silence and set at rest for ever the calumnies of the false teachers who, as a means in order to the perversion of the Galatians, had accused Paul of teaching another gospel, or a doctrine differing from that of the other Apostles of Christ, he tells them that fourteen years afterwards he went up to Jerusalem, saw his fellow Apostles, and conferred with Peter, James, and John, the pillars, as he calls them, of the Apostolic College; two of whom had been specially intimate associates and specially favoured disciples of Jesus, and had beheld alike His glory in His transfiguration on the holy mount, and His abasement and agony in the olive-garden

of Gethsemani. 'To them,' he says, 'I communicated the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, . . . and they added nothing' (ii. 2, 6). On the contrary, he adds, 'When they had seen that to me was committed the Gospel of the uncircumcision, as to Peter was that of the circumcision, and when they had known the grace that was given to me, James and Cephas and John, who seemed to be [that is, who were manifestly] pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship' (ver. 7, 9). In short, James and John, two chiefest among the Apostles, with Peter their prince, recognised Paul's Apostleship, and confirmed his Gospel as identical with their own, or as being, in a word, the one Gospel of Christ.

3.

And now, Where is this Gospel? Where is this one Gospel of Paul, this one Gospel of the Apostles, this one Gospel of Jesus of Nazareth?

This is a question the answer to which can be no matter of indolent inquiry or idle interest to those in whose minds it has not yet been solved, and solved with the absolute and undoubting certainty of Divine faith. It is of all questions the most important that a man can put to himself or to his fellow-man.

On our possession of the one Gospel our faith in its fulness depends; and on our faith all depends. By faith we are justified. On our faith, as on a foundation, rests the whole edifice of our spiritual life; and on that life depends our life eternal. 'For this,' said Jesus, 'is life eternal, to know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent' (St. John xvii. 3).

Where is, then, this one Gospel of God, so that receiving, embracing, and holding it fast, we may, as St. Paul says, 'obey the truth' (Gal. v. 7).

Just as it is with regard to sects or churches other than that of Christ, so is it also with regard to false gospels, or gospels other than the one Gospel of Jesus Christ. St. Paul calls every such gospel *aliud evangelium, quod non est aliud*—'another gospel, which is not another;' and he calls the preachers of such gospels apostates, and perverters of the Gospel of Christ. There is and there can be but one Gospel of the one God and of the one Jesus Christ. Men who believe or teach other gospels may arrogate to themselves the name of Christian, but St. Paul maintains that they are not Christian. Be they what they may, this at least they are not. This they cannot be.

We live in these days surrounded by sects of

every kind and shade, embodying almost every phase of unbelief and misbelief, and in all stages of decomposition ; and from every side a very Babel of contending tongues and a clamour of discordant gospels breaks upon our ears. All might conceivably be false, but one alone can possibly be true ; and by *true* we mean—be exactly and precisely that Gospel which Jesus of Nazareth received from the Father, which He delivered to the men of His day, which He left on earth behind Him when He ascended into heaven, which the Holy Ghost completed and sealed up in the minds of the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, which Peter taught the Jews, and Paul the Gentiles and among these, his converts of Galatia.

To be the one true Gospel in any accurate or adequate sense it must be that Gospel, neither more nor less, in its entirety and in all its purity, with nothing added and, still more, with nothing taken away. If anything be omitted from it, then it is not, for it is less than, the Gospel of Christ ; nay, even if anything be added to it, it thereby ceases to be the Gospel of Christ. It is at once ‘another Gospel, which is not another.’

Those who so add, St. Paul says, are ‘perverters’ of Christ’s Gospel ; and of them he further says, ‘Let them be anathema.’ He lays them, with all

the force and power of his Apostolic authority, and with all the simplicity and fervour of his Apostolic spirit, under the anathema or curse of God. The words are his, not ours. It is not for us to apologise for the vehemence of this language of an Apostle of Christ, and of one who wrote under the direct inspiration of another Divine Person—of God the Holy Ghost. Had St. Paul lived in our land and in these days, and had he written of his contemporaries in a letter to be publicly read in the churches, as he wrote in this Epistle of his to the Galatians, not only would he have been denounced in the public prints, and perhaps by the majority of his countrymen, as unchristian and uncharitable and as a fanatical bigot, but he might have laid himself open to prosecution before the civil courts. And yet Paul tells us that if he spoke otherwise, and so as to please men, he should not be ‘the servant of Christ.’

The fact is, there is in the world a spurious charity. The sentiment to which men so often nowadays give the sacred name of charity is the offspring of indifference. It is the result, not of faith and of zeal for revealed truths or for the Gospel of Christ, but of want of faith and of a failure to realise what that Gospel is, what it is for God to have revealed Divine truths, to have

given a Divine Gospel, and to have sent a God, a Divine Person, to deliver it.

That Gospel was given in vain, so far as we individually are concerned, unless we can find it in our own day, and unless we have absolute certainty as to its identity, its completeness, and its purity.

No wonder that those men who have been brought up in some one of the sects which swarm outside the one Catholic and Roman Church of God, and who find each separate sect with its own doctrine and its own interpretation, and yet all of these sects claiming either to be or to belong to the one Church of Christ and to teach His one Gospel,—no wonder that they, if they are thinking men, should recognise the inconsistency, the impossibility, and the absurdity of such claims made in the name of Christianity, and should be driven by the very force of the circumstances by which they find themselves surrounded into blank and open infidelity.

The case is a typical one of an acute thinker of recent times who, born a member of a sect, had Calvinism presented to him under the name of Christianity. From one of the doctrines of that sect, from this, namely, that our good God has predestined some men to eternal damnation,—that is,

has created some human beings for this purpose that they should exist eternally as the everlasting monuments of His vengeance,—he recoiled with horror, and exclaimed, ‘The God of these Christians is worse than their devil!’ He was right. In this only did he err, that he confounded that hellish heresy with the glorious and glad and gracious Gospel of that God who ‘wills all men to be saved, and to come to knowledge of the truth,’ and of that Christ who ‘gave Himself a redemption for all.’ No wonder that that man renounced the profession of Christianity, and lived and died an open infidel. The number of his followers would be greater were men really to think, and to think out their thoughts; had they but the courage of their convictions, and the honesty to carry them to their legitimate and necessary consequences. They would see clearly, and be driven to conclude that if the Catholic claim of one living, ever-enduring, and Divine Church, possessing, preserving, and infallibly proclaiming the one Gospel of God, pure, entire, and precisely as Jesus brought it down from heaven, and left it behind Him on the earth, be baseless and untrue; and that if all that Christianity has done has been merely to engender a swarm of conflicting sects, and so to swell the clamour of contending tongues, Christianity is in-

deed a ghastly failure, and the mission of Jesus a miserable fiasco.

It is to us a consoling thought, when we sadly ponder on the spiritual estate of such men, that what they turned away from was not the One Gospel. That Gospel they had never known. St. Paul confesses, in an Epistle to St. Timothy, that he was some time 'a blasphemer and a persecutor and contumelious,' teaching and acting contrary to 'sound doctrine, which is according to the Gospel of the glory of the Blessed God;' but he adds, that he did it 'ignorantly, in unbelief.' St. Peter too makes excuse for the men of Israel who delivered up and denied the Holy One and the Just before the face of Pilate, and killed the Author of life, and he says, 'I know, brethren, that you did it through ignorance, as did also your rulers.' And Jesus Himself, when in His last agony He prayed for His persecutors, and cried, 'Father, forgive them!' pleaded in extenuation of their guiltiness, 'for they know not what they do.' It is not for us to judge those who are without, and to determine their estate before God. Their condition before God is the secret of God. The measure of their responsibility is known to Him only who is the Searcher of hearts, and to whom no things are hid. But this we may hope, that

among those who know not, and so cannot 'obey the truth' of the one Gospel of God, those whose ignorance is hereditary may still be 'men of goodwill.' This at least we do know, that those who sever themselves from any sect, and who abjure what they fancy to be Christianity by abjuring the gospel of that sect, have not renounced Christianity or rejected God's Gospel, for Christianity as it is contained in the Gospel of Christ they have never known.

But men tell us that great as is the evil of this multitude of sects, and multiplicity of divergent beliefs, there is yet among those sects which make profession of Christianity, in spite of all the differences which lie upon the surface and strike the eye, an underlying unanimity as to *fundamental* doctrines.

Now here we come to the root and centre of the whole contention. This objection brings the whole quarrel to a point, and rests it upon one issue. It is the same issue which St. Paul raised in his Epistle to the Galatians; and we may put it in the form of this question,—What is a *fundamental* doctrine?

From St. Paul's point of view, and from ours, there is no doctrine which is not fundamental, because there is no doctrine to be believed with

Divine faith which is not founded in Divine revelation. All doctrines divinely revealed must equally be believed, if belief in any one doctrine is to be religious, reasonable, and well founded. In the region of faith, as in the sphere of morals, he that 'offendeth in one point is guilty of all.' We believe all for this one reason, that all have been divinely revealed, and are divinely taught. We believe each separate doctrine of the one faith, not upon its individual merits, or because it commends itself to our understanding, but for this simple and sole reason, that it is contained in that deposit of faith which has been divinely revealed.

That deposit of faith contains, it is true, certain main or leading doctrines, which we may call central or cardinal doctrines, inasmuch as other doctrines radiate from them, and converge to them; but there is no doctrine whatsoever lying even on the outer verge of the Divine deposit which is not *fundamental*, in the sense that belief in it is of Divine obligation. The obligation to believe is measured by, as it is based on, not the material importance of the doctrine in itself, but the fact that God has revealed it. As the idea of the Divine is one, and admits of no degrees—neither of greater nor of less—so the Divine character which attaches to all revealed truths is one and

the same. To no doctrine which has not been divinely revealed can we give the assent and obedience of faith. Should we do so, should we give belief to any doctrine which did not form part of the one Gospel of Christ, then we should lie under the same condemnation and anathema with the Galatians and their false teachers. Those teachers merely added to that Gospel, and yet the Apostle denounced them as its perverters. What would he have said of men who mutilate that Gospel as they do by their *denial* of Divine truths? How would he have regarded their plea of the existence, or of the possibility of the existence of a general agreement on fundamental doctrines as coexisting with divergence of belief as to other doctrines which they should style non-fundamental? Would he not have argued that the very conception in their minds of such a distinction betrayed the fact that they had never really comprehended what Divine truth is, or what revelation means?

But we may narrow the issue yet farther, and so make the case still more clear.

By her teaching of one particular doctrine the Catholic and Roman Church undeniably differs from all other societies upon earth. This doctrine is the necessity of union and communion with the

Roman Pontiff in order to be a member of the one *Body* of the Church of Christ, and in order to possess in its completeness the one Gospel of God. This she teaches to be as much a divinely revealed truth as are the truths of the Trinity of Divine Persons and the Incarnation of the Word. If any doctrines are fundamental, then surely of all doctrines this is the most fundamental, for it lies at the very roots of faith; and the denial of this doctrine is therefore the most fundamental of heresies.

Suppose, for a moment, this her doctrine to be untrue, to be a spurious addition to the one Gospel of God, then is the Catholic and Roman Church—equally with the Galatians—a perverter of that Gospel: she lies under the anathema of the Apostle, and so under the curse of God.

And what remains? What of Christianity lies outside her pale? Where is the Gospel?

Gone! disappeared! sunk in the shifting sands of human opinion and of human thought!

But, thanks be to God, two things we know. First, that the Gospel must of necessity *yet exist* upon the earth where Jesus left it, and *as* He left it. And secondly, we know *where* it exists, where it always has existed, where it will ever exist, and where alone it is to be found in all its fulness.

