

A SUMMARY  
OF  
CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

Pross, Geo, & Banter

SCC # 12,557  
C.1













A SUMMARY  
OF  
CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

BY  
FRANCIS L. PATTON, D. D., LL. D.  
PRESIDENT OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY



Philadelphia  
The Westminster Press  
1901

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1875, by  
THE TRUSTEES OF THE  
PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION,  
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

## INTRODUCTORY.

---

AN opinion is one thing, a fact is another. If a man says that he believes the moon is inhabited, we may very properly say, "That is your opinion, but we differ with you." And since the opinion in question is at present not capable of proof, prolonged argument would not be called for.

Many entertain the idea that what are called "the doctrines" are only conjectures or opinions for which there is little or no evidence, and certainly no proof.

This is a mistake.

We may assent or not to an opinion as we please; if we reject a fact, we only advertise our stupidity. If a man denies that the three angles of a triangle are together equal to two right angles, we can demonstrate the proposition. If he says that Brutus did not kill Cæsar, we can open the books of history and convince him. In the one case we reach mathematical certainty, in the other moral. If in face of evidence a man persists in denying facts, he acts unreasonably. Now, "the doctrines" are facts.

But though truth for truth's sake is the motto of the philosopher, it is nevertheless certain that we cannot know everything, and there may be considerations which make some truths more important than others. The sick man wishes above all things to know what medicine will help his case. And the most important truth to every man is that which makes known the conditions of a happy hereafter. "The doctrines" claim a position above all other truth

because of their practical value. If any one chooses to call this a utilitarian philosophy, he may. Certainly, if there were no questions of destiny pending, there might be more excuse for those who are jubilant over the discovery of a fossil, but indifferent to the facts of Christianity. The doctrines are truths which are capable of proof, and which stand in vital relation to the life that now is and to that which is to come. These considerations will shape the method to be observed in the following pages,

---

#### THE FACTORS IN RELIGION: MAN AND GOD.

RELIGION is the bond which unites God and man. It supposes, therefore, two factors—man, the subject of religious feelings, and God, the object of religious worship. To cast doubt on either of these factors would be to damage or destroy religion. If the universal beliefs of mankind had been allowed to pass unchallenged, it would not be necessary to offer arguments for the existence of mind or of God. Infidels, however, have put Christians on their defence, and their bold denials of fundamental truth make it proper, and perhaps necessary, that, even in so brief a statement of doctrine as this is intended to be, something should be said to show how we can vindicate our religious nature.

#### I. MAN.

The most pretentious form of current philosophy denies our existence, or rather, that element in our existence which gives it value: the mind. The student of theology has a battle to fight at the threshold, and his first foe is the materialist; for if it should turn out that what we call mind is only material force, it would be absurd to talk of

religion, since there could be no God to worship and no "we" to bow down to him. Suppose, now, that some disciple of Maudesley should hear us arguing for the being of God from the laws of mind, and should meet us plumply with the question, How do you know that such a thing as mind exists? What should we say? We might feel that this is a question which we were not expecting—we should certainly feel that, metaphysical though it is, it has a great deal to do with religion, and demands an answer. Our reflections when written out might take a form something like the following:

1. I exist. This is taken for granted in everything I do, say or think. There can be no knowing, feeling, willing, without an "I" to know, feel and will. What is this something which goes by the name "I," "me," "self," "ego"? It is not my body, for I know I am separate from it. It is not any part of my body; my brain is *mine*, not *me*. There is a necessity laid upon me of thinking that I exist; for if I should think I did not exist, I should have to exist in order to think that I did not. This brings us to Descartes' famous utterance, "I think, therefore I am."

Now, I have certain powers or attributes which my body does not have, which no part of my body has. I will to lift my arm. I know that my arm could not exert an act of will, nor is it possible for me to conceive of any material substance exercising volition. Will power is a power which "I" exert; and when I see a manifestation of it which is not due to me, I at once attribute it to another "I" or "self" similar to me—that is to say, to another *person*. I know. Knowledge is one of my prerogatives which material substances do not possess. A stone cannot know or feel.

To sum up: There is a something, ens, entity, substance—called "I," "me," "self." This something has attributes which matter has not, and it has not the properties of mat-

ter. We are compelled to think that it is a different substance, and we call it mind. The more we attempt to realize the proposition that mind is matter, the more its absurdity grows upon us, and the more does the distinction between the two assert itself as a necessity of thought. In philosophical language we say that the distinction is a fact of consciousness.

2. The philosophy which denies mind a place in the universe ought to be able to support its terrible conclusions by the presentation of evidence. But when asked on what authority they deny the universal beliefs of mankind, these philosophers have very little to say. To be sure, they are able to show that there is an intimate connection between mind and body, and they talk learnedly about nerve-currents and the grey matter of the brain. But between matter and thought, between nerve-currents and personality, there is a breach which this philosophy does not fill. The belief in mind is a necessity of thought—a necessity felt none the less by those who write books to prove that mind does not exist. The materialist has encountered two barriers which rise mountain-like to dispute his passage into the realm of mind: the one is the mystery of life, and the other is the mystery of personality. The attempt to bring a living thing out of dead matter and to make mind a department of physiology has been a failure.

3. The hypothesis that thought is a function of brain is beset with endless confusion, and is palpably absurd. According to it, the rationale of conversation is this: A movement takes place in A's brain which we call A's volition to speak; other movements follow which we call thoughts; these are attended with the articulation of certain sounds; these fall on the tympanum of B's ear, affect the auditory nerve and cause the movements or nerve-currents called hearing; other movements follow in B's brain, attended by corresponding articulations, which constitute

B's reply. Talking is just telegraph-operating *without the operators.*

The theory involves the following incongruous elements: (a.) Matter thinks, feels, wills. (b.) The irresistible conviction of this thinking matter is that it is not matter, but mind. (c.) Thinking, feeling, willing, as it does, this matter is necessarily of the opinion that matter cannot think, feel or will.

And further, we might say to him who seeks to convince us that mind does not exist: It is folly for you to undertake any such task; for if your theory is true, I am not properly the subject of argument. You might as well expect a dead man to find comfort in his funeral sermon. Convincing me, were you to succeed, would only mean setting in motion certain nerve-currents in a material organism. And besides, you, in the act of arguing, are only a material organism, with a set of material forces at work which you call your philosophical opinions. One Leyden jar might as well be supposed to discuss chemistry with another Leyden jar as for you and me to talk metaphysics.

And yet again: If I am convinced that you are right, I am convinced that consciousness has played me false. But if in regard to this fundamental conviction I am deceived, how can I be sure of my eyes and my ears when they tell me that you are present and that you speak? To be convinced that consciousness is a false witness seems to be impossible, when I remember that my belief in the existence of my philosophical acquaintance is founded on a belief in the veracity of consciousness. I must trust my consciousness in order that I may be convinced that it is mendacious, which involves an absurdity akin to that of a man trying to take himself up in his arms.

## II. GOD.

1) The belief in God is universal. All men believe in the existence of some being or beings above them to whom they are responsible and whom it behooves them to propitiate. This belief is not the result of argument, for the majority of men have never faced the question why they believe in God. The fact that this belief is so widespread is a strong argument in favor of its truth. It would be strange if the human race were unanimous in entertaining a falsehood like this; and though the atheist will say that this is not more strange than the fact that men for ages believed that sun, moon and stars revolved round the earth, yet a moment's thought will show that the cases are not parallel. The sun seemed to them to rise and set, and the stars to move from east to west. It was perfectly natural that they should trust their eyes. Or if it should be said that men have held with considerable unanimity the belief in many superstitions regarding the supernatural, we should reply again that, given the fact of a widespread conception respecting the supernatural, it is not difficult to understand the multiplied misconceptions. But it is not easy to explain how it happened that a universal belief in the supernatural should have taken possession of the minds of men if there is no supernatural. If God exists, we can account for the crudities which are associated with the belief in his existence. But on the hypothesis of materialism, the *genesis* of the idea of God is without explanation. Atheism leaves us with a universal effect without any assignable cause. Our belief in God we will allow is open, however, to honest criticism. If evidence could be brought to show that it is without foundation or is false, we should listen to it and give it all the consideration it deserves. On the other hand, it is fair to require of him who undertakes to overthrow the world's faith that he present some objection



which goes beyond an assertion of his own skepticism. The atheist as yet has not met this requirement. If he reminds us that advancing science is banishing polytheism, we shall remind him, on the other hand, that it is at the same time establishing theism. If he tells us that the phenomena in the material world occur in accordance with universal law and are due to the operation of one force, we shall tell him that he must believe in one omnipotent and omnipresent Being before these generalizations can have any significance, that they do not conflict necessarily with our belief in God, and that they do not add much to what we learned from the Book which says: "In him we live and move and have our being" (Acts xvii. 28), and which tells us that "In him and through him and to him are all things." Rom. xi. 36.

Belief in God is universal; this is a presumption in favor of the doctrine of God's existence, and lays the burden of proof on him who undertakes to set it aside. The atheist may be defied to show that any fact of science is inconsonant with theism. We, however, are able to produce arguments which abundantly serve to vindicate our faith and to condemn the atheist.

We shall notice four: (1.) That which is based on the idea of cause. (2.) That which arises out of our moral nature. (3.) Scripture. (4.) Congruity.

1. Cause. We are so constituted that whenever any event occurs we are necessarily led to ask a reason for it, or to believe that it was due to some cause. This fact in our mental constitution is the basis of the two methods of reasoning which are commonly known as the cosmological and the teleological arguments.

(a.) The cosmological argument. Every change is due to some cause. Let us see where this statement will lead us. We exist. We owe our existence to our parents. Our parents owe theirs to their parents, and so on. Unless we adopt Darwinism, we must conclude that the human race is

eternal, or that the chain of which parent and child are the links terminates in our first parents. But we cannot believe that the human race is eternal, for this would be like supposing that one link of a chain is supported by the one above it, and that by the one above it, and so back to infinity. By a necessity of thought we must think of a first link which is fixed and which supports all the rest. So the chain of causes must bring us to the first man, the father of the human race, and he must be self-existent, or he must seek for a cause of his existence. How did he come into being?

Take other species of animal life. There is no evidence that any species has developed by gradual transition out of a lower species; so that, tracing the individuals of any species backward, we come, as in the case of man, to the first individuals of the species. And the question occurs again, What is the cause of their existence?

We are of necessity led to believe in the existence of a necessary self-existing First Cause; and unless we adopt the theory of evolution, we soon come to a point where it becomes necessary to look for that cause outside of matter. But were the hypothesis of evolution accepted, it would relieve us of no difficulty; for grant that the effects or changes in the material world can be traced back in a chain of finite causations till we come to an original ether, this ether is in motion or else it is at rest. If it is in motion, the motion is a change which demands a cause; and as an infinite series of finite causes is inconceivable, we must believe that matter is the originator of motion or is self-moved. But this is inconceivable. Plato argued, and we see no reason to doubt the correctness of his reasoning, that, since it is impossible for the mind to conceive of matter originating motion, there must be a mind as the first cause of motion.

(*b.*) The teleological argument. This likewise is as old as Plato, though made more familiar to us by the writings of Paley and others. If, says Paley, we were walking on the

sea-shore, and should find a watch on the sand, we should discover on examination that it was intended to be a measurer of time, that the parts of the watch are contrived for bringing about this result; we should never dream that the parts were fitted to each other and with such delicate adjustment, as a matter of chance. We could not resist the feeling that the watch was the product of wonderful skill, and the work of a designing mind. Applying this reasoning to what we observe in nature, we conclude that the universe is not only an effect which has a cause, but an effect which has an intelligent cause. Paley's watch is none the worse for wear; and however much some are disposed to disparage this line of argument, it is nevertheless true that it is impossible for the mind to face the evidences of design in nature without feeling that they testify to an intelligent Creator. A man may say that it is possible that these so-called adaptations are nothing more than a fortuitous concourse of atoms. When he says this, however, he is not seeking truth, but seeking an excuse for not assenting to the force of evidence. As long as he is in this state of mind it will be of no use to multiply the evidences of design. The man who can see no evidence of design in the structure of his own body is not likely to be convinced by illustrations drawn from the latest discoveries in science.\*

2. The moral argument. There are two pairs of correlative expressions which we all use, and which, if we stop to think, almost necessarily suggest the idea of God. These expressions are—right and wrong; ought and ought not.

Some actions we pronounce right, others we say are wrong. Benevolence is right, envy is wrong. The same

\* For illustrations of design in nature, we refer to the admirable summary of the teleological argument in the first volume of Dr. Hodge's *Systematic Theology*, to the numerous works on natural theology and to the volumes of lectures published by the Christian Evidence Society of London.

thing may be called right and wrong, it is true, by different persons, but all feel that the distinction is fundamental and necessary. It is not because a word or action pleases us that we call it right. Its moral quality we know is something altogether different from the feeling of pleasure or displeasure which it occasions. We are conscious, when we say of a word or act that it is wrong, of appealing to an absolute standard, and our judgment is simply an expression of its want of conformity with it. A standard there must be, or the words right and wrong would have no meaning. What is that standard? Some tell us that there is an eternal principle of right, but what meaning can we attach to a principle of right as the standard of moral action? Let us, however, believe in the existence of a perfect moral being, whose nature constitutes the ground of right, and then we use language intelligibly when we speak of right and wrong.

Again, morality is obligatory. We are conscious of this. There are some things which we *ought* to do and some which we *ought not* to do. There is a vast difference between saying to a man, "It will be better for you to be honest, for honesty is the best policy," and saying, "You are bound to be honest." The difference is so great that, though the attempt has more than once been made to show how the idea of obligation can be developed out of the idea of expediency, it has never succeeded. If there is no God, why do I feel under obligation? Who has a right to command me? If atheism is true, obligatory morals are impossible. Our moral nature speaks, however, in the imperative mood. We must believe in God, or believe that the root of our nature is a lie.