We know that it *must* exist; for we have the words of His promise, and they cannot fail, that the Spirit of Truth should abide with His Apostles for ever, to guide them into all truth, and that He Himself should be with them all days, even to the consummation of the world. Jesus said, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away.'

His words we hear in our own day. They are uttered with the same authority, they are believed in with the same certainty, as if they fell on our ears straight from the human lips of the Messiah and Son, of the Prophet and Word of God.

They are spoken to all nations, and in every land. One living voice has proclaimed them with clear unfaltering utterance throughout the ages from Pentecost to this hour. The same voice shall continue to proclaim them from this hour onwards to the end of time. And so the Son of Man, when He comes again, shall find the faith upon the earth.

The One Catholic and Roman Church was founded and erected by Jesus of Nazareth to be the treasure-house of His one Gospel. She is the pillar and ground of the truth. By means of her Jesus yet exercises and is accomplishing His mission from the Father to the sons of men; for to

her, in her twelve foundations, Jesus said, 'As My Father sent Me, so send I you;' and 'He that heareth you heareth Me.' Hearing her we hear Him; listening to *her* doctrine we listen to *His* Gospel; and even if it contains hard sayings, and men say, Who can hear them? *we* can say with the Apostles and their Prince, 'Lord, to whom shall we go? *Thou* hast the words of eternal life.'

NOTE.—The writer has treated the subject of these lectures at greater length in *The Divine Teacher*, and still more fully in *The Written Word* (London: Burns and Oates).

III.

ST. PAUL'S RELATION TO ST. PETER.

In faciem ei restiti, quia reprehensibilis erat.

I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.

Galat. ii. 11.

WE have considered the doctrine of St. Paul with regard to two great truths—with regard to the one Gospel of God, and with regard to the Divine mission of Jesus Christ as the Messiah and Prophet of God, or, as St. Paul calls Him, the ‘Apostle of our profession.’

We have defined the Gospel of God as being that organic system or body of Divine truths which was contained within the human mind of Jesus Christ. It is that body of mysterious truths which the Son of God, as Incarnate, received from His Eternal Father, and which also He so received for one definite purpose, namely, to deliver it to the human race.

From this fact of that body of truths having been contained within the one human mind of Jesus of Nazareth, as in a treasure-house, we saw the essential and necessary unity of the Gospel.

The same unity we saw preserved when this

Gospel lay in another storehouse to which Jesus transferred it from the storehouse of His own mind, namely, in the one collective mind of the Apostolic body.

We saw, finally, the necessity for some such storehouse being provided, which should endure on earth to the end of time, if the Gospel of God was to be preserved throughout the ages, in its unity and integrity, in its completeness and in its purity. This we found to have been provided in that one Church, which alone is Apostolic in the sense of the Apostle, in the One Catholic and Roman Church of God.

In brief, we have considered, 1. The Gospel of God in the mind of Christ. 2. The Gospel of Christ in the mind of His Apostles. 3. And the Gospel of the Apostles in the mind of that one Church of God which is built on them, as on its twelve foundations, and has Jesus Christ Himself for its one Living Corner-Stone.

There is then, and there can be, but one Gospel of God and of His Christ; and every Gospel which differs from that one Gospel but by a hair's-breadth, whether by way of addition or by way of omission, is not the Gospel of God and Christ,—it is *aliud evangelium, quod non est aliud*, 'another gospel, which is not another.'

This one Gospel of Christ was intended by God not for one people, as was His Law of Moses, but for all nations. It was to be preached, not to the men of one age, but to men throughout the ages—all days up to the end of time and the consummation of the world. It was, moreover, to be preached to men with Divine authority, with an authority as Divine as that of Jesus the Messiah of God. This authority was to be so really Divine as that men, submitting themselves to the Body invested with it, and from the lips of that Body hearing and receiving the Gospel entrusted to it, should so doing be ‘taught of God.’

In other words, Jesus of Nazareth was to continue preaching to men on earth His own Gospel by means of instruments, by the ministry of men whom He should choose. They were to be His coadjutors, and so the ambassadors of God, or, as St. Paul calls them in this Epistle, His angels or messengers. ‘You received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus’ (iv. 14). As He was the one ‘Apostle and High-priest of our profession,’ so did He make them Apostles and priests unto God. As He was the Messiah and Prophet of God, so did He make them Messiahes and prophets with Himself. As He was the Christ of God, so did He make them *alteri Christi*,

or Christs in His place and with Him, anointed to preach His Gospel, to continue and extend His work.

Briefly, the Apostolate was instituted and bestowed as a means towards an end, and that end was the preaching with Divine authority of the one Gospel of God. And the principle of the Apostolate was association, union, and identification with Jesus in His Divine mission from the Eternal Father: 'As My Father sent Me, so send I you.' And finally, to complete this mission in the Apostles, another Divine Person was sent to abide with them. They were the subjects of a twofold mission. Two Divine missions centred in them. They were thus Apostles of God in the fullest sense of the term, being not only Apostles of Jesus, but Apostles likewise of the Father who sent Him, and who with Him sent to them God the Holy Ghost.

The day of Pentecost, the day of the Holy Ghost's descent, was the birthday of the Catholic Church; and on that day Paul was not numbered among the Apostles. The Church of Christ was in existence before Paul was even a Christian. Before Paul had heard and believed the Gospel, that Gospel was being taught in all its fulness by the Church of God. The Apostles and Peter had

preached. Multitudes had believed and had been baptised. Many wonders and signs had been done by the Apostles, and the Lord had added daily to their society such as should be saved.

On Pentecost alone there were added, we are told, about three thousand souls, who persevered in the doctrine of the Apostles. Again, after the preaching of Peter and John, and the miracle of healing wrought by Peter on the lame man who lay begging at the Beautiful Gate, 'many of those who heard the word believed, and the number of the men was made five thousand.' As to the miracle itself it was undeniable, and it was known to all Jerusalem. The chief priests and the Sadducees who had caused Peter and John to be arrested and imprisoned, Annas and Caiaphas and John and Alexander and the other notables and men in authority among the Jews, who composed the tribunal before which they were brought, wondered, knowing that they were illiterate and ignorant men; but seeing the man standing with them who had been healed, they could say nothing against the miracle. They commanded the Apostles to go aside out of the Council and they conferred among themselves, and said, 'What shall we do to these men? for a miracle indeed hath been done by them, conspicuous to all the inhabitants of

Jerusalem: it is manifest, and we cannot deny it.' They would gladly have punished them; but such was the influence of the Apostles with the people that they feared to do so, for 'all men glorified what had been done in that which had come to pass.'

Christianity was already a power; and that in the very centre of Judaism, in Jerusalem itself. It was a power sufficiently formidable to check the action of the Jewish authorities, and cause them to hesitate in taking forcible means for its suppression.

After the deaths of Ananias and Sapphira, and the many signs and wonders which followed that Divine visitation, the people magnified the Apostles yet more, and 'the multitude of men and women that believed was more increased.' Such was the people's faith, and such their confidence in the Apostles' power, that the sick were brought out into the streets and laid there on beds and couches, that as Peter passed by his shadow at the least might fall upon them, and they should thereby be delivered from their infirmities.

Nor was the fame and influence of the Apostles confined to one city, albeit that the chief city of Judea. 'There came also together to Jerusalem a multitude out of the neighbouring cities, bringing sick persons and such as were troubled with unclean spirits; and they were all healed.'

Again the high-priests and the Sadducees conspired against the Apostles, and they were imprisoned. But an angel of the Lord by night opened the doors of the prison, and led them out, and said to them, 'Go and stand and speak in the Temple to the people all the words of this life.' They went and did as the angel charged them. In the morning they were found there, and brought again before the Council. Here we have the testimony of the high-priest himself to the spread of their teaching. He said to them, 'We commanded you that you should not teach in this Name; and behold, you have *filled Jerusalem with your doctrine.*' The Council would have put them to death, but yielded to the counsels of one of their number, a Pharisee, by name Gamaliel. He was a celebrated doctor of their law, and a man respected by all the people. Gamaliel said, 'Refrain from these men, and let them alone, for if this design or work be of men, it will fall to nothing; but if it be of God, you are not able to destroy it, lest, perhaps, you be found to oppose God.' To his advice they consented, and contented themselves with scourging the Apostles, and charging them not to speak at all in the Name of Jesus. The Apostles went forth from the presence of the Council, 'rejoicing that they were accounted worthy to suffer reproach for

the Name of Jesus. And they ceased not every day in the Temple, and from house to house, to teach and preach Christ Jesus.'

We have next the election and ordination of the Deacons, and thereafter the 'Word of the Lord increased, and the number of the disciples was *multiplied very much* in Jerusalem, and a *great multitude* also of the *priests* obeyed the faith.'

As with the Apostles themselves, so also with the Deacons whom they had ordained. We hear specially of two, of Stephen and of Philip. Not only did Stephen teach as did the Apostles, but he received, as a testimony to the divinity of his doctrine, the same miraculous powers which they exercised. 'Full of grace and fortitude, he did great wonders and miracles among the people. They were not able to resist the wisdom and the power with which he spoke.' His zeal, however, cost him his life, and he sealed the Gospel which he delivered with his blood. As present at Stephen's martyrdom, we hear for the first time of that Saul of Tarsus who was afterwards to be known throughout the world as the Apostle Paul. At his feet the witnesses laid their garments while the Protomartyr was being stoned to death. To his death his cousin Saul was 'consenting.'

We see then, from St. Luke's narrative in his

Book of the Acts of the Apostles, what was the progress of the Church founded by Jesus of Nazareth, and what was the spread of His Gospel *before* the conversion of St. Paul.

We have endeavoured to set this before our minds for a special reason. It is necessary, if we are to be capable of forming a true idea of St. Paul's relation to that Church, to the Apostles and to Peter, that we should previously apprehend and realise what Paul, at the date of his conversion, found the Church to be.

The Church was not only a power in Jerusalem and in the surrounding district, but its influence was already widely extended and felt throughout the world. This was due principally to two causes in the Divine Providence. It was owing partly to the assembling at Jerusalem, on the Feast of Pentecost, of devout Jews out of every nation under heaven. There were on that day gathered together in the holy city Parthians and Medes and Elamites, inhabitants of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya about Cyrene, strangers of Rome, Jews also and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians. These men, on their return to the countries in which they dwelt, spread that Gospel which Peter had preached to them,

and in which they themselves, by the grace of God, had come to believe.

A second cause, resulting in the still farther spread of the Gospel, was the general dispersion which took place by reason of the great persecution which was raised against the Church after the death of Stephen. 'They who were dispersed went about preaching the Word of God.'

We read also of another Deacon, Philip by name, who went down to Samaria, and there preached Christ. The Samaritans 'believed Philip working miracles, and casting out devils, and preaching the Kingdom of God in the name of Jesus Christ. And they were baptised, both men and women.' After his departure from them, and while on his way to Gaza, he converted the Ethiopian eunuch, the treasurer of Queen Candace; and thereafter he preached the Gospel in all the cities from Azotus to Cæsarea.

2.

Such was the state of the Church at the time when Saul of Tarsus went to Damascus, furnished with letters to the authorities there from the high-priest at Jerusalem to empower him to bind and imprison all disciples of Jesus of Nazareth, all Christians, both men and women, on whom he

might lay hands. He was 'breathing forth threatenings and slaughter' against them, and, as St. Luke says, he was 'ravaging the Church.'

We shall better appreciate the importance of the movement, and better gauge the influence of this new society, if we consider who and what manner of man was this Saul who had devoted his life, and was straining every energy of his being, to put it down. He had set his heart upon suppressing and extirpating this sect of the Nazarenes.

He was not, like Peter, a common fisherman who toiled for his daily bread, and earned it by his labours on an inland lake, rude and unlettered, poor and unknown. Paul was a man of rank and riches, of position and influence, of culture and refinement. He was a man of the highest education, of great talent, of wide reading, and of varied learning. He had been brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, one of the most noted doctors of the day, and he was learned, not only in the Jewish law and the traditions of the ancients, but also in the writings of the philosophers and poets of the Gentile world. As afterwards appeared, he was fit to cope with both Jews and Gentiles, with each on their own ground. He could argue with the Jews in their synagogues, and reason from their Scriptures. He could also argue with

the Stoics and Epicureans in the market-places of Greece, and quote to the pagans from their own poets. He was both eloquent and an orator, with a mind masculine in its texture, at once strong and subtle and severely logical, and with a speech luxuriant in its wealth of imagery, lucid and incisive in expression. He was, moreover, a man of unwearied energy and of unbounded zeal, of singleness of aim, of concentration of purpose, and of an iron will. Besides these his intellectual and moral gifts, he had also the civil and social advantages of being not only a member of the powerful sect of the Pharisees, but also, by right of birth as a native of Tarsus, 'no mean city of Cilicia,' a citizen of Imperial Rome. Add to this that he was a man unfettered by domestic ties, and thus free to spend and to be spent in pursuit of his purpose,—and we have before us Saul of Tarsus.

If ever there was a man preëminently fitted for rooting out this new religion, and for razing to the ground the society that professed it, that man was Saul of Tarsus. Had this religion been human, had this society been other than Divine, Saul might have accomplished his object. But this society was the one Church of the Living God, and against it the might of men was powerless, for against it the gates of hell could not prevail.

To Saul, as he rode on his way from Jerusalem and neared Damascus, Jesus of Nazareth suddenly appeared! About midday a light from heaven shone round about him, and he was struck sightless to the ground. For a moment he had seen the Risen Jesus, His body radiant with the blinding brightness of the Beatific glory. His eyes were darkened by the vision, but the light dawned within his soul as he listened to a voice. The voice explained the vision when, in answer to Saul's question, 'Who art Thou, Lord?' it replied, 'I am Jesus.' The vision vanished, but the voice remained ringing in the soul of Saul. It left behind it in his inmost soul an intimate conviction of three great truths: 1. that the Crucified was indeed the Christ, that Jesus of Nazareth was the Son of the Living God; 2. that Jesus had established and left behind Him a Church upon the earth, and that this Church was that society which he Saul had been persecuting; 3. the oneness and identity of this Church with Christ Himself; for speaking of Saul's persecution of the Church, Jesus said, 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou *Me*?' And again: 'I am Jesus, *whom thou persecutest.*'

This trinity of truths remained throughout his life indelibly impressed, deep graven as by God's

finger on the soul of Saul—the Resurrection of Jesus,—the existence of His Church,—and its oneness in itself and with Him its Head.

Those three ideas underlie his whole doctrine. They are the three great truths which we read of his most often preaching, and which we find him continually enforcing and developing in his various Epistles.

His mind held firm grasp of that revealed truth—the oneness and indivisibility of the Church of Christ; or perhaps, to speak more truly, his mind lay in the grasp of that truth, which had taken possession of it. He taught that the believers in Christ's one Gospel were members of one Body, with one Spirit; and that that Body was the Body of Christ, in real union with Him as with its Living Head in heaven. For the building up of this Body, in order to its growth and increase, he asserts that he was sent an Apostle, and had received his Gospel, not from men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised Him from the dead.

To Paul, then, the unity of the Church was apparent and clearly evident, not merely as an actual fact, but also as an antecedent necessity.

As an actual fact, for the Church was then as now a compact body of men of many nations, all

of one mind, of one heart, and of one soul ; all subject to the same Apostolic authority, all believing in the same Gospel of God.

As an antecedent necessity, and that from the very nature of its constitution, as at once the embodiment of the Apostolic authority or Divine mission of the Messiah of God, and as also the treasure-house of His one Gospel.

Now in order to get at the same point of view as that of Paul when he 'went up to see Peter,' and so to regard his relation to Peter in its true light, we must let our thoughts go back to the days when Jesus was yet upon the earth, and consider the words of Jesus with regard to His Church, to His Apostles, and to Peter.

Jesus spoke of a Church which He was to establish upon the earth. He spoke of that Church in the singular, and as *His*—'My Church.' He spoke of it as a Church which the powers of evil should assail, but which they should be powerless to overthrow.

Of this Church He laid the foundations, and He laid them in those twelve men whom He selected from the number of His disciples. He constituted and called those men His Apostles. Those twelve foundations he laid not on the shifting sand but on the Living Rock. That

Rock was Himself—the Christ. He was Himself the centre of their unity while He was yet among them. He then needed no Vicar or Vicegerent. He was Himself visible to them, audible to them, and in their midst—their Father, Head, and Prince. But, as He told them, He was to depart from them, and they should see His face no more. Against the consequences of His departure He had to make provision. Among those consequences He had to provide against this—that by His departure they should be left without Him as their *visible Head on earth*. He must therefore leave some one in His room, to take His place, and to be to them what He had been—their visible Head, and the centre of their unity.

All were Apostles, and all were invested with the same Divine mission; but one must be an Apostle, and more than an Apostle; one must be Prince of the Apostles, as the Vicar and Vicegerent of Jesus Himself.

He chose Peter the Fisherman, and to Peter He spoke as He spoke not to the other Apostles. Peter He put in His own place as the Living Rock on which should lie the twelve foundations of the Catholic Church. To him separately and singly He said, in the coasts of Cesarea Philippi, ‘Thou art Peter; and upon this Rock I will build

My Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'

He foretold what He intended, and He declared the place which Peter was to occupy, and the consequent relation in which he was to stand to the Church of God.

Again, and still more clearly, at the Last Supper, when He spoke to the twelve of their Apostolate, of their Divine mission and royal authority in the Kingdom of God, and said to them, 'As My Father hath disposed to Me a kingdom, so do I dispose to you a kingdom;' turning to Peter, and addressing him separately and singly, He said, 'Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren.'

He foretells what Peter was to be to his fellow-Apostles, not then while Jesus was yet with them, but after His Resurrection from the dead and Peter's resurrection from his fall, after his conversion from the sin of his thrice denial of his Lord and Master.

When those two events had come to pass, and just before His departure from the earth by His Ascension into heaven, we find Jesus again ad-

dressing Himself to Peter, separately and singly, solemnly and by name, 'Simon, son of John,' and saying to him, 'Feed My lambs, feed My sheep.'

He gave him charge and commission as Chief Pastor, as the one Chief Shepherd set over the entire Flock of God. He put Peter in His own place with regard not only to the Church at large, but with regard also to his fellow-Apostles. He said to him without restriction, 'Feed My sheep,' as well as also, 'Feed My lambs.' He thus provided for His Apostles a centre of their unity.

Had Jesus failed to do this before He left the earth, what would He have left on earth behind Him? He would have left a practically headless Body, a visible Body without a visible Head, a society without any principle of cohesion or of unity, a society which, as it increased in size, must have fallen to pieces by its own weight.

Instead of this He left One Fold, with its unity secured by the preëminence of One Chief Shepherd;—One Family under One Father;—One Kingdom, with its oneness guaranteed by the supremacy of One Sovereign. He left a society of the most perfect kind, an absolute monarchy in the supernatural order, His kingdom in the world which is not of the world: He left—the One Catholic and Roman Church of God.

3.

With this Church, already a power not only at Jerusalem or in Judea but throughout the world, and not a mere vague power but an organised society, a compact body of men bound together and preserved in a perfect unity under one head, Saul of Tarsus found himself face to face.

This Church he had ravaged, this Church he had been striving to root out of the earth. To him, as persecutor of this Church, Jesus said, 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?' Into this Church Saul entered, as do others, by the gate of Baptism; and in this Church he received his place as an Apostle, and that not from man, but from Jesus Christ Himself.

So far as his Apostolate was concerned he was, as he tells us, not a whit behind, in no way inferior to the very chiefest Apostles. His was the same Apostolate as theirs. It was derived and received from the self-same source. As an Apostle he was the equal of Peter. Peter, as an Apostle, was but the fellow-Apostle of St. Paul.

But Peter was an Apostle, and more than an Apostle. He was Prince of the Apostles, for he held to his fellow-Apostles the place of Christ. When, then, Paul went up to Jerusalem to see

Peter, he went up to behold his superior, to have audience of the Vicar of Jesus Christ.

Paul's entrance into the Church did not alter its constitution; it did not disturb that economy which he found already existing.

When he received his Apostolate as, to quote his own words, 'one born out of due time,' he was associated with the Apostles who were in Christ before him, but with them in their subordination to Peter. They as Apostles were not twelve separate individuals, independent of each other and of any head. They were twelve men who together formed one organic body, a society of members bound together in union one with another by their common subordination to one visible head.

Once given that the Church of God on earth is a visible society of living men, this follows from the very nature and idea of a society. There can be no society without a centre and principle of its unity. There can be no society without head and members; and in every society the head must in some way be homogeneous with the members. This principle applies to all societies; it lies at the very root of the idea of a society, and it is that which gives to every society its formal existence as a society. But if it applies to particular or smaller or less perfect societies, with still greater force and

reason must it apply to societies which are more perfect, greater, or general as comprehending within them particular societies. In an army a company is a particular society as headed by its captain. A regiment is a greater and more perfect yet particular society, and it is so as headed by its colonel. The army itself is constituted a general society by the headship of its commander-in-chief. A diocese, in like manner, is a particular society, of which the members are bound together by the headship of their Bishop. The Catholic Church is a general society, consisting of the aggregate of all dioceses as particular societies, and it is constituted and secured in its unity by the headship of its Pontiff. Were it otherwise, a perfection pertaining to the several parts would be lacking to the one whole; a necessary constituent, and the formal principle of the particular societies as societies would be denied to the universal society which comprehends them. But the Church of Christ, as it is the kingdom of God upon earth, is an universal society, and the most perfect of all societies.

Hence it is inconsistent and illogical, unreasonable and absurd to argue for the necessity of Episcopacy as a means of unity for the particular societies called dioceses, and at the same time to deny the at least equal necessity of the supremacy of

one Pontiff, as head of the whole body, to secure the organic unity of that universal society, the Catholic Church. Those who maintain the former must admit the latter. Those who deny the former must fall back on the assertion that there is no visible *Society* of Christians or Church of Christ on earth.

This we know to be false. We know that not only in the Divine design and of antecedent necessity, but as matter of actual fact and by the institution of Jesus Christ, His Church on earth was to be and is a visible society. It is to-day a society of men subject to the Apostolic and supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff. It was centuries ago, and when St. Paul submitted and sought entrance to it, a society of men subject to that Peter whose successors the Roman Pontiffs are.

Not only did Paul's Apostolate not strip St. Peter of his primacy, but Paul did not receive a primacy like that of Peter. He received his Apostolate subject to that primacy. Of that primacy he was no more independent than were the others, his fellow-Apostles.

But with regard to Paul's sphere of Apostolic labour, Jesus had in a special manner declared His will. Paul was, as Jesus revealed to Ananias, a vessel of election to carry His name, not to the

Jews only, but specially before the Gentiles. 'It pleased God,' writes the Apostle to his Gentile converts at Galatia, 'to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the Gentiles' (i. 15, 16).