3. Scripture. A great deal of our knowledge rests on the testimony of others. Testimony, however, would be worthless if we believed that men would lie as readily as they would speak the truth. Now, supposing that we were not led by the constitution of our nature to believe in God, there is no

reason why the Bible should not be competent to give independent proof of His being. If the testimony of travelers is enough to satisfy us as to the appearance and habits of men in the heart of Africa whom we have never seen, the Bible, if it is authentic history, is enough to satisfy us of the existence of a Being who made all things, who works miracles and knows the end from the beginning. Some facts, we concede, require more evidence than others, for their support. The Bible history, however, is supported by evidence enough to satisfy every just demand. If any history is veritable, the history of the Jews is; but take God out of the Jewish history, and what would remain? Prophecy is not explainable on atheistic principles, but the Bible contains the record of prophecy and the record of its fulfillment. The resurrection of Christ is certified not only by the testimony of those who saw Him alive after his passion, but by the fact that the gospel was first preached in Jerusalem, where neither the desire nor the material was wanting for the destruction of Christianity, if it were true that the apostles appealed to a falsehood when they referred to the resurrection. If we cannot believe in God's existence on the testimony of the Bible, we might as well burn our books of history. A man cannot deny its testimony unless he says plainly, "No amount of testimony will convince me of the supernatural." Of course such skepticism is incurable.

4. Congruity. We know that we have the wrong key when it does not fit all the wards of the lock. On the other hand, it is a strong argument for the truth of a theory that it explains all the facts in the case. The belief in a self-existent personal God is in harmony with all the facts of our mental and moral nature as well as with all the phenomena of the material world. If God exists, a universal belief in his existence is natural enough; the irresistible impulse to ask for a first cause is accounted for; our religious nature has an object; the uniformity of natural law

finds an adequate explanation, and human history is vindicated from the charge of being an immense imposture. Atheism leaves all these matters without any explanation, and makes not history alone, but our intellectual nature itself, an imposture and a lie.

The line of argument which we have pursued has brought us first to a reasoned belief in ANIMISM, and secondly to a reasoned belief in THEISM. The atheist, however, may say, "This mode of reasoning is not demonstration. It *may* be there is no God, and that my consciousness bears false witness." Of course, if a man goes so far as to charge his very nature with falsehood, we have nothing more to say. Discussion would be useless. It is worth while to note the fact that the strongest argument of the atheist is that the theist has not demonstrated the being of God; and in reply it is enough to say: (1.) We did not set out with a promise to demonstrate the being of God, but to vindicate a universal faith. This we claim to have done by arguments which ought to convince you and which are enough to condemn you. (2.) Your complaint is a confession; for when you seek to justify your disbelief on the ground that *possibly* there is no God, you virtually confess that the question of God is at least immensely probable. We have no wish to discuss the question whether the existence of God is a demonstrable proposition. We ask you simply to consider the peril in which you stand when you assume the responsibility of denying the existence of a Being whom you must one day face. (3.) Probability is the guide of life. You admit this in other matters; why do you deny it in this? If you go to sea on a raft because there is a bare possibility that you will cross the ocean safely, you act like an idiot. If you persist in atheism in face of all the evidence of God's existence, you are what the Bible calls a "fool."

## THE RULE OF FAITH.

OUR moral nature prompts us to ask many questions, and makes us impatient until they are answered. What is the origin of the human race? How does it happen that sin is universal? What is the character of the Being to whom we are responsible? May we trust him, or must we be in terror? How are we to know what is right and what is wrong, since the judgments of men conflict? Are we immortal? Is it a happy hereafter which awaits us? Does that depend on anything which we can do? If so, what must we do?

Whither shall we go for a satisfactory answer to these inquiries? We cannot rest until we find some standard of truth which we can regard as infallible. Where are we to find it? In your reason, says one. In the Church, says another. In the Bible, says a third. The decisions we reach respecting our rule of faith will determine whether we shall be Rationalists, Romanists or Protestants. Let us consider these answers in the order mentioned.

## I. REASON.

There are two ways of investing reason with infallibility. A man may say that he needs no other revelation than the light of his own intellect, in which case he makes reason the source of knowledge; or he may say that, conceding that the Bible contains divine revelations, he will receive nothing which he cannot comprehend or which conflicts with his sense of right, in which case he makes reason the criterion of truth.

To one who denies the necessity or the possibility of a revelation we should reply by saying:

1. If you deny that God can or will give a revelation,

you simply make yourself a pope and proclaim your infallibility. Argument with you is, therefore, out of the question.

2. The need of a revelation is seen in the conflicting opinions which men entertain respecting fundamental questions. If twelve clocks at the same instant indicate a different hour, it is certain that at least eleven of them are wrong. The conflicting verdicts of the human conscience on matters of right and wrong prove that without a revelation the race is hopelessly in the dark.

3. The need of a revelation and its possibility are questions which are set aside by the undoubted fact that God has given a revelation, and that we have it in the Old and New Testaments. When the steam-engine was invented, it was argued that it never could be made a means of land-travel. The railroad is a refutation of the reasoning.

When, however, the rationalist takes the position that reason is the criterion by which we are to decide what is and what is not properly a part of divine revelation, it is necessary to remind him that there is a proper and an improper exercise of reason in matters of religion. If a man were to say that up in the moon two and two make five, we should deny it point blank. If he said that in the moon there is a race of men who can fly, we should say, Possibly; the thing is certainly not inconceivable. This illustrates the first prerogative of reason, the right to pronounce against a statement which contradicts a necessary belief. We cannot believe a contradictory proposition; we cannot believe that an event occurred without some cause of its occurrence. We cannot believe that right is wrong or that wrong is right. Any book that asks us to believe these things asks an impossibility, asks us to assent to unthinkable propositions, and therefore cannot be from God. Again, the Bible comes to us as a revelation. So do other books—the Koran, for example. Why do we accept the Bible and reject the



rest? Because the Bible gives evidence of being a divine revelation. The mind, therefore, must be allowed to weigh the evidence which accredits the Bible and determine whether it is adequate. To deny this would be to deny that there is any reason for believing one alleged revelation rather than another. The rationalist, however, wishes the privilege of sitting in judgment on the contents of Scripture. His position is open to obvious objections.

1. It does not follow that a doctrine is untrue because it is incomprehensible. The Bible teaches the doctrine of the Trinity. The rationalist denies it. It is a contradiction, he says. But it is not a contradiction, for the human mind cannot believe a contradiction, and the doctrine of the trinity is a cardinal one in the Christian's creed. Incomprehensible it undoubtedly is, but this is no argument against it, unless, indeed, the man who makes it is omniscient.

2. A man has no right to settle beforehand what God may or may not do, and then condemn the Scriptures because they do not harmonize with his view. God cannot do wrong, we know. But what may be wrong for us to do may not be wrong for God to do. It may be wrong for a man to chastise another man's child, though quite proper for him to punish his own. We have no right to kill a man; it does not follow, though, that God has none. The rationalist raises moral objections to the Bible because he makes the mistake of applying to God the laws which were meant to govern the relations of men.

3. We must not form our judgment of God by the light of the Bible, and at the same time criticise the Bible by our idea of God. If an Eastern prince should send us a package containing a letter and his photograph, it might be well enough to take the necessary means of satisfying ourselves that the package came from the person in question. But that fact being ascertained, we must take the photograph as a genuine picture, even though it should be very unlike

what we would have expected. Now, the Bible is a portrait, if we may so speak, of God. We learn from it that God is just, and that he will take vengeance on those who obey not the gospel of his Son. It is our business to determine whether the Bible gives evidence of being sent to us from God ; but having satisfied ourselves of that fact, it would be a very foolish thing to reject any part of it because it does not correspond with the notions we had formed of God.

## II. THE CHURCH.

Roman Catholics regard the Church as infallible and her teachings as authoritative. They believe that the Scriptures are infallible and inspired, but deny that they are sufficient. They say that the Church is the custodian of a body of unwritten truth communicated by Christ and his apostles and preserved in the form of tradition. But how are we to distinguish between true and false traditions? Romanists apply the tests of catholicity and antiquity: what has always been believed, and by all Christians, is true. The peculiar doctrines of Romanism will not meet the requirements of this canon, however, and the only way in which they can be justified is to fall back upon the infallibility of the Church. Romanists claim that the traditions are true because endorsed by an infallible Church. Romanism therefore stands or falls with the doctrine of the Church's infallibility. Some say that infallibility resides in the pope as vicar of Christ, and others in the Church, speaking through the majority of her bishops. A word or two, first, on the general question of infallibility:

1. Proof of infallibility is, in the nature of the case, impossible, for the appeal must be made either to Scripture or to tradition. The Scripture cannot be cited to prove the infallibility of the Church, for a favorite point which the Romanists make against Protestants is that

we have no infallible interpretation of the Scriptures. If the Romanist is correct in this argument, it applies with equal force to himself. He cannot appeal to the Scriptures to sustain the infallibility of the Church ; and if he does, he must assume that his Church is infallible in order that he may have an infallible interpretation of those passages of Scriptures on which the infallibility of the Church is based. On the other hand, he cannot appeal to tradition, for his belief that a particular tradition is true depends upon the infallibility of the Church which holds the tradition. Roman Catholic reasoning is proverbially circular. The appeal is to tradition to support infallibility, and to infallibility to certify tradition.

2. The Church of Rome is not infallible, because it contradicts the Scriptures ; and the Scriptures, it concedes, are infallible. The Bible teaches that only God can forgive sins ; Rome says the priest can. The Bible says, Worship God only ; Rome says, Worship the Virgin Mary too. The Bible says there is one Mediator ; Rome says every priest is a mediator. The Bible says that Christ offered himself once for all ; Rome pretends to repeat the sacrifice in celebrating the eucharist. The Bible says we are justified by faith ; Rome says we are justified by baptism. If the Church of Rome is infallible and the Bible is infallible, we have two infallibilities contradicting each other.

But there are special difficulties connected with the infallibility of the pope and the infallibility of the bishops or of general councils. The doctrine of the pope's infallibility is attended with difficulties like the following :

(1.) It is not certain whether the infallibility of the pope follows from the infallibility of the Church, or the infallibility of the Church from the infallibility of the pope. Archbishop Manning holds the latter opinion. "The tradition of the Church is not to test the teaching of the pontiff

by the assent of the Church, but to take the doctrines of the pontiff as the test of the doctrines of the Church." A writer in the *Catholic World* takes the other view, and says: "The infallibility of the pope is implicitly contained in and logically concluded from the infallibility of the Church in general."\* And Archbishop Manning himself turns round and appeals to the infallibility of the Church to certify the legitimacy, and therefore the infallibility, of the pope. He says † "that St. Peter was bishop of Rome, . . . that the Council of Trent and the Council of the Vatican are œcumenical—that is, legitimately celebrated and confirmed; that Pius IX. is the successor of St. Peter by legitimate election. These truths are not revealed, . . . yet they are so necessary to the order of faith that the whole would be undermined if they were not infallibly certain. But such infallible certainty is impossible by means of human history and human evidence alone. It is created only by the authority of the Church."

(2.) Some important gaps in history must be filled before it can be shown that the pope is infallible.

(a.) It does not appear in the New Testament that Peter had any primacy among the apostles. Romanists base the doctrine on Matt. xvi. 18: "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church." ‡ We know, however, that Peter did not lay any claim to precedence, nor was any accorded to him by the other apostles. He writes, "The elders who are among you I exhort, who am also an elder." He did not preside at the Council of Jerusalem. Paul, on one occasion, withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.

(b.) It cannot be shown that Peter was ever in Rome.

\* *Catholic World* for August, 1871.

† *Petri Privilegium*.

‡ For an exposition of this verse see Lange's *Commentary and Notes*.

(c.) And if it could, it would not follow that he had any successors.

(d.) And if he had successors, it would be impossible to prove that Pope Pius IX. is the legitimate occupant of the papal chair.

(e.) The advocates of papal infallibility are confronted with the damaging fact that the sixth general council, A. D. 680, anathematized Pope Honorius as a heretic.

The Gallican party in the Church of Rome deny that the pope is infallible, but believe in the infallibility of the Church—that is to say, they believe that the decisions of a majority of the bishops are infallible. This position, however, is as untenable as that of the Ultramontanes just noticed.

(1.) It is assumed that the “Church,” to whom promises are given and on whom privileges are conferred, is a visible organization, and is composed of those who are in subjection to the bishop of Rome. Christ promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against his Church. The Church is said to be his body, the fullness of Him who filleth all in all. Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by his blood, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having a spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish. It cannot be shown that these statements refer to any visible organization, and far less that that organization is the Church of Rome. We know, moreover, that these statements do not refer to any visible Church; they are true of no one organization as such. They are true, however, of all believers as such, and no organization has a monopoly of them.

(2.) The promises of Christ do not imply infallibility. It is not denied that the New Testament sometimes uses the word church to convey the idea of visible organization,

though in the passages which are most relied on by Romanists we know it has not that signification. Our Lord evidently has referred to the local organization in Matt. xviii. 15, when he speaks of church discipline and says. "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." But his promises, whether referring to visible societies of Christians or to Christians as members of his invisible Church, never imply that those to whom they were made were to be preserved from error.

(3.) No argument for the infallibility of the Church—*i. e.*, the bishops—can be based on apostolic succession.

It is claimed that the bishops are successors of the apostles, and have the gifts of the apostles. But the New Testament gives every evidence that the apostolic office was special, and did not survive when the original twelve passed away. There is no evidence that they had any successors, and those who claim apostolic honors do not have the "signs" which accredited those whom Christ ordained. They cannot work miracles, nor are they inspired, nor have they seen the Lord. But the exclusive claims of the Roman Catholic and the Anglo-Catholic communions rest upon the absurd figment of apostolic succession.

If, however, the Church is infallible because the bishops are successors of the apostles, the infallibility of the bishops should be analogous to that of the apostles. The latter were infallible as teachers because they were inspired. Their infallibility was individual and not collective. Romanists do not claim that each bishop is infallible, but that a majority of fallible opinions in a general council amounts to an infallible decision.

(4.) The Church of Rome is in a dilemma.

For if the council was infallible which anathematized Pope Honorius, the pope cannot be above a general council, nor can he be infallible. On the other hand, if the pope is

infallible, the council did wrong in anathematizing Honorius, and must be fallible. And yet, again, if a general council may be fallible, of what value is the decision of the Vatican council which declared the pope to be infallible?

In the light of history, therefore, the claim of infallibility for either pope or council is ridiculous.

### III. THE BIBLE.

Protestants deny the authority of tradition, and take the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice. Is it an infallible rule? Let us mark the steps which lead to an affirmative answer to this question.

1. The historic credibility of the Bible is a settled question. The books of Moses were written by Moses. The Gospels are genuine biographies, and were written by the men whose names they bear. What is true of the Pentateuch and of the Gospels is true of all the other books of the Bible. The Scriptures have been subjected to the severest criticism, and their authenticity has been placed beyond question. The trustworthiness of the Scriptures as literary documents we therefore take as granted.