With regard to Peter's sphere of labour as he was an Apostle, it was otherwise. Paul writes, 'To me was committed the Gospel of the uncircumcision, as to Peter was that of the circumcision; for He who wrought in Peter to the Apostleship of the circumcision wrought in me also among the Gentiles.' This fact Peter, James and John, whom Paul distinguishes as pillars in the Apostolic College, allowed and recognised, as later on we shall more fully see, when they gave to him and to Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, on the understanding that those two should go to the Gentiles, while Peter and the others should give themselves to the evangelising of the Jews.

This, then, is clear, that the Apostolic labours of Peter and of Paul lay in different spheres. They each spoke, as a rule, to two distinct classes of men. Peter addressed himself to those who all their lives long had been trained in Judaism, and accustomed to the observances of the ceremonial Law of Moses; Paul to men who had never known the Law, but had been born and bred in Paganism in one or other of its various forms.

In a word, St. Paul was, in an especial manner, the Apostle of the Gentiles, while St. Peter was the Apostle of the Jews.

Both Apostles were Jews, and both had been observers of the Law. St. Paul was not only a doctor of that Law, but, as a Pharisee, he was a member of the strictest of the Jewish sects; and even in that sect he had been distinguished above his fellows as a zealot for the strict observance of the Law according to the tradition of the Fathers.

With regard to the Law, its observance and the question of its obligation subsequent to its fulfilment by Jesus Christ and the promulgation of His Gospel on the day of Pentecost, the belief and teaching of both Apostles was one and the same. Both held and taught that justification was not by the works of the Law, but by the grace of Christ. Both held and taught that observance of the Law had been of obligation but for one people, and that but for a certain time; that even this obligation had now ceased; that the Jews themselves were no longer bound by it; and, this being so, that certainly Gentiles, who had never known it, were not to be made subject to it. Both Apostles also made in practice a distinction between their Jewish and their Gentile converts. They permitted the Jewish Christians to continue those legal observ-

ances to which they had been for so long time accustomed. It was a condescension to human nature and to the force of life-long habit, in a matter in itself indifferent. It was, moreover, a mark of respect for the ancient law which, as St. Paul says, had been given by God as a pedagogue to lead men to Christ. The Jews might otherwise have been tempted to suppose that they abandoned the Law as something in itself evil, as were those idolatries from which the Prophets had so often in the time past been sent to recall their fathers. The Law was dead, indeed, and its observance could now profit nothing; but in the case of Jews it was not yet *deadly*. In the case of Gentiles, however, it was not only dead but deadly; for its observance, as of obligation or necessity to salvation, amounted to a denial of the sufficiency of the Gospel thereunto. It was an adding to and an adulteration of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Both Apostles were at one as to their doctrine, and both were full of solicitude and zeal for the welfare of those whom they had begotten in the Gospel. The main solicitude of each was naturally and rightly for his own converts, and for those specially committed to his charge. The anxiety of Peter was for the Jews, and his anxiety even to meet their prejudices, an anxiety the fruit of his

Apostolic zeal, led him, as we shall see by and by, into a certain imprudence. This imprudence was the occasion of the difference between him and St. Paul, which the latter narrates in his Epistle to the Galatians.

Before, however, mentioning this incident, St. Paul gives an account of his proceedings at the Council of Jerusalem; and these we must first consider, in order clearly to understand the full import of the dispute at Antioch, and the reasons which induced him to refer to it.

After fourteen years, he says, he went up again to Jerusalem. He went up from Antioch, and the motive of his going, as we read more fully in the Acts of the Apostles, was this. Some Jewish Christians had come down from Judea, and were teaching the brethren at Antioch that unless they were circumcised after the manner of Moses they could not be saved. When he and Barnabas had had no small contest with them, it was determined that those two, with certain also of the other side, should go up to the Apostles and priests at Jerusalem about this question. It was not merely the wish of the brethren at Antioch that decided St. Paul to take this step. He was specially directed to do so by our Lord Himself. 'I went up,' he says, 'according to revelation.' With that singular

sagacity, that human prudence and wisdom of the serpent, which characterised all the actions of St. Paul, he took with him Barnabas and Titus—the one being a Jew and the other a Gentile. They arrived at Jerusalem, after having, on their way through Phenice and Samaria, given great joy to all the brethren there by their relation of the conversions among the Gentiles. They were received at Jerusalem by the Church and by the Apostles and Ancients, to whom they declared how great things God had done with them. There arose, however, here also some of the sect of the Pharisees who believed, saying that men ‘must be circumcised, and be commanded to observe the Law of Moses.’ The Apostles and Ancients then assembled in council to consider the matter. After there had been much disputing, Peter rose up and said, ‘Men brethren, you know that in former days God made choice among us, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel, and believe. And God, who knoweth the hearts, gave testimony, giving unto them the Holy Ghost as well as to us, and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. Now, therefore, why tempt you God, to put a yoke upon the necks of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear? But by the grace

of the Lord Jesus Christ we believe to be saved in like manner as they also.'

St. Peter's words were definite and clear. His doctrine was undeniably identical with that of Paul.

He referred to that outpouring of the Holy Ghost upon the Gentiles who heard the word from his lips in his discourse after the baptism of Cornelius the Gentile and centurion of the Italian band. On that occasion the 'faithful of the circumcision,' that is, the Jewish Christians who had come with Peter, were astonished that the grace of the Holy Ghost was poured out upon the Gentiles also. But Peter said, 'Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptised, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we;' and he commanded them to be baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. This took place at Cesarea. Afterwards, when Peter was come to Jerusalem, those of the circumcision, or the Jewish Christians, contended with him as to his intercourse with and treatment of the uncircumcised Christians, or Gentile converts. He related to them his vision at Joppe, which taught him that God is not a respecter of persons, and that in every nation he that feareth God and worketh justice is acceptable to God. These events were present to the mind of Peter as he addressed the Council, and the narrative of these

events throws light upon his words. When he had finished speaking, all the multitude held their peace.

Next, Paul and Barnabas related what great signs and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles by their means. Finally, after James had spoken, and had given his judgment in the sense of Peter, it pleased the Apostles and Ancients, with the whole Church at Jerusalem, to write an encyclical to their Gentile brethren at Antioch and in Syria and Cilicia.

The preamble set forth: Forasmuch as we have heard that some going out from us (that is, that certain Jews) have troubled you with words, subverting your souls, to whom we gave no commandment, it hath seemed good to us, being assembled together, to choose out men, and to send them to you with our well-beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have given their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Then comes the decree: It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay no farther burden upon you than these necessary things, that you abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which things keeping yourselves you shall do well. Fare ye well!

We may here remark, in passing, the similarity in language between this decree and St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. It speaks of the false Judaising teachers as troubling the Gentile Christians; he writes, 'I would they were even cut off who trouble you.' It calls the false teachers subverters of souls; he calls them perverters of the Gospel of Christ. It says that the Apostles gave those men no commandment; he distinguishes himself from those who were apostles from men, and who taught 'another gospel, which is not another'—which was not the Gospel of the Apostles, and therefore not that of Christ.

We may remark also the Apostles' assumption of their own association and identification with the Spirit of Truth in His Divine mission to guide men into all truth. 'It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.' His abiding presence, assistance, and direction was the principle of their infallibility in doctrine, and of their Divine authority in government. They, as an Apostolic body, with Peter as its head, were the human organ of the Divine utterance.

Such was the motive of St. Paul's second journey to Jerusalem, of which, in his Epistle to the Galatians, he speaks. He, on that occasion, compared with his Jewish brethren the Gospel which

he preached among the Gentiles. He conferred apart with those who seemed to be something; that is to say, he conferred not only publicly and with all, but also privately with those who not only were, but *seemed* to be, that is, who were universally held to be *something*, or, as he afterwards says, to be pillars in the Church of God. This he did, 'lest perhaps he should run, or had run in vain.'

It was not that he himself had any doubt or misgiving as to his own doctrine. He knew that, as he asserts, he had not learned it of men, or been taught it, but had it by revelation and from the lips of Jesus Christ, or by means of that infused knowledge of Divine things which, along with a Divine light, had been bestowed upon him. It was in order to remove all occasion of gainsaying and to leave no room for the calumnies of his enemies, and those of the one Gospel of Christ which he preached.

Just as he had previously submitted to be baptised at the hands of Ananias the priest, although he was then already justified; and just as he allowed himself to be separated, or consecrated to the work of the ministry, along with Barnabas, although he had then already received his Apostolic commission, and that directly and immediately from Jesus Christ Himself, so did he now

also confer with the other Apostles, and compare his doctrine with theirs, although that doctrine he had received along with his Apostolate, and from the same source, from Jesus Christ Himself.

There can be no more striking proof of the truth of Christianity than this fact, that St. Paul, on comparing that Gospel which he had himself received immediately and directly from Jesus Christ with the Gospel which Peter and the other Apostles had years before received from the same Christ, found it to be in all points and precisely the same.

St. Paul next gives the Galatians a practical instance of the conformity of his doctrine with that of the other Apostles concerning the Law. He brings forward the case of Titus: 'Neither Titus,' says he, 'who was with me, being a Gentile, was compelled to be circumcised.' Lest perhaps it might be objected that this was an oversight, or because Titus was supposed to have already submitted to that rite, he calls attention to the fact that he had himself resisted the circumcision of Titus when it was demanded by the Judaisers. He speaks of certain 'false brethren, unawares brought in, who came in privately to spy our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into servitude; to whom we

yielded not by subjection, no not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you.'

But, it may be asked, why was the Apostle so resolute in his resistance to the circumcision of Titus, and so vehement in his condemnation of those who demanded it, seeing that in the first place, and on his own showing, the rite was in itself a matter of indifference, it being, like other rites of the old Law, dead indeed, but not yet deadly—no longer prescribed, but not yet prohibited; and seeing, secondly, that his own practice at Lystra had been different?

We answer that the cases differed widely, and a comparison of them shows the conformity of St. Paul's practice with his doctrine.

At Lystra he had found a certain disciple named Timothy, the son of a Jewish woman who believed the Gospel, and of a Gentile father.

To this man the brethren who were in Lystra and Iconium gave a good testimony, and Paul would have him go with him as his companion, and, taking him, he circumcised him. His reason is given in the Acts of the Apostles—'because of the Jews who were in those places, for they all knew that his father was a Gentile.' St. Paul was to send him to the Jews, and therefore that his ministry might be more acceptable to them he

caused him to undergo this indifferent rite—there being in this case no occasion of scandal to the Gentiles by leading them astray as to the obligation of the Law.

But in the case of Titus there was a man who was a Gentile, and who was to minister to Gentiles. Circumcision might in his case have led the Gentiles to suppose that it was of obligation; and, moreover, his circumcision had been explicitly demanded by the false teachers as necessary in order to his salvation. Circumcision became thus in his case a test of doctrine, and for this reason the Apostle strenuously and successfully resisted it.

Not only was St. Paul victorious in this matter over the false brethren and heretical teachers, but he had the sympathy and concurrence and approval of the pillars of the Apostolic College, of James, Cephas and John. ‘To me,’ he writes, ‘they who seemed to be something, added nothing.’ They concurred in his judgment, and confirmed his doctrine as their own. ‘Contrary-wise,’ he adds, ‘when they had seen that to me was committed the Gospel of the uncircumcision, as to Peter was that of the circumcision (for He who wrought in Peter to the Apostleship of the circumcision wrought in me also among the Gentiles); and when they had known the grace that

was given to me, James and Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision.' They made but one stipulation, and it was this: 'Only that we should be mindful of the poor; which same thing also I was careful to do.' The Jewish converts were often in great straits by reason of their loss of worldly possessions; and therefore St. Peter imposed on St. Paul the duty of seeing that his Gentile converts should contribute of their substance in aid of the necessities of their Jewish brethren.