2. The Bible gives us a great deal of information respecting God and his relations to men, which we find nowhere else. The most cursory study of it will convince us of this. We find in it accounts of miracles which God did, and which show the close relation subsisting between God and his covenant people. Then, the Bible contains accounts of communications from God to men, and some of them are very extended. A large part of the Old Testament consists of prophetic utterances prefaced with the expression: "Thus saith the Lord." And, finally, the Bible contains doctrines which carry on their face the evidences of divine authorship, because they meet so exactly the wants of the human heart and are in such strong contrast with all hu-

man efforts to supply them. The doctrine of expiation by an incarnate God may be taken as an example.

A large part of the Bible being a written account of what God did and said, we may properly say that it contains the word of God.

3. The whole Bible is God's message. This is another step in advance. The Bible was not written simply because it occurred to several writers to put on record the facts in their possession or to reduce to writing their religious sentiments. God designed it to be an authorized message from him to men. Several considerations point to this conclusion. The official standing of some of the writers—Moses, for instance—would bespeak official value for what they wrote. And then, the Bible being the only means of making known the way of salvation, we may presume that it was designed to be an official communication. For, if it was not, there was no official communication, and we are left to believe that, although the scheme of redemption was of sufficient importance to engage the thought of God, it is due to accident that an account of it has been preserved. Besides, the Bible is an organism. The several books stand in designed relation to one body of truth, and the whole body is animated by the same spirit.

Parts of the Bible we know were written by express command of God—the Pentateuch, the prophecies of Jeremiah, the Apocalypse, for example. The books of Moses are frequently quoted as the law of the Lord. Christ referred to the Old Testament as authoritative. Peter says that the things which were written aforetime were written for our learning. The repeated occurrence of expressions like "It is written," "What saith the Scripture," "The Scripture saith," shows that writers of the New Testament regarded the Old Testament as a divine message.

4. The Bible is infallible. We should expect that God would protect his message against the errors which are in-



cident to mere human authorship. We should naturally suppose that no unauthorized books would be allowed a place in the sacred canon. The references to the Old Testament which we find in the New confirm this judgment. All the parts of the Old Testament are put on the same level. No difference of rank or value is recognized. They are all embraced in the same titles, and the titles indicate their sacred character: The Scriptures, The Holy Scriptures, The Hallowed Writings, The Oracles of God.

The greatest deference is paid the Old Testament by the writers of the New. Incidental circumstances in the life of our Lord are spoken of as fulfillments of prophecy. This cannot be accounted for on any other supposition than that the evangelists believed in the verbal infallibility of the Old Testament. Our Lord himself asserts the infallibility of the Old Testament: "The Scriptures must be fulfilled." "The Scriptures cannot be broken." "All things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses and in the Prophets and in the Psalms concerning me." Moreover, the verbal references to the Old Testament which we find in the writings of Paul prove that he and the Jewish people generally believed in the verbal infallibility of the Old Testament. Unless the infallibility of Scripture extended to its words, the apostle would not have been justified in making a single word the premise of a syllogism. He did so, however, in more instances than one, and we must conclude that Paul reasoned falsely or that the Old Testament is verbally infallible.

5. The Old Testament is declared to be of divine authorship.

Passages are cited from Scripture as the words of the Holy Ghost. Heb. iii. 7: "Wherefore, as the Holy Ghost saith, To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts." Acts iv. 24: "And when they heard that, they lifted up their voice to God with one accord, and said,

Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is; who, *by the mouth of thy servant David hast said*, Why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?" Acts i. 16: "And in those days Peter stood up . . . and said, . . . Men and brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, *which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake* before concerning Judas." 2 Peter i. 20: "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation, for the prophecy came not in old time of the will of man, but holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16: "And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God."

"The New Testament canonizes the Old, the INCARNATE WORD sets his seal on the WRITTEN WORD. The incarnate Word is God, therefore the inspiration of the Old Testament is authenticated by God himself."\* It will not require much evidence to convince one of the inspiration of the New Testament who believes in that of the Old. It may be inferred from the fact that it evidently forms part of God's revelation and is necessary to the full exhibition of the gospel scheme. Our Lord, however, promised the inspiration of the Spirit to guide the apostles: "The Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say." Luke xii. 12 "For it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost." Mark xiii. 11. And Paul says (1 Cor. ii. 13), "Which things also we speak not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." If the apostles were preserved against error in their oral utterances, how much more may we suppose them to have been inspired in writing what was to shape the Church's faith in all time! We know, however, that Peter

\* Wordsworth on the Canon, p. 51, Am. Ed.

placed the writings of Paul on a level with the inspired writings of the Old Testament: "Even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you, as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also *the other Scriptures*, unto their own destruction." 2 Peter iii. 15-17.

The Bible, therefore, not only contains the word of God, but it is the word of God.

It is infallible because it is inspired. The Holy Ghost influenced the sacred writers to such an extent that what they said, God said. His influence, however, did not destroy their individuality or abridge their liberty. It made them infallible as teachers, but not perfect as Christians. Inspiration is one thing, sanctification another.

The Bible is a human book; it is also a divine book. It had human authors; it has a divine Author. Moses wrote history; David wrote psalms; Paul wrote letters. Suppose there were no inspiration guiding these writers. Moses might still have remembered his interviews with God, and have written them out with tolerable accuracy. He might still have been a trustworthy historian of the Exodus, though we could not feel sure that he had incorporated no errors in his books. David, being a religious man, might have written pious psalms, as religious men have since done, but he might have put wrong sentiments in them too; for good as he was, he was far from perfect. Paul might have written his doctrinal Epistles, and there would have been good reason for believing that Paul knew what was true and what was false. But Paul may nevertheless have had some wrong views, and we could not tell but what these views were expressed in his letters. The Bible might still contain a great deal of valuable information regarding God and our relations to him, but it would not be infallible.

But God is also the author of Scripture. God writes history. The history must therefore be true in every detail. God writes psalms. The psalms must therefore express proper religious feelings. God writes letters. The letters can give no unwise counsel, contain no false reasoning, propagate no false doctrine.

The doctrine of the inspiration of the Scriptures is one of practical and fundamental importance.

---

## SIN.

THE whole Bible is summed up in two words: Sin and Salvation. It is with the first of these that we have now to deal. The subject is very important; for the conclusions we reach regarding sin will affect our opinions in respect to the atonement. It is also very wide. In the discussion of it four distinct inquiries arise, each of which has been the subject of many volumes and much debate. These inquiries concern: (1.) The nature of sin. (2.) Inability. (3.) Original sin. (4.) Adamic relation.

### I. NATURE OF SIN.

Is sin a misfortune, or is it a fault? Is it a disease which ensures suffering, or is it an offence which deserves punishment? Is salvation cure or pardon? Our Shorter Catechism says: "Sin is any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God." This statement accords with the voice of conscience and the word of God. Violation of law is implied in the idea of doing wrong. Sense of guilt is the feeling that punishment is deserved. A crime may prove a blunder, for it may cost a man his liberty; and being a blunder, he may regret that he committed it. But this is a

very different feeling from that which a man entertains when he realizes that he did wrong and deserves punishment. Punishment may have a very salutary effect upon the criminal, or it may deter others from committing a similar offence. But neither the reformatory nor the deterrent element of punishment exhausts the idea which the word suggests. We feel that justice requires that the offender shall suffer—that he deserves to suffer.

If we turn to the Bible, we shall find that sin is spoken of as related to law. Man's first sin was disobedience. The relation subsisting between God and man, even when man was innocent, was that of ruler and ruled—of sovereign and subject. Great injustice is done the book of Genesis when men regard God exclusively as our Father, and forget he is our King. The nature of sin is clearly seen in God's treatment of it. The pain which the child suffers when he burns his finger is not punishment, nor is its removal pardon. Sin is always spoken of, however, as being punished or pardoned. The suffering which follows it is a judicial infliction. Confession of sin presupposes this. We pray for forgiveness, not for cure. The heathen are proven to be under condemnation though they never had the law of Moses; they are a law unto themselves, and are judged on the ground that they violated the law written on the heart.

“For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves. Which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing one another.” Rom. ii. 14, 15.

“Sin is the transgression of the law.” 1 John iii. 4.

Sin exposes us to punishment. The punishment of sin is death—death temporal, death spiritual, death eternal. Salvation must mean, therefore, deliverance from condemnation. It may include more than this; it does, as we shall

see, but it must assure us of pardon, or it is not salvation. The word used to express the idea of exposure to punishment is *guilt*. A religion which does not tell us how we may be free from guilt does us no good. It may have many excellencies, it may inculcate pure morals, but it leaves us under condemnation.

## II. INABILITY.

All men sin. They have all gone out of the way. There is none righteous, no, not one. If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. We begin to sin when we begin to speak. As soon as children perform rational acts they show signs of sinful dispositions. They go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies.

Sin is a tyrant. Even Christians are not altogether free from its dominion. "I delight in the law of God after the inward man, but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members." Rom. vii. 22, 23.

How is the universality of sin to be explained? How is its power to be accounted for? There are three answers: The Pelagian, the Semi-Pelagian, and the Augustinian.

The Pelagian says that man is *well*, that he has full ability to do all that is required of him, and that sin is due to the effect that he exercises the power of a free agent and chooses to sin.

This is contradicted by conscience, and opposed to the Bible. We know that we ought to do what it is out of our power to do. Paul said he could not do the things he would. The drunkard knows he ought to be sober, but he is the slave of appetite. Besides, it does not explain the fact that all men do sin to say that they can sin. The Pelagian sees the tree of humanity bearing evil fruit, but fails to apply the principle furnished by our Lord.

The Semi-Pelagian says that man is *sick* and needs divine assistance, though he believes that he may repent of his sins and turn to God under the influence of persuasion, and without divine influence. And it must be confessed that he can repent and believe if he is disposed to do so. The difficulty is, however, that he has no disposition to repent and believe, and will have none until influenced by the Spirit of God. This is the opinion of the third class.

The Augustinian believes that man is *dead*, and spiritually can do nothing good. This is the doctrine of our Confession: "From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions." chap. vi., §4. Again, "Man, by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man, being altogether averse from that good and dead in sin, is not able by his own strength to convert himself or prepare himself thereunto." chap. ix., §3.

This doctrine we believe to be true—

(1.) Because it serves best to explain the universality of sin and its controlling power.

(2.) Because faith and repentance are spoken of in Scripture as the gifts of God:

"By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." Eph. ii. 8. "For unto you it is given in behalf of Christ not only to believe in him, but also to suffer for his sake." Phil. i. 29. "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." Acts xi. 18. "If God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." 2 Tim. ii. 25.

(3.) Because the doctrine is more or less directly affirmed in the Scriptures:

"No man can come to me except the Father who hath sent me draw him." John vi. 44. "And you hath he quickened

who were dead in trespasses and sins." Eph. ii. 1. "The carnal mind is enmity against God, and is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Rom. viii. 7. "The natural man discerneth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. ii. 14.

It is clear therefore that we need more than pardon. Salvation must deliver us from the guilt, and also from the power, of sin. It must change our legal condition, and also transform our character. The one is, as we shall see, the work of Christ, the other that of the Spirit.

### III. ORIGINAL SIN.

A man may say: "I admit that I am so constituted that I must certainly sin. But am I under condemnation on account of the corruption of my nature, from which actual transgression proceeds?" Our standards answer this question affirmatively. The Catechism calls the corruption of our nature "original sin," and the Confession (ch. vi.) says: "Every sin, both original and actual, being a transgression of the righteous law of God, and contrary thereunto, doth in its own nature bring guilt upon the sinner," etc.

This is true—1. Because it is difficult, if not impossible, to account for our being responsible for actual transgression, if we are not responsible for the corrupt nature from which all actual transgressions do proceed. The readiest way of explaining our responsibility for sins which our inability rendered certain is to suppose that we are accountable for our inability.

2. Because it is involved in our idea of character. The fact that a bad act is the indication of a wicked heart makes it all the more heinous in our sight. So far from a bad disposition being an apology for malicious conduct, the disposition itself is the object of our reprehension.

Moreover, we are conscious of and pray to be delivered



from evil thoughts and feelings which are not under our control, but which have moral quality, nevertheless.

3. Because sins of omission are heinous as well as sins of commission. We are responsible not only for doing what we ought not to have done, but for not doing what we ought to have done. We ought to be perfectly holy, and we are not, and cannot be. This cannot be explained without supposing that we are responsible for our corrupt nature.\*

4. Because physical death is part of the penalty of sin, and infants die who have not been guilty of actual transgression. "And so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Rom. v. 12.

5. Because the Scriptures plainly teach it: We are by nature the children of wrath even as others. "For I was born in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." Ps. li. 5. "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." Matt. vii. 16-19.†

#### IV. ADAMIC RELATION.

But how do we become responsible for the corruption of our nature? We find the solution in the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. There it is distinctly stated that the cause of our transgression was Adam's sin. By one man's disobedience many were made sinners. By the offence of one judgment came upon all men unto condemnation.

\* See Shedd on the sin of omission, in "Sermons to the Natural Man."

† These verses were his [Augustine's] weapon against the shallow Pelagian scheme, which would look at men's deeds apart from the living root in man out of which they grew, and suppose that man's unaided will is capable of good.—*Alford, in loc.*

Our Catechism says: "The covenant being made with Adam not only for himself, but for his posterity, all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation, sinned in him, and fell with him, in his first transgression." In the explanation of this relation there is considerable difference of opinion among divines in our Church; some hold that Adam, being a sinner, begat children in his own likeness—that is to say, with corrupt natures; that, having corrupt natures, they are under condemnation on that account. Others hold that there is a oneness of relation between Adam and his posterity, so that what he did they did, and what he suffered they shared. This oneness is by some held to be a realistic oneness—that is, a oneness in the sense that we were actually in Adam when he sinned, and actually committed the offence. By others it is held to be a federal oneness—that is to say, that Adam was the representative of the race, and what he did was accounted as being done by his posterity. Spiritual death or inability is alike in the case of Adam and his posterity the punishment of sin as well as sin itself.

The inquirer will naturally ask how it can be that the fortunes of the race have been staked upon the conduct of one. Our inability to answer this question does not affect the fact that this is nevertheless the teaching of Scripture. It is our duty to accept the truth on God's authority. This, however, may be said—that, considering the way in which the race is perpetuated, no fairer probation can be conceived than that which the human race had in Adam, who was created in full possession of his faculties and in the image of God. It is a blessed thought, moreover, that where sin abounded grace did much more abound.