St. Paul proves, therefore, that not only was he of one heart and of one mind with the other Apostles as to their common doctrine, but that they were agreed also as to the partition of their work. He had expressly arranged with Peter, in accordance with that which the Lord Himself had signified, that he should be specially the Apostle of the Gentiles, while Peter should be specially the Apostle of the Jews. It was not that either should absolutely and exclusively or jealously confine himself, or be confined, to the strict limits of this division. We find that St. Peter preached to the Gentiles by himself at Rome, and also far and wide by means of his immediate disciples. He

thus fulfilled the lesson of his vision in the house of Simon the tanner by the seaside at Joppe. St. Paul, on the other hand, also preached to Jews as well as to Gentiles at Antioch, at Corinth, at Rome, and in other places, and as specially appears from one Epistle of his addressed expressly to the Hebrews. He thus fulfilled the words of the Lord to Ananias: 'This man is to Me a vessel of election, to carry My name before the Gentiles and kings *and the children of Israel.*'

We come now to the famous incident at Antioch where St. Paul 'withstood St. Peter to the face,' and that, he says to the Galatians, 'because he was blameable.' The circumstances which led to it were as follows:

After the Council at Jerusalem, St. Paul returned to Antioch with the decree. By and bye St. Peter arrived there also. St. Peter did not, any more than did St. Paul, believe in the efficacy of the Jewish rites, or in the obligation of the ceremonial Mosaic Law. He had shown his belief in the abrogation of that Law by himself eating with the Gentiles, and eating of such things as the Law, while it was in force, had forbidden. When he was with Gentiles he ate with them such things as were set before him. But afterwards, when cer-

tain men came down from James—that is, certain Jewish converts from Jerusalem or the surrounding district where, as Bishop, St. James presided—and professed themselves scandalised at this non-observance of the Law, knowing their inveterate Jewish prejudices, and regarding them as weaker brethren, and fearful lest, in the exercise of his Christian liberty, he should be placing a stumbling-block in the way of those Jewish converts for whom he was in a special manner, as we have seen, and more immediately concerned and responsible, he in his over-anxiety separated himself from the Gentiles, withdrew himself from their tables, and ate no more with them.

St. Peter did not see that, in his anxiety to remove a stumbling-block from the path of the Jews, he was in effect placing a stumbling-block in the way of the Gentiles. He was, by his act, giving occasion to them to suppose and to allege, with some show of reason, that his doctrine was that of the false teachers who would have all Christians, whether Jews or Gentiles, to be circumcised, and to keep all the observances of the Law of Moses as of Divine obligation, and as of necessity to salvation.

St. Paul saw it in a moment. His strong clear master-mind saw straight through this false

policy to its inevitable and mischievous effects; and this false policy he denounced, even in his superior, with the Apostolic freedom of his Apostolic zeal. He calls it a 'dissimulation,' and a 'walking not uprightly unto the truth of the Gospel.' He withstood in this matter Peter 'to his face because he was blameable.' When to his dissimulation the rest of the Jews consented, so that even Barnabas was led also into it, Paul said to Peter before them all, 'If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as the Jews do, how dost thou compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?'

After his remonstrance with Peter, turning to the bystanders, he says, 'We by nature are Jews, and not of the Gentiles, sinners.' He says, in effect,—We, born in Judaism, have been always worshippers of the one living and true God, and never idolaters and worshippers of false gods. We have all our lives long been believers in the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob, according to the faith of our fathers, and we have also been doers of His Law; and yet, leaving Judaism as such, we have embraced and profess Christianity. And why? In the hope that we might thus be justified: 'Knowing that man is not justified by the works of the Law, but by the

faith of Jesus Christ.' But if in so doing we have sinned, then is Christ the minister or author of our sin. There is no way out of it. Either Christianity is what it claims to be—the reality of which Judaism was but the shadow and the figure; and if so, to return to Judaism would be to become prevaricators:—'If I build up again the things which I have destroyed, I make myself a prevaricator.' If, on the contrary, Judaism is sufficient to justification—'If justice be by the Law, then Christ died in vain.'

Then comes the magnificent peroration of this portion of his Epistle, straight from the depths of his mighty heart, in words burning with the fire enkindled by the Holy Ghost within his inmost soul: 'I through the Law am dead to the Law'—instructed, led by the hand as by my pedagogue, I see clearly its scope and idea, its nature and its end. I see it fulfilled in all things by Jesus Christ my Lord. Therefore 'am I, through the Law, dead to the Law, that I may live to God. With Christ I am nailed to the cross; and I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me. And that I live now in the flesh, I live in the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and delivered Himself for me.' I have been born again, and I have put on Christ. I have put off the old man,

with his affections and works, and I have put on the New. I have put off the first Adam, who was of the earth, earthy, and I have put on the Second Adam, who is the Lord from heaven. With His Life I live, with His strength I am strong, in Him I believe and hope, and Him I love. To Him, without reserve, I give and dedicate myself, and offer myself a holocaust, for He loved me, and He gave Himself for me. Shall I, like my stiff-necked ancestors, lust after the flesh-pots of Egypt, and long to return to the house of my bondage, I who have passed through the waters, and am fed, even here in the way of this wilderness, with the Bread of Angels, the Bread of Life, the Living Bread which cometh down from heaven? Shall I say, with the Syrian, Are not Abana and Pharphar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Jordan? May I not wash in them, and be clean? No! 'I cast not away the grace of God. For if justice be by the Law, then Christ died in vain.'

Thus did the Apostle in his Epistle to the Galatians conclusively and triumphantly refute the calumnies of the false teachers, who asserted that not only was he not an Apostle, but that, even if he were, his doctrine was not that of the other Apostles; and that his doctrine and practice at one place was not the same as at another.

His sole reason in bringing forward this incident of his rebuke of Peter at Antioch was to shew that he was not only an Apostle, but that in his doctrine he was at one with Peter; and that if in *practice* there had been divergence, it was on Peter's part and not on his; albeit on Peter's part it was but a practical imprudence into which he had been carried away by his over-anxiety for his Jewish converts, and by an excess of Apostolic zeal on their behalf.

And yet this incident has been used by the false teachers of later days, by those who teach 'another gospel, which is not another,' and thus pervert the one Gospel of Christ, as an argument to undermine the Apostolic authority of the one Church of Christ,—as betraying a lack of unity even in the Apostolic College,—and as subversive of the supremacy and infallibility of the Vicar of Jesus Christ.

But when we come to discount this difference between these two Apostles, to what does it amount?

It was no question of divergence in doctrine, and it was no question of conflicting jurisdiction; and it must have had regard to one or other or both of these points if it is to avail as an argument against the infallibility and supremacy of the Vicar of Christ.

It was no question of jurisdiction; for, as

appears from the text, that was well understood and agreed upon. St. Peter was to go to the Jews and St. Paul to the Gentiles.

It was no question of doctrine; for, as we have seen, as to that they were at one.

It regarded, then, simply an imprudence, an indiscretion on the part of Peter, the result of zeal untempered by adequate prudence, an inordinate charity, an inconsiderate condescension to the prejudices of his neophytes; and the Apostle of the Gentiles, in his zeal for the purity of God's Gospel, did not hesitate to rebuke this indiscretion even in his superior. He rebuked Peter before them all. Peter was silent; and no man said Paul nay.

True, there is no mention of Peter's primacy in the Epistles of St. Paul. But why should there have been mention of it? There was no necessity for his asserting or even alluding to it. Everybody knew it. It was a well-known fact, undisputed and recognised by all. It was a commonplace, a first principle of their common Christianity.

But had St. Paul the right thus to reprove St. Peter? Did not his act savour of arrogance, or betray insubordination to the Vicar of Jesus Christ? Did it not amount to a practical assertion of his own equality with the Prince of the Apostles?

In no way. In the first place, St. Paul had the

right to rebuke St. Peter; for it is not only the right, but sometimes the duty, of an inferior to rebuke his superior, with all reverential observance and due respect. But secondly, although in this case it was his superior whom St. Paul was rebuking, it was not *as* his superior. There was no question between these two as between superior and subject. It was a question between them as they were *fellow-Apostles*, the one ministering to the Jews and the other to the Gentiles; and in their *Apostolate* they were precisely equal, even as they were equal in their episcopate and in their priesthood.

But if it is folly, and folly betraying an entire misapprehension of St. Paul's purpose in narrating this incident, to regard it as supplying an objection to the infallibility and supremacy of St. Peter and of his successors the Roman Pontiffs, it is equal folly to argue that therefore a Bishop in the present day might with equal right similarly treat the Vicar of Jesus Christ. A Bishop is not an Apostle; and, in the strict sense, he is not a successor of the Apostles. He has not succeeded to and does not possess their Apostolic position and those prerogatives which distinguished them from and exalted them above the Bishops of their day. There is properly but one Apostolic See; and, strictly speaking, the Roman Pontiffs are alone successors

of the Apostles. The Episcopate exists apart from the Apostolate, save in that one instance in which the Apostolate itself perseveres in the Primacy, where, to use the language of the Fathers,—Peter perseveres in his See.

There are, however, certain cases in which a subject is not only permitted but bound, by the precept of charity, to admonish a superior; and there have been cases in ecclesiastical history in which this has been done even with regard to the Roman Pontiff. St. Bernard cannot certainly be suspected of insubordination or of want of reverence and submission to the Vicar of his Lord, and yet he addressed remonstrances to his former pupil, the then Pope Eugenius. Again, a Council is said to have condemned Pope Honorius, not for heresy, of which he was guiltless, but for incautiousness, a lack of apostolic vigilance, and an imprudent silence, in consequence of which the heresy of Sergius was suffered to grow apace.

In his case, as in that of Peter his predecessor, there was no question of personal doctrine, but of practical policy; and as the case of Honorius forms no argument against the supremacy of the Roman Pontiffs, so St. Paul's rebuke forms no argument against the supremacy of Peter. Peter feared the Jews, not from human respect, but

from an inordinate charity (for, as prudence rules all the virtues, a charity which is without prudence is inordinate and excessive), and so was led into an inconsiderate act of practical imprudence. St. Paul, his fellow Apostle, although at the same time his subject, with a fraternal charity set him right. In this there was no insubordination on the part of Paul, and his act was followed by no schism.

So it is, and so it ever will be, in that Church of which the Apostles were the twelve foundations, the Catholic and Roman Church, the one Church of God. Contentions outside that Church issue in the multiplication and subdivision of sects, and in consequent yet farther perversions of the Gospel of Christ. Contentions within the Church make manifest her essential unity, and but develop with still greater clearness the truths of her Gospel. Sects may arise by reason of such contentions, and she is but purified from the contagion of false brethren within her borders. They go out from her, because they were not of her. They are members severed from the One Body, branches fallen from the One Vine. As severed members they live no longer with her life, and are dead; and of them, as withered branches and broken off, Jesus said, 'Except you abide in the Vine, you have no life in you.'

With regard to such men St. Paul uses words which may sound in the ears of some as hard, and yet those words were words of charity. There can be no Christian charity which is not founded, and which has not its roots in Christian faith; and there can be no true charity sprung from faith which shrinks from denouncing those who by their schisms rend the Body of Christ, and by their heresies pervert His Gospel.

By the preservation to our days of his Epistle to the Galatians, Paul, being dead, yet speaketh; and he tells us that, if he said not anathema to those false teachers and perverters of the Gospel of Christ, who are Apostles from men, and preach 'another gospel, which is not another,' he should not be the servant of Christ.

The same anathema has been uttered in all ages by the Catholic and Roman Church, and is uttered now. By it she lays beneath her ban, which is not the curse of man but the curse of God, all those who resist her authority or dispute her doctrine.

Did she fail to use this weapon with which God has provided her for the preservation in its purity of His Gospel, she might indeed 'please men,' but she would not be the Church and the 'servant of Christ.'

IV.

ST. PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

Ut ex fide justificemur.

That we might be justified by faith. *Galat. iii. 24.*

ST. PAUL, having reëstablished his authority with the Galatians by proving to them the reality of his Apostleship, and the oneness of his Gospel with that of the other Apostles, and so with the Gospel of Christ, proceeds to set forth the doctrine of man's justification, which he declares and proves to be not by the works of the Law, but by means of faith.

We come now, therefore, to consider this cardinal doctrine of justification by faith.

In order that we may arrive at a right understanding of this doctrine, we must first have a clear idea of what is meant by these terms. We ask ourselves, then, in the first place, What do we mean by *justification*? and secondly, What do we mean by *faith*?

Justification may be considered either actively or passively; actively, as it is an operation; pas-

sively, as it is an estate, which is the result of an operation.

It is God who justifies or makes man just, and His justification of a man is a Divine operation. This is justification in its active sense. When a man is justified by God, he is constituted by God in an estate which is called the estate of justification. When, then, we speak of man's justification by God, we speak of justification in its passive sense.

The estate of justification, to put it popularly and in its simplest form, is the same as the estate of salvation; and the estate of salvation is again identical with the estate of grace.

Those three, the estate of justification, the estate of salvation, and the estate of grace, are therefore convertible terms; that is to say, they mean practically one and the same thing. The operation by which a man is placed in the state of grace, and so in the state of salvation, is called his justification.

Precisely opposed to the estate of grace is the estate of sin; and the estate of sin is the estate of damnation.

In one or other of those two contrary and incompatible estates, every man, woman and child, every human being, of necessity exists. Every one of us is either to-day and now in the estate of

grace or in the estate of sin, justified or not justified, in the estate of salvation or in the estate of damnation.

There may be, and there are, various grades of justification or degrees of justice, as there may be, and are, various degrees and depths of sin; but there are but the two *estates* or conditions, in one or other of which every man necessarily is,—the state of justification or grace or salvation on the one hand, and the state of sin and damnation on the other.

When we come into this world, we come destitute of divine grace, and therefore in the estate of sin. We are conceived and born with our souls infected with original sin. This original sin is not *personal* sin; that is to say, it is not, like actual sin, a sin which we have ourselves individually, deliberately and knowingly, freely and voluntarily committed. It is a sin of our *nature*, of that nature which flows to us from its source in Adam our first parent. In him, the head of the human race, human nature was once, in its entirety, contained. On him, and on human nature then existing in him, Divine grace was bestowed. But for his personal sin he would have retained possession of that grace; but, when he personally fell from grace, whole human nature existing in him, and

which was to be derived from him to his posterity, fell with him. Human nature was in him, and by his act, deprived of that sanctifying grace which justified it; and it was placed in the estate of damnation. When, by the grace of his contrition, there was restored to him personally that sanctifying grace which justified him, it was restored to him as an individual, as a human *person*, and not to human *nature* existing in him as in its source.

The reason for this difference between the consequence of Adam's fall—the loss of justifying grace for human nature, and therefore for his posterity—and the consequence of Adam's contrition—which was rejustification for himself only, or rebestowal of sanctifying grace on himself personally, and not on his race—is to be found in that position which Adam occupied in the Divine design and economy towards the human race as its father and head. When Adam sinned, he fell not only from personal grace, but from his position of *spiritual paternity*, or *headship* in the *supernatural* order. Had he, by refraining from sin, preserved his personal grace, he would have remained our father in the supernatural, as well as in the natural order. Human nature would have remained in him justified or dowered with Divine grace; and so dowered, and consequently justified, it would have flowed

to us. Immaculate conception and birth in grace, or conception and birth in the estate of justification, would have been in the human race not a singular exception, but the universal rule to which there should have been no exception. As it is, and since the fall, the words of the Psalmist apply to all men and women, save to Jesus and Mary: 'I was born in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.'

From this estate of sin, and consequent damnation, in which we are conceived and born, we have need to be restored and raised to the estate of salvation. This is effected by the bestowal upon us of the grace of God, of that grace which is called habitual or sanctifying grace; and our possession of this makes us, so far as is possible to the creature, 'partakers of the Divine Nature,' and so by adoption the sons and the daughters of God. This bestowal of grace is what is called our justification, and it is effected in our baptism.

The Sacrament of Baptism is therefore the Sacrament of justification. Other sacraments have been instituted and exist for our sanctification, to increase and add to our grace, to justify us more and more; but Baptism is the sacrament by means of which we are first justified. By it we who were born 'children of wrath,' and 'dead in trespasses

and sins' are born again unto the life of Divine grace. Of this grace it bestows the first instalment, which takes us out of the estate of sin and damnation, and places us in the estate of grace and consequent salvation.

We shall more clearly apprehend and better understand the nature and character of grace and sin respectively, if we consider the types of each as set before us in the Sacred Scriptures. Grace is there spoken of as light and life, while sin is represented as darkness and death. The presence of these two, of light and darkness, and of those other two, of life and death, in the same subject at the same time is impossible. The presence of the one is incompatible with and excludes the other. They are mutually destructive of each other.

Again, as darkness and death are negative rather than positive, as being an absence or privation of light and life, so also is sin. The darkness and death of sin is the result of the privation of the light and life of Divine grace. Sin is not a mere absence of grace, it is a *privation* of that grace which, of the original Divine design, we *ought* to have, and which, save for human transgression, we should have possessed. This sin, which is thus negative, is taken away by the bestowal of grace; which is not negative, but purely positive;

and as positive a reality in the supernatural order as light and life are positive in the natural order. The light of grace dispels the darkness of sin, the life of grace destroys the death of sin within the soul.

Now, just as a man must be either alive or dead, there being only those two states, so must every human being be either in the estate of grace, and so in the estate of justification and salvation, or in the estate of sin and of consequent damnation.

This matter of our justification must be to us individually of all others the most important; for 'what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?' And our justification depends upon our faith. 'By faith we are justified.' 'Without faith it is impossible to please God' (Heb. xi. 6). 'By faith Christ dwells in our hearts' (Ephes. iii. 17). 'And by faith are we the children of God' (Gal. iii. 26). 'By faith we receive the promise of the Spirit' (Gal. iii. 14). And 'the end of our faith is the salvation of our souls' (1 Pet. i. 9). In a word, as St. Paul three several times says, to the Romans, to the Hebrews, and to the Galatians, *Justus ex fide vivit*,—'By faith the just man lives.'

Faith alone will not save us. A faith which is barren and bears no fruit, a faith which is lifeless, as divorced from that charity which is the soul of

faith and renders it both living and fruitful unto this life eternal, will not suffice.

But if it be true that faith without charity is dead, it is equally true that there can be no charity without faith; for faith is the foundation of the whole spiritual and supernatural life of grace, of which life charity is the crown.

What, then, is the faith which is so all-important, so absolutely necessary in order to the justification of man?

Faith is an assent of the created understanding to Divine truths; and that by reason of the Divine authority of God Himself revealing them.

It is an assent of the understanding; and when we say this we mean something more than a mere concurrence or acquiescence of the mind. It is a submission and subjection of the understanding. It is a sacrifice of the understanding; and this sacrifice is an act of religion. It is an act of supreme homage and Divine worship paid to God. This St. Paul supposes, when he speaks of the '*obedience of faith*;' and so also does St. Luke when, in his Book of the Acts of the Apostles, he records that '*a great multitude of the priests obeyed the faith*' (vi. 7).

Again, although faith is an assent of the understanding, yet this assent is itself the result of

an act of another power of the soul, namely, of the will. Before belief there is the will to believe. This also is implied in the fact that an act of faith is an act of submission, of subjection, of obedience.

Further, since faith supposes and includes an act of the will, there must be some motive which induces the will so to act; there must be some reason why one is led to believe. As reasonable beings, it becomes us that our actions should proceed from sufficient motives which, before moving our wills, commend themselves as sufficient to our intelligence.

Now the motive of faith, and that which makes an assent of the understanding to any truth to be an act of Divine faith, is this—the authority of God Himself revealing that truth, and this authority as brought home to us. In other words, it is the fact, and our knowledge of the fact, that God has spoken and has taught or teaches us these truths.

If we believe a truth, however true, from any other motive, for a reason less than this—that God Himself has taught it—our belief will not be an act of Divine faith.

If we believe it because we have been taught it by one of our fellow-creatures, in whose wisdom

we have confidence, and on whose truth we can rely, it is an act of faith, indeed, but of *human* faith. The formal motive of this faith is *human* authority. This human faith has no part in our justification, it will not avail to the saving of our souls. The only faith which is a saving faith, and a ground of our justification, is Divine faith; and it is of the essence of this faith that its motive should be the authority of God Himself teaching us. We submit our understandings, we subject them to His teaching, because we realise that we are 'taught of God.'

This is indeed reasonable, and eminently reasonable,—to make the sacrifice of our understandings, when that sacrifice is demanded by, and is offered to, His Divine Majesty our Creator and Lord.

Whatever reason may say or suggest as to the *matter* of faith, or as to the particular truth in which we are asked to believe, our act of faith is ever reasonable when we believe because the Lord our God has spoken. It is this reasonable motive of faith which makes our act of faith *rationabile obsequium*—'a reasonable service.'

We do not mean that an act of faith is ever asked of us in anything which is *contrary* to reason, or which is contradictory to any truth; but

we do mean that an act of faith is demanded of us as to many things which lie far above the level of our reason, outside its sphere and beyond its reach.

There are many truths of faith, which we as Christians must believe in order to our justification and salvation, which are of this order. These are what are called mysteries.

All truths, and all truths of faith, are not *mysteries*. There are some truths which we can discover for ourselves, and which we can understand when we have come to a knowledge of them. There are other truths—and these are *mysteries*—which we cannot, in the first place, discover by the exercise of any power, by any talent or ingenuity, by any study or process of reasoning; and which, secondly, even after they have been revealed and taught to us, and we believe and know them, we cannot and never can *comprehend* or adequately understand.

Among such mysteries is, for instance, that of the Most Holy Trinity; that is, of the Trinity of distinct Divine Persons subsisting in the Unity of the Divine Essence. This is, and must ever remain to us, and to the Angels, and to every created intelligence, an absolute *mystery*. We shall never understand it either in this world or in the world to come. Throughout eternity, and even when we

are gazing on the unveiled face of God, this mystery will remain to us incomprehensible. And what we shall never comprehend, that we could never have found out for ourselves. This mystery of the Blessed Trinity is a truth, or rather a series of truths, relating to the eternal processes of the inner life of God, of which we should and could have had no knowledge, unless it had pleased God Himself to reveal it to us.

Referring to such mysteries, St. Paul writes to the Corinthians: 'We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, the wisdom which is hidden. . . . To us God hath revealed it by His Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, even the profound things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, but the spirit of a man that is in him? So the things also that are of God no man knoweth, but the Spirit of God. We have received the Spirit that is of God, that we may know the things that are given us from God' (1 Cor. ii. 7, 10, 11, 12).

In like manner Jesus Himself said, 'I give thanks to Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them to little ones. . . . All things are delivered to Me by My Father, and no one knoweth who the Son is, but

the Father; and who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him' (St. Matt. xi. 25, 27; St. Luke x. 21, 22).

2.