## THE ATONEMENT.

SIN has been attended with two ruinous results. It has exposed the race to condemnation, and it has debased its nature. Salvation is therefore a twofold deliverance. This is beautifully expressed in Toplady's lines :

“Be of sin the double cure,  
Cleanse me from its guilt and power.”

Now, all who profess to be Christians regard Jesus as the Saviour. What do we mean, however, when we say that Jesus is the Saviour? What has he done to justify the use of this name? Different answers are given to these questions. They may all be grouped, however, under two heads, the Socinian and the sacrificial views. These two are the poles apart. They are so different as really to constitute two different religions. According to the one view, Christ is our Saviour because he influences us by his example, teaching, sympathy or otherwise, to lead a better life. Similarly, a drunkard might call a man his saviour by whose influence he was induced to become sober and abstinent.

The other view regards Christ as our Saviour because he died as a sacrifice for our sins. It considers the effect of Christ's work to be mainly that of expiating our guilt by his own death, and so delivering us from condemnation.

## I. THE SOCINIAN VIEW.

Under this head are classed all who hold that the saving work of Christ consists in the effect produced upon our personal conduct, and who ignore or deny the fact that his death is the ground of pardon. It includes, we regret to say, some who believe in the supreme divinity of Christ, though it is difficult to see how men can believe that Christ

is God, and at the same time take this low view of his work.

1. Humanitarians say that Christ was a mere man. He taught and practiced a pure morality. He met death in the attempt to overthrow a false system. He bore witness to the truth, and died a martyr. This is simple enough, certainly; and if true, the wonder is that Paul ever said, "Great is the mystery of godliness." There would be no mystery about it.

2. Others go so far as to say that Jesus, though a creature, was far above every other creature, that he existed before he became incarnate, that he came to bear God's message, to disclose the doctrine of immortality, to preach a pure faith and be an example of a spotless life. His death was didactic. It was to teach us the lesson of self-sacrifice, and was that of a hero.

3. Some believe in the supreme divinity of Christ, but still believe that his saving influence consisted in supplying us with new motives for living a better life. He not only became incarnate that he might be an embodiment of perfect manhood, but he entered into partnership with us in the trials of life in order that he might win us by his sympathy, and induce us to leave our sins and lead a holy life. His death was a dramatic exhibition of his sympathy.

4. And there is a class of mystical thinkers who maintain, with those already mentioned, the subjective view of Christ's saving work, though they hold that the improved conduct of the Christian is not the effect of example, and is not the result of moral suasion, but is the result of a partaking, in some mysterious way, of the life of Christ.

Differing though these classes do from one another, we can see at a glance that they all identify salvation with personal holiness, or, rather, with reformation. The objections, therefore, which follow are to be urged against them all.

1. The Socinian view assumes that God will pardon men on condition of repentance and reformation. This is altogether contrary to Scripture. It teaches that condemnation is universal. "Judgment hath come upon all men to condemnation," that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God. This condemnation is everlasting, for it stands in contrast with the everlasting life which Christ gives; and those who reject that shall never see life, but the wrath of God abideth on them. From this condemnation it is impossible for men to be delivered by works of the law. "Therefore, by works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight."

2. This view identifies salvation with good conduct, but makes no provision for our deliverance from the bondage of sin.

Let it be granted that if we are holy God will forgive us. How are we to be holy? Men do not love holiness; they are, by virtue of their depravity, "made opposite to all good." Good example and a high standard will not influence men who are dead in sin. Nor will they be moved by Christ's sympathy. The view under notice fails to do justice either to the guilt or to the power of sin.

3. It does not explain the fact that salvation is so constantly referred to Christ's death. If the good we derive from Christ is his example, or his doctrine, or his sympathy, it is singular that the sacred writers refer so constantly to his death. We should expect them to say as little about the cross as those do who preach the views to which we are now alluding. On the contrary, Jesus Christ and him crucified was the theme of apostolic preaching.

4. But these opinions in regard to the work of Christ are false because they are in conflict with the passages which have a sacrificial import. These may be more properly alluded to, however, under the next view, to which we now pass.

## II. THE SACRIFICIAL VIEW.

The view which we are now to consider embraces all those who hold that the death of Christ was a sacrifice, on account of which God pardons sin and receives us into his favor. There is room, of course, for a difference of opinion in regard to the exact relation in which the sacrifice of Christ stands to our salvation. But with this we are not at present concerned.

It should be remembered, however, that those who believe in the sacrificial character of Christ's death do not hold in less esteem than the advocates of the Socinian view his example, teaching and sympathy. On the contrary, it is through the benefits which flow from Christ's sacrifice that we are able to appreciate Christ's example, to improve under his teaching, or to be affected by his exhibition of sympathy.

The view to which reference has just been made is seriously false. Great care should be taken not to be imposed upon by theories which, though they retain orthodox phraseology, are in radical opposition to the gospel. A theory which denies that Christ is the propitiation for our sin, and that we have redemption through his blood, is not the gospel of Christ. The sacrificial character of Christ's death will appear:

1. From the fact that our salvation is so constantly referred to his death. It is his death which he would have us remember in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The bread represents his body, "broken for us;" the wine his blood, which was "shed for many for the remission of sins." We are "reconciled to God by the death of his Son." "We have redemption through his blood." "Christ died for the ungodly." These passages are unmeaning if Christ saves by moral suasion or force of good example. They are perfectly plain, however, if his death was an expiatory offering,

The Jews were accustomed to a sacrificial system ; and when Jesus was spoken of as the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world, they saw the reference at once to the sacrifice of the lamb without blemish which the law of Moses ordained.

2. Passages abound in Scripture which teach that Christ redeemed us. "We are redeemed by the precious blood of Christ as of a lamb without blemish." "Christ hath redeemed us to God by his blood." "We are bought with a price." Christ said that he came to give "his life a ransom for many."

3. Christ is a priest, and a priest, moreover, "who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice first for his own sins, and then for the people's, for this he did once when he offered up himself." "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot unto God, purge your consciences from dead works to serve the living God?" Heb. ix. 13, 14.

4. Christ is called a Sacrifice. He is said to have given himself "an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savor." "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." "He is the propitiation for our sins." "He was made sin for us who knew no sin." "He bore our sins in his own body on the tree." "The Lord hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all."

5. If Christ was a sacrifice, the teachings of the Bible are consistent. If he was not, they cannot be explained. And this constitutes a very strong argument.

Those who say that Christ's death was not sacrificial are compelled—(a.) To do violence to language by saying that the Old Testament sacrifices were not expiatory ; or (b.) to affirm that there is no analogy between the death of Christ

and the sacrifices of the old economy, and that the representations of the New Testament are figurative.

As to the first position, we can only say that if the book of Leviticus, and the sixteenth chapter particularly, does not teach that the offerings were penal, vicarious and expiatory, language cannot be found which will convey the idea. And as to the second, we remark that if the language of the New Testament is figurative, the writers of it were more given to poetical expressions than any writers who have ever lived. If the sober utterances of inspired men can be explained away on the ground that they are metaphorical, Talleyrand was truly right in saying that language was meant to conceal thought. Those, however, who assume that the apostles found it necessary to employ falsifying metaphors in order to commend the gospel to the Jews must assume that God's education of that nation was a failure. It would be strange if the effect of their being made the custodians of the oracles of God should be to unfit them for receiving the gospel except through the channel of falsehood.

The view which regards the death of Christ as a sacrifice is much simpler and more natural. It explains how his death is spoken of as the ground of salvation. It shows that the Jewish ritual was a type of Christ, and so preserves the unity of the two Testaments. It leads us, too, to see how God prepared for the advent of Christ by familiarizing the Jews with the language of the altar, so that it was no strange thing for them to learn that we have received "redemption through his blood."

The Bible represents Christ as executing the offices of prophet, priest and king. Our Shorter Catechism, in the answer to Question 25, says; "Christ executeth the office of a priest in his once offering up of himself a sacrifice to satisfy divine justice, and reconcile us to God, and in making continual intercession for us."

The relation of the sacrifice of Christ to the pardon of



our sins and our acceptance with God would be more properly considered under the head of Justification. Meanwhile, notice that three things are to be said of the death of Christ :

1. It was penal.

It was not the result of unavoidable circumstances, for Jesus said, I lay down my life ; no man taketh it from me. Nor was it didactic, merely, intended as a manifestation of sympathy or an illustration of heroism. It was judicial. He was delivered for our offences. He was made a curse for us.

2. It was vicarious.

He knew no sin ; and if he stood in legal relations and endured penalty, it must have been for others. He bore our sins in his own body on the tree. He died, the just for the unjust. He gave his life a ransom for many (in place of many).

3. It was expiatory.

The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin.

---

### THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

WHO is Jesus? We know what he did. He gave his life as our ransom. He died to expiate our guilt. He is our Saviour. Our Lord once asked his disciples, What think ye of Christ? and the same question has fallen upon the ear of humanity ever since. Three leading replies have been given. Humanitarians say that Christ is a man, and nothing more. Arians say that Christ, though a creature, was more than man. The Nicene or orthodox view, is that Christ is both God and man. Let us notice these replies in their order.

## I. THE HUMANITARIANS.

Two classes are embraced under this head: (*a*) those who deny that there is anything supernatural in Christ's life, and who say that he was born, lived and died as other men; (*b*) those who believe that Christ was only a man, but who believed also in his supernatural birth, his divine commission and his resurrection from the dead.

Humanitarians affirm a very important truth when they say that Christ was a man. It may be well, therefore, to emphasize this fact, which we hold in common with them, before we consider the point of difference which separates us from them.

Jesus Christ was a man. He is spoken of eighty-two times in the New Testament as the Son of man. He is called the man Christ Jesus. He had a "true body." It was not a phantasm or shadow, as the Docetæ thought. Our Lord was born of a woman. His body grew and increased in strength. During the temptation he hungered. On the cross he cried, "I thirst." He was wearied. He slept once at night in a boat, and rested once at noon by a well. He had a true body after his resurrection. The doubting disciple had proof of this. He went up to heaven with a real, though a glorified, body.

He also had "a reasonable soul." This has been denied. The Apollinarians believed in what is called the tripartite nature of man, and held that, while Christ had a human body and the animal soul, the spirit was wanting, and that its place was supplied by the Logos. In a modified form this view is maintained by some at the present day. It is false, however; our Lord's life was as completely human as it was completely divine. He suffered; he rejoiced in spirit; he loved; he wept; he formed friendships; he used the language of indignation; he was tempted; he was made under the law; his soul was exceeding sorrow-

ful even unto death. If Christ had no human soul, these references would have no meaning. A human body is not a man. An angel in human form is not a man. God in the garment of flesh and blood could not be called a man. If Christ had no soul, he was not human, and was not our brother.

The full humanity of Jesus is a truth of vital importance. All that is precious in Christian experience is involved in it. Christ must be a man—

1. That he might be our example. He has left us an example that we should follow in his steps.

2. That he might sympathize with us. Having suffered, being tempted, he is able also to succor them who are tempted.

3. That he might take our place in law. He was made under the law that he might redeem them who are under the law.

4. That he might be our High Priest. "For every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sin."

5. That he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God. "Being tempted in all points, like as we are, yet without sin."

And yet the humanity of Christ is of little worth if Christ is only a man. Humanitarians lavish eulogies on Jesus, but they are only laying garlands on the grave of the dead. We worship a living Christ. It is because he is more than man—that Christianity is not a system of philosophy on the one hand, or a system of hero-worship on the other.

We may appeal to Christ's character to prove that he was not an ordinary man—that he was, to say the least, divinely inspired. Some find in it proof of his divinity, but this is to make it responsible for conclusions which are not legitimately deducible from it. We are not shut up to the

belief in Christ's divinity because his character is, as Dr. Schaff says, "the greatest moral miracle in history."\*

The character of Christ is peerless. The words of Pilate are the verdict of the ages: I find no fault in him. But perfect manhood is no evidence of Deity. When we are asked to account for this solitary instance of perfection, we are driven to the conclusion that Christ stood in intimate relation with God. As Nicodemus would have said: no man could have lived as he lived except God were with him. And yet Christ may have had a supernatural birth, have lived a perfect life and have risen from the dead, and still have been a man—a mere man, though by no means an ordinary man. But Christ was more than man, as we shall see.

## II. THE ARIANS.

It is difficult to understand how any one can believe the teachings of the New Testament and suppose that Christ was a mere man. Arians, though they believe that Christ is a creature, reject the Humanitarian view. Their belief may be stated in the words of Dr. Samuel Clarke, an Arian of the last century: "With this first or supreme cause or Father of all things, there has existed from the beginning a second divine person who is the Word or Son." "The Father alone," he says elsewhere, "is, absolutely speaking, the God of the universe." Arians appeal to the numerous passages of Scripture which teach the pre-existence of Jesus,† such as John iii. 16: "But he that came down from heaven." ix. 64: "What if ye shall see the Son of man ascending up where he was before." xvii. 4: "And now, O Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world

\* See Schaff's "Person of Christ," and Dr. Bushnell's chapter on the character of Christ in his "Nature and the Supernatural."

† Clarke on the Trinity.

See the admirable chapter on the pre-existence of Christ in Hill's "Lectures on Divinity."

was." The Arian finds that the Scriptures place Christ on a plane far above that of mere humanity, for they teach that Christ existed long before he came in the flesh, and that in his pre-existent state he exercised authority, wielded power, received homage, which proves him to be invested with a dignity which is shared by no other creature—which takes him out of the sphere of created beings altogether, we should say. But we shall come to that presently.

Arianism fails to explain the teachings of Scripture respecting Christ. It refutes Humanitarianism by showing that Christ is more than man. It is in turn refuted by Humanitarianism, which proves that Christ was at least a man. Arianism is false because it destroys Christ's humanity,\* and because it denies his deity. His humanity has been proved. His deity must now be considered.

### III. THE NICENE DOCTRINE.

The Council of Nice in 325 A. D. condemned Arianism, and affirmed that "the Son is begotten out of the essence of the Father, God of God, Light of light, very God of very God, begotten not created, consubstantial with the Father." The Nicene creed expresses the faith of the Christian Church. But before the evidence for the deity of Christ is presented, notice that the Arian has already overcome the greatest difficulty connected with the person of Christ in admitting the supernatural element which enters into it. The Arian is the ally of the orthodox in proving, in opposition to the

\*The incarnation, according to Arius, was merely the assumption by the Son of a human body, his nature supplying the place of a soul. Robertson's "Church History," vol. i., p. 208.