Jesus Christ in these words speaks of Himself as He is the Messiah and Prophet of God, and of certain truths known to God alone, unknown to and unknowable by man, unless God should Himself make them known to men. He speaks of those truths as *delivered* to Him, and as delivered for the special purpose of revealing and teaching them to men. These truths composed, along with other truths, which although revealed are not of their nature mysteries, that Gospel which He received from the Father, and which He was sent by the Father to deliver to the human race. That, and that alone is, as we have seen, the one Gospel of God which lay within the storehouse of the human mind of Jesus Christ; and the Gospel therein contained was, as He Himself tells us, a Gospel full of mysteries, and so incomprehensible.

And yet this mysterious, inscrutable, incomprehensible Gospel has to be believed by men with undoubting faith, if men are to save their souls. If they are to be justified, it is by faith in this mysterious Gospel of Jesus Christ.

There are men, and even men calling themselves Christians, who would reduce all religion to the level of reason, and who refuse to accept any doctrine unless it commends itself to their natural intelligence. These men are inconsistent if they admit the existence of a revelation; for, once given a revelation, we suppose a sphere beyond reason, outside it, and so high above it that to it reason can never penetrate, and much less comprehend it.

Once allow that God has given a Gospel consisting of, or at least containing mysterious inscrutable and incomprehensible truths, and it is idle and a folly to bring such truths before the bar of reason, and to examine, test, and judge them on their merits by the natural light of the finite intelligence, and by the standards of the created universe. Why refuse, on the ground of its incomprehensibility, to accept the doctrine of the real, true, and substantial presence in yonder tabernacle of the Body and Blood of Jesus of Nazareth, and yet admit a doctrine just as incomprehensible—that that Man was God, Son of the Eternal Father, and from everlasting consubstantial and coequal with Him?

Both truths we believe; and we believe both for the same reason, and from the same motive of Divine faith. We believe them, not on their own

merits, or because they commend themselves to our minds, or because we can verify them by any process of reason or evidence of our senses; but simply and solely on the authority of God revealing them. We believe them because they are of the number of the mysterious truths contained in the one Gospel of God committed to the Messiah of God, to Jesus Christ. God has spoken. His voice has reached us. His words are in our ears, —and *therefore* we believe. This, and this alone, is Divine faith, or that faith by means of which we are justified.

But, say other men, it matters not what a man believes so long as his life is blameless, and he excels in moral virtue.

However this may be, one thing is certain as unmistakably evident, that this doctrine of theirs is in direct contradiction to, and the antithesis of the distinct doctrine not only of St. Paul, but of Jesus Christ Himself.

Speaking of the life everlasting, or of the salvation of men's souls, or, in other words, of their justification, Jesus ascribes it to their knowledge of certain truths. He declares it to depend upon this knowledge, to spring from it, to rest upon it as on a foundation.

Just as Paul does not teach that faith alone will

justify a man, so Jesus does not teach that knowledge of Divine truths will, by itself, save a man.

But both He and His Apostle teach that this *knowledge* is necessary in order to a man's salvation; and therefore to this knowledge, as a means of his salvation, they ascribe that salvation. St. Paul says that we are 'justified by *faith*;' and Jesus said, 'This is life everlasting, that they may *know* Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent. . . . The words which Thou gavest Me, I have given to them; and they have received them, and have *known for certain* that I came forth from Thee, and they have believed that Thou didst send Me' (St. John xvii. 3, 8).

Here we see Jesus Christ Himself setting forth, in clear and distinct terms, that doctrine of justification by faith which we find in after days His Apostle teaching. He refers to knowledge as necessary to salvation, and certain knowledge—the knowledge of faith or belief—and belief in divers mysterious, inscrutable, and incomprehensible truths; truths which He, as man, had not Himself discovered but received, and truths, moreover, which the Father had given Him in order that He might make them known unto men. He specifies the incomprehensible truths or mysteries—

of His own Divinity, of His personal distinctness from the Father, and of His temporal mission from the Father.

Whatever men may think of the Catholic and Roman Church, this at least is evident—that she is at one with Jesus Christ in solemnly declaring that whosoever wills to be saved, and whoso would not perish everlastingly, must, before all things, hold, believe, profess, and think rightly as to the two mysterious, inscrutable, incomprehensible doctrines of the Trinity of Divine Persons, consubstantial, coeternal, and coequal one with another; and of the Incarnation of one of these, the Second Person the Son and Word of God, or, of the Divinity of the Son of Man, the Man Jesus of Nazareth.

3.

But, we ask ourselves, seeing clearly as we do, that, if God has spoken, it is meet and right, just and necessary that we should believe His words, however incomprehensible may be the truths which they express, and however little we are able to understand them, yet how are we to know, and to know for certain, that God has indeed spoken? How are His words to reach our ears?

We turn for answer, and we find our answer suggested by the method of Jesus Christ in the

preaching of His Gospel, in proposing mysterious, inscrutable, and incomprehensible truths to the belief of the men who heard Him.

He taught men that He Himself was Divine; that He, a man in all things made like unto themselves, a man whose mother they knew, and who was Himself supposed by them to be the son of the carpenter; a man whom they saw subject to the ordinary laws of our frail humanity, who ate and drank with them, who was often weary and slept for weariness, who sorrowed and was sad, who shed tears—that He, the reality of whose humanity was so unmistakably manifest so evident and undeniable, was at the same time God, the Son of God, equal to and one with the Father.

What reason had they for believing Him? Why should they accept so hard a saying? Why admit so astounding a claim? Why believe simply on His word that which their own reason would have said was so contrary to the evidence of their senses?

And yet Jesus demanded from men absolute submission, the subjection of their understandings to His incomprehensible doctrine; and that on pain of their eternal damnation, and as necessary to their everlasting salvation.

He gave them a reason for their submission, a

reasonable motive for the 'obedience of faith.' He gave them a reason which they could apprehend, and which they were bound to admit as sufficient; a reason which should not only justify them, as reasonable beings, in recognising the reality of His claim, but also bind them, as reasonable beings, to submit themselves to it.

He pointed to His miracles, to the wonders and signs which He wrought. 'If you will not believe Me, believe the works, that you may know and believe that the Father is in Me, and I in the Father' (St. John x. 38). 'I speak to you, and you believe not; the works that I do in the name of My Father, they give testimony of Me. . . . I and the Father are one.' And again: 'Amen, amen, I say unto you, that he who heareth My word, and believeth Him that sent Me, hath life everlasting, and cometh not into judgment, but is passed from death to life [*i.e.* from the death of sin and unbelief to the life of grace and faith; that is, is justified]. . . . I receive not testimony from man, but these things I say that you may be saved. . . . I have a greater testimony than that of John. For the works which the Father hath given Me to perfect, the works themselves which I do give testimony of Me that the Father hath sent Me. . . . You have not His word abiding in

you ; for whom He hath sent, Him you believe not' (St. John v. 24, 34, 36, 38).

He brings forward His miracles as sufficient and cogent reasons why those who beheld them should believe in His Divinity, in His oneness with the Father, and in His Divine mission from the Father. And that there should remain no room for doubt or misgiving with regard to the meaning of His words, that by them He meant to express and claim that which they in their literal and obvious sense signify, the Evangelist records the manner in which those who heard them understood them, and the effect which they had upon them. The Jews sought the more to kill Him, 'because He said God was His Father, making Himself equal to God.' And again: the Jews took up stones to stone Him, and they said, 'We stone Thee for blasphemy, and because that Thou, being a man, makest Thyself God' (St. John v. 18, x. 33). Had there been any misapprehension upon their parts, He would have set them right; but they had rightly apprehended His claim, to be as really God as was the Father, a claim which was either blasphemous or real and true; and therefore His claim He reiterated, and He brought in evidence of its reality the testimony of His works.

But why? In what way did this testimony

suffice? Did His manifest possession of miraculous powers, did the fact of His having wrought indisputable miracles, prove that He was Divine, that He was the Son of the Living God? In no way. Other men had worked miracles before Him, and to other men He gave the same power to work miracles which He Himself possessed; and yet there was never claim or semblance or even suspicion of a claim of divinity for Moses or Elias, for Peter, James or John.

What, then, did the miracles of Jesus prove? They proved in His case what they proved in the case of others who worked miracles in support of their claims to Divine mission, and as a testimony to the Divine truth of their teaching. They proved that He was a Prophet of God, an Apostle from God, an Angel or Messenger of God, a Messiah of God. They proved that He was sent by God, and that His words were the words of God. They proved His infallibility and His Divine authority as an Ambassador of God, bearing to men a message from God.

And this we find again and again that the people who saw His miracles recognised Him to be. After His raising from the dead the widow's son at Naim the multitude glorified God, and said, 'A great Prophet is risen up amongst us, and God

hath visited His people.' On another occasion we read that many of the people believed in Him, and said, 'When the Christ cometh shall He do more miracles than these which this man doth? . . . And some said, This is the Prophet indeed; and others said, This is the Christ.' Again, when Jesus questioned His disciples, 'Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?' they answered, 'Some say John the Baptist, others Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets.' And after His crucifixion, and looking back upon His life of miracles, Cleophas said, 'Jesus of Nazareth was a *Prophet*, mighty in *work and word* before God and all the people.'

Seeing His miracles, then, the people recognised Him, and they were bound to recognise Him, as a Prophet of God. Recognising Him as a Prophet of God, they were bound to accept and believe His doctrine, whatsoever He taught them. It would have been absurd for them to criticise His teaching, to examine and pass judgment upon it. Given His Divine authority as a prophet or teacher, His doctrine must have been equally Divine.

Now in His doctrine Jesus taught men that He was not only a prophet, but *the* Prophet, the Prophet greater than Moses, and of whom Moses and all the prophets prophesied; nay more, that He was not only the Prophet, the Christ, and the

promised Messiah of God, for whose advent men were in expectation, but that He was Himself God, and the Son of the Living God. To this doctrine of His Divinity He exacted the obedience of faith. Those who gave this obedience, and believed His doctrine, made thereby an act of Divine faith. His miracles declared Him to be a prophet of God; as a prophet He taught that He was also the Son of God. This men believed. The miracles were their motives of credibility; the formal motive of their faith was the authority of God Himself teaching.

There can be no Divine *faith* on the one side without Divine *authority* on the other side. This is manifest; for, in the first place, an act of faith is not an act of acquiescence or concurrence, but an act of submission and subjection, and there can be no submission and subjection save to authority; and secondly, since the submission of faith and the authority which exacts it are correlatives, according to the character of the authority, so will be the character of the faith.

When the authority is human, the faith will be human; that the faith may be Divine, the authority must be Divine.

We see, then, clearly how an act of Divine faith was possible in the days of Jesus Christ, as

it was possible also in the days of the prophets who went before Him ; for, as St. Paul writes to the Hebrews, ‘ God, having spoken on divers occasions and in many ways in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all in these days hath spoken to us by His Son’ (Heb. i. 1).

We have seen also from St. Paul’s teaching how an act of Divine faith was possible in the days of the Apostles, by reason of their association with Jesus Christ, in virtue of their oneness and identification with Him in His Divine mission, as He was the Messiah and Prophet of God. They were sent as He was sent, and when men heard them they in effect heard Him.