"You run counter to all the ancients in supposing the Logos to have supplied the place of a human soul, and making the Logos as *such possible*." Waterland's "Vindication" (reply to Dr. Clarke).

"We believe that Jesus is one mind, soul—one being, as truly as we are one, and equally distinct from the one God." Channing's "Unitarian Christianity."

Humanitarian, that Christ existed ages before he was born, and was in the bosom of the Father before the world was made. The question now is to determine whether Jesus is the highest of all creatures or whether he is God. There are some passages of Scripture which, though they naturally suggest the deity of Christ, may, we admit, be construed in an Arian sense; and since we can quote only a few, we shall not mention these at all. The following passages teach the deity of Christ unequivocally :

1. Christ claimed to be equal with God. He said, "I and my Father are one." "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." "That ye may know the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, I say unto thee, Arise." "Have I been so long a time with thee, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father, and how sayest thou then, Show us the Father?"

On the supposition that Christ is less than God, these utterances cannot be explained. The Jews understood him to lay claim to divine honors, and stoned him on that account: "We stone thee for blasphemy because thou, being a man, makest thyself God." Christ did not tell them that they had misunderstood him. He accepted their interpretation of his claims. The claims of Christ are backed by his character and his miracles. It is impossible to believe that so pure a man as Jesus was would pretend to be what he was not, or that God would enable him to work miracles in support of a falsehood.

2. Christ is the angel of the covenant.\* When God revealed himself to the patriarchs, it was usually in the form of an angel. An angel appeared to Jacob at Bethel, to Moses on Sinai. The angel of the Lord went before the camp of Israel in their journeying through the wilderness. We have abundant proof that this angel was not a created

\* See Hill's "Lectures in Divinity" on actions ascribed to Jesus in his pre-existent state.

being; he is invariably spoken of as God. "The angel of the Lord spake with me," says Jacob, "saying, I am the God of Bethel." The angel of the Lord appeared to Moses in a flame of fire out of the midst of the bush. "And when the Lord saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him out of the midst of the bush." There can be no doubt that the same person is called angel and Jehovah. "The angel" or "the angel of the covenant" was understood by the Jews to mean the person who had appeared to the patriarchs, and who led Israel through the desert. This person was divine, for he is called Jehovah. If it can be shown that this person was Christ, it will prove that Christ is God. We read in Malachi iii. 1: "Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in." This prophecy is referred in the gospel to John the Baptist. John the Baptist is therefore the messenger of whom it is said, "He shall prepare the way before me." But John the Baptist prepared the way for Christ. Christ is therefore the one referred to in Malachi, in the next clause of the verse, as the Lord (Jehovah), the messenger (angel) of the covenant.

3. Christ is called God in the New Testament: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt amongst us." John i.

"And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God." John xx. 28.

"Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Acts xx. 28.

"Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever." Rom. ix. 5.

“Great is the mystery of godliness, God manifest in the flesh.” 1 Tim. iii. 16.

“This (person, Jesus Christ) is the true God and eternal life.” 1 John v. 20.

“Looking for that blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.” Titus ii. 3.\*

These passages directly assert the deity of Christ. It must be remembered, too, that he is referred to in the Psalms and the prophets in terms which would be inapplicable to any creature. He is called the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace. In the New Testament, he is constantly called the Lord, our Lord, the Lord of glory. He is before all things. He is the first-born of every creature. The world was made by him. He is the image of the invisible God. He is to be honored even as we honor the Father. He is the judge of men. He is the object of worship. He is omnipresent and omniscient. He does divine acts, is the subject of divine attributes, shares divine honors, and is called God. If we are willing to accept the Scriptures as our infallible rule of faith, the deity of Christ must be considered as proved.

It is urged by objectors that it is impossible to comprehend how the Son can be God and the Father God, and yet that there is only one God. It is a mystery, of course. But the doctrine is not false because it is incomprehensible. It is not strange that the relations which the persons of the Godhead sustain to one another baffle our comprehension.

It is also said that Christ speaks of himself as subordinate to the Father. He says, “My Father is greater than I.”

\* Ellicott, Com. in loc., says, “It is difficult to resist the conviction that our blessed Lord is here said to be our *μέγας Θεός*, and that this text is a direct, definite, and even *studied*, declaration of the divinity of the eternal Son.”



He intimates that some things are known to the Father which are not known to the Son: "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father." Mark xiii. 32.

But we must remember that Christ had a finite human nature as well as an infinite divine nature. Christ, though co-equal with the Father, was officially subordinate to him in his mediatorial work. These considerations fully explain the passages referred to without derogating from Christ's divinity.

The deity of Christ is a practical doctrine. Between those who believe and those who deny it the distance is measureless. If Christ is a creature, we are idolaters who worship him. If Christ is God, his death cannot be explained except upon the principle that without the shedding of blood there is no remission. Those who deny the deity of Christ, as a rule, deny the sacrificial character of his death. Those who believe that his death was the propitiation for our sins are naturally led to believe that he is God. It is well to notice how the doctrines confirm one another. Sin calls for sacrifice, as we have already seen; but the sacrifice of an angel could not save us. It must be a human sacrifice. Christ is the sacrifice, and he has a human nature. But the death of a mere man could not atone for our sins. It must be the death of a divine person to give it value. Christ had a divine nature.

The Scripture doctrine of the person of Christ is summed up in these propositions:

1. He had a complete human nature—*i. e.*, a true body and a reasonable soul.
2. He had a true divine nature. He was God.
3. These natures exist entire and distinct, without mixture or confusion.
4. He is one person.

Though having two natures, he has only a single person-

ality. He is the divine person who existed from all eternity.

Our Shorter Catechism expresses this by saying that "The only redeemer of God's elect is the Lord Jesus Christ, who, being the eternal Son of God, became man, and so was, and continues to be, God and man, in two distinct natures and one person for ever."

---

### THE TRINITY.

RELIGION presupposes God. Belief in God is universal, and is vindicated by valid arguments. There is need of an authoritative standard to give us information regarding God's nature, and to arbitrate between conflicting opinions. That standard is the Bible. These propositions have all been considered.

The Bible teaches—

1. That God is.

It does not offer proof of his existence. It takes it for granted. It relates what God said and did, and what he would have us believe and do.

2. That there is only one God.

"Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord." Deut. vi. 4. "But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things." 1 Cor. viii. 5. There is evidence in history, and apart from Scripture, that polytheism is the corrupted form of an original monotheistic faith. For a preservation of monotheism, however, we are indebted to revelation. Jews, Mohammedans and Christians believe in one God because they have been taught by the Bible.

3. That he is extra-mundane.

Pantheists profess to believe in God, but they identify God with the universe. God is everything, and everything

is God. The Scriptures teach that God is distinct from the world for he made it: "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God." Ps. xc. 2.

4. That he is a spirit, infinite in every perfection.

"God is a spirit, and they who worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." John iv. 24. Our Shorter Catechism gives this answer to the question, What is God? God is a spirit, infinite, eternal, unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth.\*

5. That he is a person.

This is involved in the attributes first ascribed to him. He is not a force, a tendency, a law. He is a person whom we can address, whom we can love, who can reward or punish us. To deny the personality of God is, to all intents and purposes, to avow Atheism.†

But this is not all. We have reached conclusions regarding Christ which make it necessary to believe more than we have yet stated regarding God.

Jesus Christ is God. Jesus Christ is likewise the Son of God. So that we have God the Father and God the Son. We have God the Holy Ghost also, as we shall see. For it can be shown—(a) That the Holy Ghost is a person. Some orthodox people, because they are very thoughtless or very ignorant, speak of the Holy Ghost as *it*. The Holy Ghost is not simply the power of God, a divine influence or energy. He is a person, as we are clearly taught in passages like the following: "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God."

\* For remarks on the attributes of God, see the commentary on the Confession of Faith, by Dr. A. A. Hodge.

† Matthew Arnold defines God to be a stream of tendency according to which all things fulfill the law of their being. The great mistake of Christianity, according to him, consists in regarding God as a person.—*Literature and Dogma*.

Eph. iv. 30. "The Spirit maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." Rom. viii. 26. "The Spirit said unto Peter, Behold, three men seek thee." Acts x. 19. The Holy Ghost said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." Acts xiii. 2.

"The Comforter, who is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name; he shall teach you all things." John xiv. 26.\*

(b.) That the Holy Ghost is God.

There are few who believe that the Holy Ghost is a creature. Those who deny the Trinity maintain that by the Spirit is simply meant the operation of God or the influence which God exerts. The deity of the Spirit seems to follow when his personality is established. It is very clear that he is not a creature. The unpardonable sin is blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. Ananias was told that he had lied to the Holy Ghost. And when Peter repeated the statement, he said that he had lied unto God. To lie unto the Holy Ghost, therefore, is to lie unto God.

Again, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, Christians are spoken of as temples of God, and this is explained by the statement that the Spirit of God dwelleth in them. We are taught to honor the Spirit as we honor the Father and the Son, for we are baptized in his name, and the apostolic benediction invokes the communion of the Holy Ghost as well as the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The Scriptures teach, therefore, 1. That there is only one God. 2. That the Father is God; that the Son is God; that the Holy Ghost is God.

Those who accept these facts differ in their explanation of them, and their difference is brought out in the two leading opinions on the Trinity: the Sabellian and the Athanasian.

\* See Pearson on the Creed, art. viii.

## I. THE SABELLIAN DOCTRINE.

The Scripture requires us to believe in the deity of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and at the same time preserve the doctrine of the divine unity. This is a difficulty. The first, and perhaps the most natural, solution of it would be what is known in Church history as Sabellianism, or the doctrine of a modal Trinity. Those who hold this opinion suppose that the same Being manifests himself, at one time and in one relation, as Father; at another time and in another relation, as Son; and at another time and in another relation, as Holy Ghost. As Creator, God is Father; as Redeemer, he is the Son; as Sanctifier, he is the Holy Ghost, just as the same man may be known by different names at different times and under different circumstances. As a church officer, he may be called deacon; as a professional man, he may be called judge; while a third party, associating his name with army reminiscences, may call him general.

The doctrine of a modal Trinity, however, does not teach the whole truth. It teaches truly that the Father is God, that the Son is God, that the Holy Ghost is God, and yet that there are not three Gods, but one God. But it denies that the Father is a person distinct from the Son, the Son a person distinct from the Holy Ghost, and that the Holy Ghost is a person distinct from the Father and the Son. "The scriptural facts are—(a) the Father says I, the Son says I, the Spirit says I. (b) The Father says thou to the Son, and the Son says thou to the Father, and in like manner the Father and Son use the pronouns he and him in reference to the Spirit. (c) The Father loves the Son, the Son loves the Father, the Spirit testifies of the Son."\*

In other words, the Scriptures teach the doctrine of a tri-personal God.

\* Dr. Hodge, "Systematic Theology," vol. i., p. 444.

## II. THE ATHANASIAN DOCTRINE.

The full scriptural doctrine of the Trinity is set forth in the so-called Athanasian creed. We quote a few sentences.

“But this is the catholic faith, that we worship one God in trinity, and trinity in unity. Neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance. For the person of the Father is one, of the Son another, of the Holy Spirit another. But the divinity of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost is one, the glory equal, the majesty equal. Such as is the Father, such also is the Son, and such the Holy Spirit. The Father is uncreated, the Son is uncreated, the Holy Spirit is uncreated. The Father is infinite, the Son is infinite, the Holy Ghost is infinite. The Father is eternal, the Son is eternal, the Holy Ghost is eternal. And yet there are not three eternal beings, but one eternal Being. As also there are not three uncreated beings nor three infinite beings, but one uncreated and one infinite Being.”

It is to be noticed that the Athanasian creed does not add anything to what the Scriptures themselves teach regarding God. The Bible teaches—(1) That there is only one God. (2) That the Father is God, the Son God, the Holy Ghost God. (3) That Father, Son and Holy Ghost are three distinct persons. These three facts constitute the Church doctrine of the Trinity. The doctrine being proved, it is natural that we should find references to it in the Old Testament, where the word Elohim (God) appears in the plural form; where God says let *us* make man; in the trinal form of adoration: Holy, Holy, Holy; and in the threefold form of blessing. There are repeated references to it in the New Testament, but the most remarkable are found in the baptismal formula and in the apostolic benediction.

The three persons of the Trinity, though the same in substance, equal in power and glory, nevertheless sustain

such a relation to each other that the Father is first, the Son second, the Holy Ghost third. The second person is so related to the first as to be called the Son, but what the relation implies we do not know. The Son has been Son from all eternity, and did not assume the title at his incarnation. The Holy Ghost "proceedeth" from the Father and the Son, but what this expression implies we cannot say.

If the separate elements which enter into the doctrine of the Trinity are proved to be taught in Scripture, the only reasonable mode of objecting to the doctrine is that of denying the authority of Scripture; and many do stand in this defiant attitude. But there are many who are not willing to concede that the separate elements of the doctrine are taught in Scripture. In other words, they deny that the deity of Christ is taught in the Bible. Of course, as long as they do this, it is unnecessary for them to urge, or even for us to consider, further objections against the doctrine of the Trinity. Unitarians, however, are fond of making the doctrine of the Trinity appear ridiculous. And some who do not disbelieve the deity of Christ are perplexed by the difficulties which they meet in Trinitarian theology, and make a truce with doubt by assuming that, after all, the doctrine is not of much practical importance. To illustrate :

1. It is said that the doctrine of the Trinity involves a contradiction. But this is a mistake. The Church does not teach that three persons are one person, but that one Being exists in three persons. It is assumed always by those who ridicule Trinitarian faith that we suppose that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are three persons, in the same sense that Peter, James and John are three individuals. But we do not. What do we believe? We believe—(1) that there is one God; (2) that God is tri-personal—that is to say, that Father, Son and Holy Ghost are so distinct

that the Father can address the Son, the Son address the Father and speak of sending the Spirit. The Scripture teaches these facts regarding the relation of Father, Son and Spirit, and the word person expresses them better than any other.

Again, it is asked how the Son can be as old as the Father. The object of the question is to involve the doctrine of the Trinity in a contradiction, for of course, if Christ is God, he is co-eternal with the Father. But we cannot fathom the meaning of the words "Father" and "Son" when used to express the relations of the first and second Persons of the Trinity. We know that there is a relation between them which these names are used to express. Beyond that we are in the dark.

2. It is said that the doctrine is inconceivable. But this is not true. Every statement of the Athanasian creed is a plain proposition. It is incomprehensible, without doubt. But that is not strange. The incomprehensibility of the doctrine should not make us doubt its truth or question its importance.

3. It is said that the subject is of no great practical value. This, too, is a grave mistake. This is a fundamental doctrine. Sin is the violation of God's law, hence our need of pardon. Pardon must be preceded by propitiation. The propitiation is made by Christ, and to give it value Christ must be divine. The divinity of Christ proves the doctrine of the Trinity. Those who deny the Trinity deny, as a rule, the deity of Christ, deny that Christ made an atonement, and deny that sin is such a violation of God's law that it incurs God's wrath and curse to all eternity.

The doctrines of Scripture are so related that if we deny the Trinity we part company with the gospel.



## JUSTIFICATION.

A MAN dies and goes to heaven, let us suppose. Now, why? That is a practical question, certainly. And yet the answer to it fills a long chapter in theological discussion. It is a mistake, therefore, to suppose that religion can be divorced from theology.

Between man the sinner and Christ the Saviour, there must be some relation which constitutes the foundation of Christian hope, and which furnishes material for an answer to the question which we have just asked. All professing Christians would agree, perhaps, in saying that Christ saves us by securing our *justification*, or that we enter heaven because we are *justified*. But there are differences of opinion respecting the *nature, ground, means and effect*\* of justification, and these differences represent different answers to the question just propounded, if, in fact, they do not constitute different religions.

## I. THE NATURE OF JUSTIFICATION.

There are two, and only two, leading views on this subject; for justification must refer either to a change of character or to a change of legal condition. It must be *moral* or *forensic*. The difference between these views is apparent. A criminal under sentence of death is pardoned. The pardon does not alter the man's nature or reform his character; the change of which he is the subject is simply legal. If his pardon were called his justification, the word justification would be used in a forensic sense. Again, a man is imprisoned for crime, and under reformatory influ-

\* These four points "may be justly said to include whatever is essential and fundamental in the doctrine of justification."—*Buchanan on Justification*, p. 113.

ences his conduct improves. If we should speak of the change wrought on the man's character as his justification, we should be using the word in a moral sense; therefore, when a man says that he believes in "justification by faith," it is very important to know whether he uses the word justification in a moral or in a forensic sense. Let us consider these senses separately.

1. MORAL.—The controversy between the Protestants and the Roman Catholics at the Reformation turned largely on the nature of justification, the latter using the word in a moral sense, though not to the exclusion of the forensic—the former using it in the forensic sense alone. Justification is defined by the Council of Trent\* to be "not only the remission of sins, but the renewal and sanctification of the inner man." According to the Church of Rome, therefore, justification consists in a change of moral character produced by the removal of original sin and the infusion of righteousness. But besides this moral use of the word, in behalf of which they contended with the Protestants, they recognized its forensic or judicial meaning; and unless this is kept in mind, we shall fall into confusion when we study their position respecting the ground of justification, for they very strenuously teach, in opposition to Protestants, that we are justified by an inherent righteousness. But inherent righteousness *is* justification, as we have already seen; and how can inherent righteousness be the essence of justification and the ground of justification at the same time? The only solution is, that the Roman Catholics use the word both in its moral and in its judicial

\* Conc. Trid., Sess. VI., cap. 7: "Justificatio non est sola peccatorum, remissio sedet sanctificatio et renovatio interioris dominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiarum et donorum unde homo ex injusto fit justus, et ex inimico fit amicus ut sit hæres secundum spem vitæ æternæ, etc."—Quoted in *Winer's Confessions of Christianity*.

sense—the moral when they speak of the nature of justification, and the judicial when they speak of its ground.

Those who hold the moral-influence theory of the atonement use the word justification in its moral sense. They take the element of guilt out of sin, the element of law out of the atonement, and the element of pardon out of salvation. Sin, they say, brings suffering. To get rid of suffering we must cease to sin. Christ is our Saviour because he delivers us from our sins. Men need cure and not pardon. Justification is a moral change and not a legal one. We go to heaven because we are holy.\*

This view of justification is similar to that taught by the Roman Catholic Church, but it is more unscriptural and unevangelical. For, false as the Romish doctrine of justification is, it proceeds upon a recognition of the doctrine of original sin, the need of supernatural grace and the expiatory character of the atonement. The moral-influence theory ignores or denies these cardinal doctrines, while, in common with the Roman Catholics, it teaches that we go to heaven on the ground of what we are. And yet this doctrine has its defenders in so-called evangelical pulpits! We should be on our guard against it; it is another gospel.

\* So the sinner is justified, and the justification is a most vital affair—"the justification of life." The true account of it is that Jesus, coming into the world with all God's righteousness upon him, declaring it to guilty souls in all the manifold evidences of his life and passion, wins their faith; and by that faith they are connected again with the life of God, and filled and overspread with his righteousness."—*Bushnell's Vicarious Sacrifice*, p. 435.

"This first step, or look, Godward, this incipient but genuine movement of the child-spirit, is justification, rectification, the righting, rightening, setting right of the soul which was before wholly wrong."—*John Young's Christ the Light and Life of Men*, p. 171.

"Therefore, the pardon of sin, in any other sense than the revealing and the opening to us of the path of life, is now to us as undesirable as, in relation to the moral government of the Father of spirits, it is inconceivable."—*McLeod Campbell on the Atonement*, p. 183.

2. FORENSIC.—The Protestant churches hold the forensic view of justification. Calvinists and Arminians agree in affirming that justification expresses a change of legal condition, and not a change of moral character. But they differ in this way: Arminians, the later ones especially, say that justification means pardon; Calvinists say that it means pardon and acceptance. To illustrate: the executive pardons a criminal, but he does not treat him as if he had never done wrong. God, however, not only pardons his children, but he treats them as if they had never sinned. He counts them as if they were righteous. Our catechism says: "Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight." It is easy to show that this is the scriptural view of justification—that is to say, that justification is a judicial act, and that it is more than pardon.

1. A JUDICIAL ACT.—The adjective *dikaios* in Greek is the epithet used to express the idea of being right in relation to the law. The verb *dikaioo*, translated "justify," expresses the idea of placing one in the position implied in the adjective *dikaios*. Whether in a particular case it is used in the moral sense of "making righteous" or in the forensic sense "of pronouncing righteous," must be determined by the context and the *usus loquendi* of the writer. It is clear that it is used in the latter sense in the New Testament.

(a) For if it were used in the moral sense, it would be possible to substitute the word "sanctify" for "justify" without destroying the sense. This cannot be done, however, as any one who will make the experiment will find.

(b) The judicial meaning of justification is apparent from Paul's argument in the Epistle to the Romans. His theme is our relation to the law of God. All have sinned, all are under condemnation. By the deeds of the law there is no justification. Justification is an act of God—an act

done without regard to our works—an act of grace on the ground of the propitiation of Christ—an act of deliverance from condemnation. See Rom. iii. 19–26.

(c) Justification does not mean a making holy, for the Scriptures distinguish between justification and sanctification. 1 Cor. vi. 11.

(d) Paul speaks of David's describing the blessedness of the man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works. Rom. iv. 6. The context shows that "imputing righteousness without works" is the equivalent of justification. Imputing righteousness without works does not mean transformation of character. Neither, therefore, does justification: both are forensic forms of expression.

(e) The word "justify" is used as the opposite of "condemn." Rom. viii. 33, 34: "It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth?" To condemn is not to make sinful; to justify is not to make holy.

2. MORE THAN PARDON.—Arminians, as we have said, regard justification as synonymous with pardon.\* But in this they err.

(a) Because the word *dikaioo* does not mean "to pardon," and cannot be so translated.

(b) It is fair to suppose that if Paul had meant "pardon" where he says "justified," he would have said that we are *pardoned* by faith, *pardoned* without works, and that being *pardoned* we have peace with God; but he did not.

(c) The word *dikaioo* means to pronounce righteous.† Pardon is therefore included in the justification of a sinner, since he cannot be pronounced righteous in the sight of the

\* Justification is a "remission of sins," "a sentence of pardon."—*Watson's Institutes*, Part II., chap. 23.

The plain scriptural notion of justification is pardon, the forgiveness of sins.—*Wesley's Works*, vol. i., p. 47.

† Vide Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek*.

law so long as he is under condemnation. He may be pardoned, however, without being pronounced righteous.

(d) The effects of justification are such as would not follow pardon. It is one thing to remit a penalty, and another thing to receive into favor and to give entrance into eternal life. Suppose that God should pardon a man, and leave the acceptance of him and his title to heaven to depend on his subsequent behavior. Would pardon bring peace? Could he feel that he was reconciled to God? Could he have any assurance of salvation? No. And if justification is the equivalent of pardon, how does it happen that the justified person has "peace with God," is "reconciled to God," "hath eternal life," "is persuaded that nothing shall separate him from the love of God," "is accepted in the beloved"? The effects ascribed to justification can be explained only on the supposition that justification effects a permanent, unalterable change in our legal condition, and that it includes not only the pardon of our sins, but the acceptance of us as righteous in the sight of God.

## II. THE GROUND OF JUSTIFICATION.

What is that to which God has regard when he justifies us? Is it something within us or something without us? Is the ground of our justification *subjective* or *objective*? The opinions which are entertained on this subject may be grouped under these heads.

1. SUBJECTIVE.—If God pronounces men righteous, it must be on the ground of an inherent or a vicarious righteousness. In the controversy between the Romanists and the Reformers this fact was recognized, the Romanists affirming that we are justified on the ground of an inherent or infused righteousness. According to their scheme, the vicarious sacrifice of Christ procures for us the taking away of original sin and the infusion of righteousness. This takes place in baptism, which is the instrumental cause. And it

is to this remission of sin and renewal of nature that they give the name justification. When asked, however, on what ground God justifies the sinner, the answer is: On the ground of inherent or infused righteousness received in baptism.

The ground of justification according to the older Arminians was faith, and faith included or was synonymous with evangelical obedience. They believed that the atonement of Christ had the effect of lowering the requirements of the law, and that God, instead of requiring of us full obedience to the Adamic law, was pleased to count our faith—that is to say, evangelical obedience—in the room of righteousness.

The Socinian doctrine of justification proceeds upon the idea that God is a Father. It ignores the obligations of God's law, and denies therefore the divinity of Christ's person and the expiatory nature of his work. It reduces the gospel to the simple statement that God forgives on the ground of our faith and repentance.

2. OBJECTIVE.—Those who hold the subjective view as to the ground of justification agree in the opinion that when God pardons a sinner it is the state of the sinner's mind to which He has respect. In other words, that it is on the ground of something in the sinner himself. The objective view is the opposite of this. Those who hold it maintain that we are justified on the ground of what Christ has done, and not on the ground of what we do.

The Wesleyan Arminians belong to this class. Justification is defined by them to be pardon; and pardon, they are careful to say, is on the ground of the righteousness of Christ.\* It is true that our subsequent acceptance with God and our title to heaven is, according to them, based on our evangelical obedience or obedience of faith. But the pardon of our sins they strenuously affirm to be on the ground of the

\* "Watson's Institutes," Part II., chap. 23

righteousness of Christ. The doctrine of the Reformed confessions, our own among them, is that we are justified on the ground of the imputed righteousness of Christ. The Shorter Catechism says that "Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us." That is to say, God regards Christ as the substitute of his people, both in his active and in his passive obedience. His death is their death, his righteousness their righteousness. When God pronounces men righteous, it is not because of anything in them, but on the ground of Christ's righteousness which he imputes to them. That this is the scriptural view is proved by the following considerations.

(a) To justify is to pronounce righteous. A perfect righteousness, therefore, must be the ground of justification. And since we have no righteousness of our own which will meet the requirements of the law, that to which God has regard in our justification must be a vicarious righteousness.

(b) The statement that Abraham's faith was counted unto him for righteousness does not mean that he was justified on the ground of his faith, nor does it sanction the doctrine that our faith or evangelical obedience is taken in lieu of a perfect obedience as the ground of our justification. For it is in the nature of the case absurd to say that God regards us as righteous on the ground of conduct which is unrighteous. Nor will it do to say that the demands of the law are lowered through the work of Christ. For while the Scriptures represent Christians as being delivered from the law, they never represent the law itself as the subject of any change. We have peace with God because the demands of the law have been met, and not because its behests have been made easier. If the law has been lowered at all, to what extent has it been lowered? And if our justification



depends on our obedience, what is the measure of obedience necessary? and how shall we know when we have attained it? And until we know, what is the ground of our peace? Besides, this view, as Dr. Hodge says, "is dishonoring to the gospel. It supposes the gospel to be less holy than the law. The law requires perfect obedience; the gospel is satisfied with imperfect obedience."\* "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law."

3. It is distinctly stated that we are justified by faith without the works of the law, and that by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight. Both in the Epistle to the Romans and in that to the Galatians Paul argues that justification is not on the ground of anything which we can do, but on the ground of what Christ has done for us.

4. The doctrine of our Catechism is necessarily involved in the vicarious character of Christ's work. If Christ died, "the just for the unjust, that he might reconcile us to God," if he came "to give his life a ransom for (in the place of) many," if he was "made sin for us," if he was "made a curse for us,"—in a word, if the death of Christ was penal and vicarious, as the Scriptures abundantly teach, then it would follow that when God justifies the ungodly he has regard to the work which Christ has done in our room and stead.

5. But the doctrine of the Catechism is sustained by the direct testimony of Scripture. We are "justified by his blood." Rom. v. 9. God hath set him forth "to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God, . . . that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." Rom. iii. 25, 26. "Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of

\* "Systematic Theology," vol. iii., p. 169.

one the free gift came upon all men to justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Rom. v. 18, 19.

Paul, in the tenth chapter of Romans, complains of his brethren because they seek to be justified by their own righteousness: "For they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." He speaks of the blessedness of the man to whom God imputeth righteousness without works (Rom iv. 6), and in Philippians he expresses his desire to "be found in him, not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith."

To the question with which this chapter opens we reply by saying that we enter heaven on the ground of the imputed righteousness of Christ.

"Slain in the guilty sinner's stead,  
His spotless righteousness I plead,  
And his availing blood;  
Thy merit, Lord, my robe shall be,  
Thy merit shall atone for me,  
And bring me near to God."

### III. THE MEANS OF JUSTIFICATION.

We are justified by faith. All Christians will accept this statement. All will not say, however, that we are justified by faith alone, nor would all give the same answer to the question, How does faith justify? These points must now be noticed.

#### 1. Justification by faith alone.

The Bible says we are justified by faith. Are we justi-

fied by anything else? Is anything in addition to faith necessary in order to justification?