We have seen, finally, the necessity for the perseverance and continuance upon the earth of an infallible Divine Authority, if the one Gospel of God is to be preserved and preached in all its completeness and in its purity, and if it is to be so presented to all men as that they may make in it a reasonable act of Divine faith. Hence the existence of the Church of God, with its apostolic character, with its Divine authority and consequent infallibility, as the representative and instrument of Jesus upon the earth. Through and by means of her Jesus teaches the nations. She bridges the chasm between the present of to-day

and the past of eighteen centuries ago. Her unbroken unity brings us in contact with Jesus of Nazareth and His Apostles. She is His mystical Body, one in herself, and one with Him as her Head. This, her supernatural oneness, an unity unparalleled on earth, an unity that naught can destroy, and an unity such as no power of man could create or secure, is the evidence that she is that which she claims to be—the one and only Church of God. She requires no external testimony. She is her own evidence. She ‘bears in her body the marks of the Lord Jesus.’ Men may despise her, hate her, fear her; men may say all manner of evil against her falsely; one thing they cannot, and they dare not, and they do not say—that she is not one. Her oneness is a fact patent and manifest to the eyes of all men. It needs no proof. It is evident, allowed, and acted on. She is treated as one, legislated against as one, persecuted as one. The men of the world wonder at that which they cannot deny. They seek an explanation of a phenomenon which is peerless and stands alone, and they fail to find it. It is inexplicable save on one hypothesis, and that is—the reality of her claim.

To us, who believe, there is matter for admiration, but there is none for wonder. We find the

explanation where we know to seek for it, in the words of Jesus, the 'Author and the Finisher of faith.' He has promised that she should endure all days to the consummation of the world, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her. He has said that she should be one, and we know that her oneness is secure. He chose this property which He bestowed upon her, this her oneness, to be a sign to the nations that she is their teacher sent from God, bearing to them the Divine message; to be a testimony to the world that she is, as He was, the Light of the World; to be a motive of credibility, a ground of faith, a reason why men should believe unto justification.

Had the Catholic and Roman Church graven upon her no other sign that she alone is the Church of Jesus Christ, this her unexampled unity would of itself suffice. On this one issue we are content to rest our whole case; and we prefer to rest it on this testimony rather than on any other for this simple reason—that Jesus chose it.

In His prayer before His Passion, He said to His Eternal Father, 'I have *given them* Thy word. . . . As Thou hast sent Me into the world, I also have *sent them* into the world. And not for them only do I pray, but for those also *who through their word shall believe in Me*. That they

all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee: that they also may be one in Us: *that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me* (St. John xvii. 14, 18, 20, 21).

He asks for unity—‘that they may be one’—for an unity which should be not human and natural, but superhuman, supernatural, and Divine—‘as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee.’

The motive and end of His asking for this unity He declares. It was that there might remain on earth the standing testimony of an enduring miracle to be a ground of faith for all men, a reasonable motive of credibility for the whole world of men, and throughout all time,—‘that the world may know;’ and know what?—‘that Thou hast sent Me;’ may believe the mysterious, inscrutable, incomprehensible truths of the Trinity of Divine Persons in the Unity of the Divine Essence,—of the Incarnation of the Son of God,—of His Divine mission as the Mediator and Messiah; in a word, of the Divineness of His Apostolate, and the Divineness of His Gospel.

4.

And yet the world does not believe. And why? Why do not all men recognise the Divine character of the one Church of God, the Catholic and Roman

Church; and all submit themselves to her Divine authority?

In the first place, the faith which is necessary in order to justification is itself a grace, a free gift of God. It is not something which a man can acquire for himself; it must be given him by his Maker. Without grace, and this grace of faith, a man cannot arrive at a knowledge of these Divine truths. It is not by any mere schooling of his mind that he can bring himself to accept them. He must have indeed a good will, he must dispose himself and coöperate with the grace of God; but there must be the grace with which to coöperate, and without grace 'he can do nothing.' 'We are not sufficient,' says the Apostle, 'to think anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God' (2 Cor. iii. 5). And again, writing to the Ephesians, '*By grace you are saved through faith, and this not of yourselves, for it is the gift of God*' (ii. 8).

But is God, then, niggard in the bestowal of His gifts, or does He bestow His graces upon one and refuse them to, or withhold them from, another? No! For, as His Apostle says again, 'God wills all men to be saved and to *come to knowledge of the truth*' (1 Tim. ii. 4). For this reason He sent His Son. For this reason His Son has estab-

lished His Church, to continue His work upon earth, to preserve and to preach His Gospel. The existence of that Church is known to all men. Her claim to be the one Church of Christ, the one representative of God to men, is known to all men. The unity to which she points as evidence of her Divine origin and constitution and life is known to all men. And yet men go on their way, and stop not seriously and honestly, anxiously and earnestly to examine her claim. And why is this? For one reason, because of their indifference to absolute truth, because of their intellectual and moral indolence. They do not concern themselves, they will not exert themselves to find out what really is the truth.

This, again, betrays that from which in great measure it springs, their loose and hazy conceptions with regard to the Incarnation, with regard to the character and office of Jesus Christ, with regard to the purpose of His coming, with regard to the significance of what He said and did. They have no real grasp of the truth of His Messiasship or Divine Apostolate, which leads on to the inevitable and irresistible conclusion that, as He is One, His Gospel must be one; that if He is God, His Gospel must be the Gospel of God. Let them once firmly grasp and see clearly this truth,

and, verily, they are 'not far from the kingdom of God.'

They then see the necessity of some means for preserving the Gospel in its entirety and in its purity, and of some authority to teach it to men, and of an authority so Divine as that men taught by it are 'taught of God' as really as if they had been taught immediately and directly by Jesus Christ Himself.

They are then at the very threshold of the Catholic Church.

They are then on the very verge of making an act of Divine faith, of submitting their intelligences to a Divine authority, of being able to say with solid reason, *Credo*—'I believe.' 'Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth.'

But, alas, many halt on the way, and come not thus far. And why? Partly because of the spirit of the world, and its influence upon them, and partly because they dread that Gospel which is the Gospel of the Cross. They dread the suffering and the loss which submission to it may entail upon them.

The spirit of the world is that spirit which causes men to live in this world as if there were no other world, to live in this life as if there were no other life, no life everlasting and unending; as if

the life of a man terminated with the death of his body, and as if it were bounded by his grave.

The spirit of the world is that spirit which causes men to live according to the lusts of their flesh, to indulge and gratify their appetites and passions, their natural inclinations and desires; to live lives as carnal and sensual and almost as purely animal as if they had before them no higher destiny than that of the beasts that perish, and as if their corruptible and mortal bodies were not tenanted by incorruptible and immortal souls.

The spirit of the world is that spirit which makes men value and covet and strive after those things only which the world can give them—its pleasures, its riches, and its honours—and makes them forget the one end of their being, the one purpose of their creation, the one reason why they live with a human life, which is that they may know and love and serve His Divine Majesty, their Creator and Lord, and so doing save their souls.

The spirit of the world is that spirit which leads men to forget God, to ignore God, to live and act, to speculate and plan as if in His own universe there were no God at all. He is in His world, and His world was made by Him, and the spirit of the world knows Him not.

And how many men there are who in various degrees and in various ways are held captive under bondage to the spirit of the world, who try to serve two masters, or who, when at last the world will not have a divided allegiance, and they have to make their choice and say whom they will serve, determine to serve man rather than God!

The spirit of the world, what is it but the spirit of idolatry? And it is the spirit of idolatry in one shape or another, in one or other of its various forms, that is the great hindrance in men's minds to the truth, to their submission to the Church of God, and so to their reception of the one Gospel of God. They sit down and count the cost. They think of themselves, and they think of others their fellow-creatures, before they think of the God who made them. They think of the anger or the distress and sorrow of parents, of the pain and grief they may cause to relations, of the friendships they may lose, and the ridicule and contempt which they may have to endure from those by whom perhaps they have hitherto been held in honour; of the loss of fortune or expectations, or of position and influence and other advantages, civil, social, and domestic. These and suchlike form to them the cross, and from that cross they shrink. They would gladly embrace

the Gospel, if it cost them nothing, if it were not the Gospel of the Cross. They forget that if it were not the *Verbum Crucis*, the 'Gospel of the Cross,' it would not be the Gospel of the Crucified, it would not be the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

That it is the Gospel of the Cross is another note and sign and evidence that it is the one Gospel of Christ. Jesus foretold to the letter that which has come to pass in our days: 'Think you that I have come to give peace on earth? I tell you, No! but separation. I came not to send peace, but the sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, and a man's enemies shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me, and he that loveth son or daughter more than Me is not worthy of Me, and he that taketh not up his cross and followeth Me is not worthy of Me' (St. Matt. x. 34-38; St. Luke xiii. 51). And again: 'If any man come to Me, and hate not his father and mother and wife and children and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he *cannot* be My disciple' (St. Luke xiv. 26).

But hear the words of His promise: 'Whoso-

ever shall lose his life for My sake, and for the Gospel, shall save it. For what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?' (St. Mark viii. 35, 36.)

It is made matter of accusation against the Catholic Church, that submission to her authority has its result in the rending of social and domestic ties, in the introduction of variance and disputes into once united families, and that it is an obstacle to one's advancement in the world. It is true. The Catholic Church is a foe to peace—to that which the world calls peace. She is an element of disturbance, and an occasion of dispute, as no sect or so-called church or society outside her pale is or ever can be. But there is another peace which the world understands not, which the world cannot give, and which the world is as powerless to take away. There is the joy and peace of *believing*. This peace is the possession and privilege of those who have made submission of their minds and wills to the Divine authority of the one Church of God. The fact that for this peace they have to pay the price which Jesus foretold is to them another motive of credibility and ground of faith.

This habitual submission of mind and will to Divine authority is that faith by which we are

justified; and this faith is the foundation of that 'holiness without which no man may see the Lord.' 'Being justified *by faith*,' says the Apostle, in his Epistle to the Romans, 'let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom also we have access *through faith* into that grace wherein we stand, and glory in the hope of the glory of the sons of God' (v. 1, 2).

Such is the doctrine of man's justification by faith in the one Gospel of Jesus Christ. In the light of this doctrine we have examined the foundations of our faith, and we have found them laid on Jesus, the Author and Finisher of our faith; on the Jesus, not of the past or in the distance, but of the present and in our midst; on Jesus, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever; ever abiding, as He said, in and with His one Church, and by means of her continuing His work upon the earth, and teaching to men, with Divine authority, the whole counsel and Gospel of God.

Were there no Catholic and Roman Church the world would be to-day in the same condition as if no prophet had ever taught in the name of God, as if no Apostle had ever been sent, as if Jesus Christ had never come. Jesus would have delivered His Gospel, and Paul would have preached in vain. When their voices were heard

no longer in the ears of men, their words would have perished with them. The living stream would speedily have lost itself in the shifting sands of time, or perhaps rather have been dried up at its very source. The golden chain which binds the centuries together, and joins the fulness of time with its last days and with that day when time shall be no more, would have been severed. Christianity would have been but a philosophy, a human system of religious speculation and thought, at the mercy of human teachers, propounded with but human authority, and believed in with but human faith.

That the words of Jesus have been preserved throughout the ages, that they are spoken in our ears with all the Divine Apostolic authority of Jesus Himself, is due to the Divine fact that there has lived on throughout those ages that Divine Society which includes within it Jesus of Nazareth;—that living Body of which He is the living Head, which is one with Him, and lives with His life, and which, therefore, cannot die. He that heareth her heareth Him; and he that despiseth her despiseth Him; and he that despiseth Him despiseth Him who sent Him. Taught by her, we are ‘taught of God,’ and ‘we have the mind of Christ.’ To us Christianity is a living

and Divine reality, for it is the one living Gospel once contained within the one human mind of Jesus of Nazareth, now contained within the one collective mind of His one Church, and thence derived straight to each one of us individually, to our minds and hearts.

Thanks be to God who hath called us into the society of His Son, and hath given us this grace to listen to His voice, to hear His words, and to say—*I believe.*

THE END.

HUMPHREY, William.

BS

2685

Other gospels.

.H8

HUMPHREY, William.

BS

Other gospels.

2685

.H8.