Our catechism says that we are justified by the "righteousness of Christ imputed to us and received by faith alone." This is the doctrine of the Bible. Paul says that we are justified by faith without the works of the law; that by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be justified. By works he does not mean the ceremonial law or works done before regeneration. His doctrine is that Jew and Gentile are alike under condemnation because they have violated the law of God, and that, being under condemnation, they can do nothing to justify themselves; for the law requires a perfect obedience, and this they cannot render. In excluding works from justification he excludes everything which we can do. He excludes faith itself so far as it is a work and lays claim to merit. We are not justified by works: we are justified by faith. There is no discrepancy between Paul and James, though the latter says that Abraham was justified by works, and adds, "Ye see, then, how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." Because (a) James is showing the relation of works to faith, and is not discussing the question of justification. Saving faith is followed by good works; where these are wanting faith is dead. (b) James cannot mean that Abraham was pardoned and accepted when he offered Isaac his son, for he had been pardoned and accepted long before.\*

## 2. Relation of faith to justification.

Men may use the same language and mean very different things. This is illustrated in the matter before us. The Romanist believes that we are justified by faith. But what does he mean? He has two faiths and two justifications. In his first justification original sin is removed and righteousness infused. This takes place in baptism. He believes

\* See Cunningham's "Historical Theology," vol. ii., p. 66; "Buchanan on Justification," pp. 239-249

that he ought to be baptized; and that being baptized, he is justified. In this sense he is justified by faith as a predisponent to justification. This faith is only intellectual assent, *fides informis*. In his second justification he receives title to eternal life, and on the ground of his "works"—that is to say, of his character. Prominent among these "works" is "faith." But the word faith as now employed does not mean intellectual assent. It is synonymous with love. This is *fides formata*.\*

The older Arminians believed that we are justified *on account of our faith*. Faith they considered as synonymous with evangelical obedience, and was regarded by them as imputed to us in the room of righteousness. Wesleyan Arminians say that we are justified—meaning pardoned—on condition of faith.

Those who hold the moral-influence theory of the atonement believe that we are justified by faith; but justification means personal holiness, and faith justifies because it stimulates to Christian activity. Faith is the secret of success. Have faith in a cause if you wish to conquer. Faith saves, because by it we overcome sin. The principle is true, but the adoption of it as an explanation of the gospel is a fundamental error. In opposition to these views our standards teach that "faith justifies a sinner in the sight of God, not because of those other graces which do always accompany it, or of good works that are the fruit of it; nor as if the grace of faith or any act thereof were imputed to him for justification; but only as it is an instrument by which he receiveth and applieth Christ and his righteousness."—*Larger Catechism*, Q. 73.

\* Hodge, "Systematic Theology," vol. lii., p. 165.

## IV. THE EFFECT OF JUSTIFICATION.

From what has been said respecting the nature and the ground of justification it will be easy to infer what opinions are entertained respecting the effect of justification. The Roman Catholic believes that the justification which he receives in baptism places him in the condition which Adam occupied before the fall. It does not secure his continuance in that state, however. His post-baptismal sins render him liable to eternal death if *mortal*, and to the fires of purgatory if *venial*. To escape eternal death and to mitigate the punishments of purgatory, it is necessary for him to make proper satisfaction in this life. It is a doctrine of the Church of Rome that a man may exceed the amount of praying, fasting and almsgiving requisite as a satisfaction for his own sins, and thus have something over which may be used for the benefit of others. The Church of Rome made merchandise of this excess in the iniquitous system of indulgences, the exposure of which led to the Reformation. The Arminians believe that justification is pardon, but that it secures no permanent change in our condition, and gives no title to heaven. Our acceptance depends on our persevering to the end, and our salvation will be the reward of our obedience.\*

The doctrine of the Reformed or Calvinistic churches is that justification is a permanent change of legal condition. The justified person is no longer subject to condemnation. He is saved. He *hath* eternal life. This is one effect of justification. And, moreover, justification is always followed by sanctification. Hence the Reformers, when they

\* "In asserting salvation by faith we mean this: (1) That pardon (salvation begun) is received by faith producing works. (2) That holiness (salvation continued) is faith working by love. (3) That heaven (salvation finished) is the reward of this faith."—Wesley's "Works," vol. v., p. 205.

affirmed that we are justified by faith alone, were careful to say that the faith which justifies was never by itself. It was a *fides sola*, not a *fides solitaria*. Good works are the evidence and the effect of saving faith. This must be so; for we know that without holiness no man shall see the Lord; and we know too that whom he justifies, them he also glorifies.

---

### REGENERATION.

WHAT is faith? Belief. But belief is assent when it terminates on a proposition and trust when it terminates on a person. I assent to the doctrine of plenary inspiration; I trust in Christ. The Romanists, regarding faith as assent, were in the habit of charging the Reformers with believing that men are saved by bare intellectual assent. The latter, however, maintained that saving faith included trust as well as assent; and this is the doctrine of our standards. From this definition of faith the necessity of both the external and the internal call may be inferred. The external call is necessary to faith. For says the apostle, "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?" The gospel must be preached and the offer of salvation must be made before men can believe. But is the presentation of the truth through the Word sufficient? Are men willing to accept Christ as their Saviour even although the claims of the gospel are pressed upon their attention? We have found that men are "indisposed, disabled, made opposite to all good and wholly inclined to all evil." This is their condition by nature. While they remain in this condition *can* they exercise faith? *Can* they rest on Christ alone for salvation? Sin, we found, has produced two

great results. It has made man guilty. A scheme of salvation must therefore provide for his deliverance from condemnation. We have seen how this was done. But sin has likewise debased our nature; it has caused spiritual death. A scheme of salvation must provide also for our change of nature. This moral change is necessary in order that we may avail ourselves of the remedy provided for our legal liabilities. For to be justified we must have faith. But there is a barrier to the exercise of faith—to wit: that we are spiritually dead. Now, it is the work of the Spirit to effect the moral change whereby we are persuaded and enabled to embrace Jesus Christ freely offered to us in the gospel. This change he accomplishes in “effectual calling,” and the result itself is termed regeneration. We are to consider regeneration first as to its nature and secondly as to its mode.

#### I. NATURE OF REGENERATION.

It is an instantaneous, radical and permanent change in the moral nature, in virtue of which the subject is said to be born again, to be a new creature, to be raised from the dead. It is instantaneous, for it is a transition from death to life; it is radical for the same reason; it is permanent, for the life imparted in regeneration is immortal. Whom he calls he justifies, whom he justifies he glorifies. The change affects the whole soul. The mind is enlightened in the knowledge of Christ, the will is renewed, and we are persuaded and enabled to embrace Jesus Christ freely offered to us in the gospel. It follows, from the nature of the case, that the soul is passive in regeneration. A dead man cannot be instrumental in his own resurrection. The soul is regenerated; it never regenerates itself. We are commanded to repent, but not to be regenerated. Regeneration is necessary to salvation, but it is not a duty. This view of regeneration is proved—

1. From the doctrine of total depravity. If it is true, this follows of necessity.

2. This is taught in the second chapter of Ephesians, where spiritual life, as the antithesis of spiritual death, is attributed to divine power: "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he hath loved us when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ (by grace ye are saved), and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus."

3. It is involved in other statements of Scripture: We must be born again. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." "We are his workmanship." It follows, therefore—

(a) That regeneration is not a change of external relation. This was Archbishop Whately's view, and it is the view of others in the Church of England, who understand baptismal regeneration to mean nothing more than that in the sacrament of baptism the subject becomes externally related to the Church.

(b) It is not a change of purpose, as theologians of the New Haven school suppose; for the "purpose" presupposes the moral change in which regeneration consists.

(c) It is not moral reformation. Birth is different from growth. Resurrection is different from the life which follows it. Spiritual growth follows regeneration, but regeneration is the word which expresses the change from death to life.

(d) Nor is regeneration the same as conversion. The regenerated person turns to God—*i. e.*, is converted. The soul is active in conversion, passive in regeneration. Conversion is the fruit of regeneration.

## II. THE MODE OF REGENERATION.

The agent in regeneration is the third Person of the blessed and adorable Trinity. "The wind bloweth where it list-



eth and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth. So is every one that is born of the Spirit." John iii. 8. "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Tit. iii. 4, 5.

The doctrine is stated by the Confession of Faith in the following terms: "All those whom God hath predestinated unto life, and those only, he is pleased, in his appointed and accepted time, effectually to call by his word and Spirit out of that state of sin and death in which they are by nature, to grace and salvation by Jesus Christ; enlightening their minds spiritually and savingly to understand the things of God, taking away their heart of stone, and giving unto them an heart of flesh; renewing their wills, and by his almighty power determining them to that which is good, and effectually drawing them to Jesus Christ; yet so as they come most freely, being made willing by his grace. This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from anything at all foreseen in man, who is altogether passive therein, until, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it."—*Confession of Faith*, chap. x., § 1, 2.

The agency of the Spirit in regeneration is immediate, sovereign and efficacious.

1. IMMEDIATE.—The change wrought in regeneration is through the direct exercise of divine power. Lutherans dispute this proposition. They do not believe in the operation of the Spirit except through the Word. They hold that there is virtue in the Word which, if not resisted, will result in the conversion of those to whom it is preached. This, however, cannot be the true state of the case, for the objective presentation of the truth to a man spiritually dead is surely not sufficient. Besides, the Scriptures dis-

tinctly say that it is not sufficient, for they affirm that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. ii. 14. The Scriptures distinguish, moreover, between the influence of the Spirit and that of the Word. "Who, then, is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye have believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase." 1 Cor. iii. 5, 6. That the influence of the Spirit in regeneration is by direct agency, and not through the moral influence of the truth, is seen in passages like the following: "For it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." Phil. ii. 13. "In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves: if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." 2 Tim. ii. 25.

2. SOVEREIGN.—Regeneration is a sovereign act of God's Spirit, who works when and where he pleases. It is not on the ground of anything that a man does, or that God foresees he will do, that he regenerates him. Romanists, and those who hold high sacramentarian views, maintain that baptism is necessary to regeneration. This dogma is both extra-scriptural and unscriptural, however. The Bible does not teach baptismal regeneration, but it teaches the contrary. Baptism, we know, does not secure salvation; regeneration does. Whom he calls (regenerates) he justifies, whom he justifies he glorifies. The salvation of infants is not jeopardized by neglect of baptism. But "elect infants, dying in infancy" (and we believe that all infants dying in infancy are elect), "are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when and where and how he pleaseth."—*Confession of Faith*, chap. x., § 3.

3. EFFICACIOUS.—Regeneration is the result of a direct exercise of divine power. The soul is passive. There can be no co-working in regeneration. This view is opposed by

those who hold Semi-Pelagian views respecting sin, and who maintain that the work of the Spirit in regeneration consists in moral suasion. The best way to reply to this view is to prove the doctrine of original sin. A dead man is not in a position to be influenced by moral suasion. Besides, it is strange that the Scriptures should say that we are created in Christ Jesus unto good works, that we are born of the Spirit, and that we are raised from the dead, if they meant only to teach that the Spirit presents arguments and motives for our consideration. The Arminians believe in total depravity, but maintain that the Spirit of God is present with every man, granting him sufficient grace to enable him to attain eternal life, and that the difference between a believer and an unbeliever is that one co-operates, and the other does not co-operate, with the Spirit of God. To which it is enough to reply that if men are dead they *cannot* co-operate, and if they are alive they *need not* co-operate, for they are already regenerated.

Regeneration is God's act; conversion is man's. Conversion follows regeneration, and is evidenced by faith and repentance.

“Faith in Jesus Christ is a saving grace whereby we receive and rest upon him alone for salvation as he is offered to us in the gospel.”

“Repentance unto life is a saving grace whereby a sinner, out of a true sense of his sin and apprehension of the mercy of God in Christ, doth, with grief and hatred of sin, turn from it unto God, with full purpose of and endeavor after new obedience.” \*

\* “Shorter Catechism,” Q. 86, 87.

## ELECTION.

To be saved we must be justified ; to be justified we must believe ; to believe we must be regenerated. God regenerates. All regenerated persons are saved. Those who die unregenerated perish. Thus we are led to a consideration of the doctrine of election. On this subject two contradictory opinions are entertained. Calvinists affirm, Arminians deny, that God for his own glory has from all eternity elected some to everlasting life. Every man who has an opinion on this subject must be, at least so far as this doctrine is concerned, an Arminian or a Calvinist.\*

## I. ARMINIAN VIEW.

Arminians agree in saying that the Bible speaks of an election of some sort. They agree in saying that it does not teach the doctrine of a sovereign election of individuals to eternal life. But they are not agreed in respect to what the Bible doctrine of election is. They fall into two classes.

1. Those who maintain that the election spoken of in the Bible is an election to the external privileges of the Church. God, they say, has shed gospel light on some parts of the world and kept the remainder in darkness. He has elected some to the enjoyment of Christian privileges, while others are in a state of heathenism. This election does not secure salvation, though it confers great advantages on those who are the subjects of it.† But it is very

\* For a full discussion of this point, see Principal Cunningham's masterly essay on Calvinism and Arminianism in his "Reformers and Theology of the Reformation."

† "So, also, we may conclude no Christian is elected to eternal salvation absolutely, but only to the knowledge of the gospel, to the

clear that the election spoken of in the Bible is an election which secures salvation. Whom God predestinates he calls, whom he calls he justifies, whom he justifies he glorifies. It is an election of those "whom he had afore prepared unto glory," "whom he had chosen, that they should be holy and without blame," of those whom he had "predestinated to be conformed to the image of his Son." This theory of election does not explain the facts, and therefore falls to the ground.

2. Those who maintain that God elects to everlasting life those who, he foresees, will repent and believe in Christ. But this view is equally unsatisfactory; for so far from our election proceeding on the ground of a foreseen faith, faith itself is the gift of God. God does not elect us because he foresees that we shall repent and persevere in holiness, inasmuch as the reason that we have repented is that he "hath granted" unto us "repentance unto life;" and the reason that we persevere is that we are "created in Christ Jesus unto good works." Election is not on the ground of a foreseen faith, but on account of God's good pleasure, "who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began." 2 Tim. i. 9.

## II. CALVINISTIC VIEW.

The Calvinistic doctrine assumes three forms.

1. SUPRALAPSARIAN.—According to this view, the decree of election takes precedence of the decree of creation. Out of the mass of creatable men God elects some and reprobates others for his own glory. To carry out this privileges of the Christian Church, to the offer of God's Holy Spirit, and to the promise of final salvation on condition of being a faithful follower of Christ."—Whately's "Essay on Certain Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul."

decree he created man and permitted him to fall. This view is not commonly entertained. It presents metaphysical difficulties to begin with.\* It is unsupported by the word of God, and contrary to it. It requires us to believe that God has reprobated some of the human race without regard to their sins, whereas the Scriptures teach that, while God saves some out of his mere good pleasure, those who are passed by are punished on account of their sins.

2. *SUBLAPSARIAN*.—The advocates of this view maintain that the decree of election contemplates man as fallen. Out of the mass of fallen humanity God has predestinated some, they say, to eternal life. This is the doctrine of our standards, and, we believe, of the Scriptures. “God having, out of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity elected some to everlasting life, did enter into a covenant of grace, to deliver them out of the estate of sin and misery, and to bring them into a state of salvation by a Redeemer.” †

3. *INFRALAPSARIAN*.—This is the view which was advocated by the French Protestant theologians at Saumur “during the second quarter of the seventeenth century.” It contemplates man not only as created and fallen, but as redeemed. Its advocates say that God decreed to create man; to permit the fall; to provide a salvation for all men through Jesus Christ on condition of faith and repentance; but, foreseeing that none would accept Christ, that he decreed to give faith and repentance to some. This view involves a denial of the vicarious nature of the atonement, and is incompatible with the doctrine that Christ laid down his life for his sheep.

The advocates of these three views agree in affirming that election is (1) of individuals, (2) to eternal life, (3) of God’s mere good pleasure and not on account of a foreseen

\* For a discussion of them, see Turretine, loc. iv., quæst. ix.

† “Shorter Catechism,” Q. 20.

faith. These are the essential elements in the Calvinistic doctrine of election. This doctrine is proved by the following considerations :

1. It follows from the doctrine of regeneration. This is obvious.

2. Faith and repentance are gifts of God, but they are necessary to salvation.

3. It is specifically affirmed in Scripture: "Whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son," etc. Rom. viii. 29. "According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame," etc. Eph. i. 4. "God hath from the beginning chosen you unto salvation," etc. 2 Thess. xi. 13.

4. It is proved by the objection which Paul answers in the ninth chapter of Romans. The most common objection to this doctrine is that it destroys responsibility. This is precisely the one which Paul anticipates: "Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will? Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor? What if God, willing to show his wrath and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction, and that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy which he had afore prepared unto glory?"

5. It is involved in the doctrine of decrees. The Confession of Faith says, chap. iii.: "God from all eternity did by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass; yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or

contingency of second causes taken away, but rather established."

Election is simply part of God's eternal purpose. That God's purpose is eternal and that it extends to every event the Scriptures clearly teach. God notices the fall of a sparrow. He numbers the hairs of our head. He disposes of the lot. Every good and perfect gift comes from him. He directs our steps. He controls the free acts of men, giving faith, granting repentance unto life, working in us to will and to do of his good pleasure. The wicked acts of men are foreordained and overruled. Christ was delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God. Joseph's brethren were carrying out God's purpose when they sold him: "God sent me before you to preserve you a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives by a great deliverance." Gen. xlv. 7. He has mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth. Moreover, foreordination is involved in foreknowledge. It is admitted by all, except Socinians, that God from all eternity has foreknown whatsoever comes to pass. If God has foreknown every event, then every event has been fixed and determined from all eternity. God from all eternity foresaw the crucifixion of Christ. The crucifixion was inevitable, therefore, and God knew from all eternity that it would certainly occur. What made it certain? There is only one answer: It formed part of God's eternal purpose "whereby for his own glory he hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass."

The common objections to this doctrine are—

1. That it represents God as dealing unjustly. But this is not the case. It would have been just for God to have left the world to perish in its sins. This must be admitted if the atonement is believed in. There is no need of and no mercy in an atonement if the punishment of sin would have been an injustice. But if God might justly



have left the whole world to perish, who shall challenge his prerogative to have mercy on as many as he pleases?

2. It is said to destroy free agency. This must be because it makes our actions certain; but so does foreknowledge. If certainty is incompatible with free agency, the objection is involved against foreordination, as foreknowledge is foreordination. Certainty and liberty are not incompatible. God is free, but it is certain that he will not do wrong. Christ was free, but it was certain that he would not sin.

3. It is said to make the use of means unnecessary. Popularly stated: "If I am to be saved, I shall be saved no matter what I am; if I am to be lost, I shall be lost, do what I may." The mistake arises out of the fact that God's decree embraces *every event*, that he foreordains the means as well as the end. If God decrees the salvation of a soul, he decrees that he shall hear, heed and believe the gospel. In like manner, if God decrees that there shall be an abundant harvest, he decrees that the farmer shall prepare the soil, sow the seed, and that favorable influences shall combine to produce the result.

What practical influence should the doctrine of election exert upon the children of God? It should make them humble: "By the grace of God we are what we are." It should make them grateful, for what have we that we have not received? It should make them confident, for faith is the pledge that God hath "chosen them unto salvation."

"Why was I made to hear thy voice  
And enter while there's room,  
While thousands make a wretched choice,  
And rather starve than come?"

"'Twas the same love that spread the feast  
That sweetly forced me in,  
Else I had still refused to taste,  
And perished in my sin."

## SANCTIFICATION.

REGENERATION is related to sanctification as birth is to growth. The soul's new life begins at regeneration. Its development in spiritual strength and stature is its sanctification. We are here using the words regeneration and sanctification in the subjective sense to denote the state of being regenerated and sanctified. They are also used in the objective sense to denote the agency or process by which we are brought into this state, though the objective side of regeneration is expressed in our standards by the term "effectual calling." Let us consider sanctification first subjectively and then objectively.

## I. SUBJECTIVELY CONSIDERED.

Sanctification is moral transformation, and is altogether different from justification, which is only a change of legal condition. At regeneration the Christian begins to lead a new life—a better, but not a sinless, life. Though a new nature has, so to speak, been grafted upon the soul, the old nature is not dead. The fruits of sin and the fruits of the Spirit hang side by side. Recovery from disease is not effected in a day. The patient is feeble long after all danger is past. So with the soul's convalescence. And it has not only been sick, but dead—dead in trespasses and sins. Sanctification is a gradual change of character; it is a putting off of the old man, which is "corrupt, according to the deceitful lusts," and a putting on of "the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." In regeneration the child of God becomes "a new creature," and this becomes more apparent as sanctification goes on. He is the subject of new feelings, new pleasures, new motives, new aims. "Old things are passed away."

His is not so new, however, that he loses his individuality or ceases to be himself. Sanctification makes Christians like Christ, but does not destroy the differences which distinguish one Christian from another.\* The agency of the Holy Ghost is present in sanctification as in regeneration—with this difference, however, that the Christian co-operates with the Spirit in sanctification. Sanctification is a duty. We are commanded to “grow in grace.” The doctrine of justification by faith alone is not responsible for neglect of personal piety. The Christian is commanded to be holy; and that he may attain holiness he is to be actively engaged striving against sin. Christian life is a warfare, and he is to put on the whole armor of God. It is a race, and he is to lay aside every weight. The Christian is both a sinner and a saint—a sinner, however great his attainments in holiness, and a saint notwithstanding his sins. It is certain that while he lives he will not be free from sin; it is just as certain that he will not fall away from grace. But we are assuming the truth of doctrines which merit a more explicit statement. Three great questions claim attention here: Antinomianism, Perfectionism and the Perseverance of the Saints.

1. ANTINOMIANISM.—Some have perverted the doctrine of justification by faith, and have held that as they are released from the law as the ground of justification they are under no obligation to keep it. This does not disprove the doctrine, however. Men did the same thing in the days of the apostles. The Epistle of James was aimed at Antinomian error. Some have said that the doctrine of justification by faith belittles conduct, which, as Matthew Arnold says, is three-fourths of life. But this does not disprove the doctrine. Paul had the same objec-

\* The fig tree, formerly unfruitful, now becomes fruitful; but the rose never becomes the grape, the sanctified Peter never a James or a John.—Van Oosterzee’s “Christian Dogmatics,” vol. ii., p. 658.

tion to meet: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid." Some charge upon those who preach the doctrine of justification by faith a disregard of holiness as a pre-requisite of heaven, and speak boastingly of themselves as the special apostles of personal piety. The charge is a slander and the boast a mistake.

The Christian is under the deepest obligation to obey the law of God, and is urged by the strongest motives to strive after holiness.

1. This follows from the nature of the law; it is the expression of God's will—a transcript of his nature. It tells man what he ought to do. To break that law is to sin, and a scheme of salvation which would license sin is inconceivable.

2. We are commanded to be holy, to put off the old man and put on the new, to give diligence, to add to our faith, virtue, etc. Our Saviour prays that his disciples may be sanctified, and Paul prays for the Thessalonians that the very God of peace would sanctify them wholly.

3. It is the Christian's nature to live a life of growing holiness. He has been delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son. He was dead *in* sin, he is now dead *to* sin. "How shall we who are dead to sin live any longer therein?" That a man should find in justification by faith an apology for moral laxity would be convincing proof that he had never been born again.

4. It is distinctly declared that without holiness no man shall see the Lord.

5. The Christian is influenced by the motive of gratitude. If we are saved by the precious blood of Christ, a life of consecration is a very obvious duty. "For we thus judge that if one died for all, then were all dead, and that he died for all that we who live should not henceforth live

unto ourselves, but unto him who died for us and rose again."

6. And he is influenced by another motive; for while we are not saved on account of our works, we are judged by our works. In no sense are men saved by works. They enter heaven only on the ground of the imputed righteousness of Christ. But they are rewarded with higher or lower degrees of blessedness according to their conduct here: "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ that every one may receive the things done in the body according to that he hath done whether it be good or bad." 1 Cor. v. 10.

2. PERFECTIONISM.—We ought to be like Christ; this is the Christian's aim. We are to be like Christ; this is the Christian's hope. But perfection is not attainable in this life: "No mere man, since the fall, is able in this life perfectly to keep the commandments of God; but doth daily break them in thought, word and deed."

The proof of this is found—

1. In the experience of Paul. In the seventh chapter of Romans he says: "I delight in the law of God, after the inward man; but I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin, which is in my members." In the Epistle to the Philippians he says: "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which I also am apprehended of Christ Jesus." Paul's humility makes the claim of perfection on the part of a Christian seem like presumption.

2. We read: "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." 1 John i. 8.

3. Our Lord gave his disciples a model for prayer, and it contains the petition, "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." The perfect Christian, however, cannot offer that prayer.

4. Christian experience is opposed to the doctrine. Does any Christian suppose that he is as like Christ as he will be? Is there a man living who for a moment supposes that all his thoughts, words and actions conform to the law of God? The truth is that if by sin is meant "any want of conformity unto or transgression of the law of God," and if by the law of God is understood the law given to Adam, there is not a perfectionist in the world. Perfectionist theories are based on false views of sin or false views of the law. Let it be shown that the law by which we are bound is the moral law as it was given to Adam without abatement or change, let it be shown that sin is any want of conformity unto as well as transgression of this law, and Perfectionism becomes transparently absurd.

3. PERSEVERANCE OF THE SAINTS.—The angels rejoice over the sinner's repentance. They are not disappointed. The sinner who once accepts Christ in a living faith never forsakes him. Spiritual life may languish, but it never dies.

On this point Calvinists and Arminians hold opposite opinions. The Calvinistic position is well stated in our Confession of Faith: "They whom God hath accepted in his Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace, but shall certainly persevere therein to the end and be eternally saved." This is the doctrine of the Bible.

1. It follows from the statements which teach a present salvation. "He that believeth hath eternal life." "We have passed from death unto life." "There is now no condemnation." These statements could not be made regarding Christians if their ultimate salvation were uncertain.

2. We read that whom he "calls he justifies, and whom he justifies he glorifies." Every Christian is therefore sure of glory.

3. The Bible says that he who believes shall be saved.

It also says: "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." This doctrine harmonizes these passages, as it teaches that every believer will persevere in holiness.

4. The doctrine of Perseverance is necessary to account for the strong language of confidence employed by the apostle Paul: "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness;" "I know whom I have believed," etc.; "I am persuaded that nothing shall separate me from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus my Lord." Paul was not self-righteous or self-confident. His assurance was based on the evidence that God had chosen him to obtain salvation.

5. It follows of necessity from the doctrine of election. God has chosen some to everlasting life. He has chosen them to salvation through faith. Faith is the fruit of regeneration, and regeneration is the proof of election. A living faith is a guarantee of election. This is necessarily so, for all who believe are saved; but none are saved who are not elected. Therefore all who believe are elected. Hence those who are regenerated never die. "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance." They are not revoked.

6. The Scriptures affirm the doctrine: "I will give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." John x. 28. "He who hath begun a good work in you will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ." Phil. i. 6.

The doctrine of the perseverance of the saints is very precious and very comforting to the child of God, but it does not encourage indolence or pride. Along with this doctrine comes the exhortation to "give diligence to make your calling and election sure," and the caution, "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." Nor is it by any inherent strength that he resists temptation and perseveres in a holy life. He is kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation.

## II. OBJECTIVELY CONSIDERED.

Our catechism says that sanctification is a work of God's free grace, whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image of God, and are enabled more and more to die unto sin and to live unto righteousness.

1. It is effected by divine agency. This is the uniform testimony of Scripture. The Father sanctifies, the Son sanctifies, the Spirit sanctifies. 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. xiii. 20, 21; Tit. ii. 14; Eph. v. 25. But it is especially attributed to the third person of the Trinity. In the work of redemption each person of the Trinity is especially concerned. The Father loved us, and sent his Son; the Son loved us, and died to expiate our guilt; the Spirit loved us, and made his abode in us, taking of the things that are Christ's and showing them to us. To his gracious influence the Christian owes not only the new birth, but growth in grace. Our growth in grace is a very different thing from moral reformation. It is not by culture, development or building up of manhood that souls grow in grace. The preaching which fails to recognize the agency of the Holy Ghost is not the preaching of the gospel, however fully and eloquently it may urge upon men a life and conversation becoming the gospel.

2. It is a work.

It is to the continued presence of God's Spirit that Christians are indebted for their advances in holiness. We are in Christ, and being in him derive spiritual sustenance: "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine, no more can ye except ye abide in me." And being united to Christ the Spirit abides with us, and our bodies are made the temples of the living God. The Holy Ghost does not remove all trace of sin when he regenerates us, as Roman Catholics teach. Hence regeneration is only the beginning of a process which ends in complete sanctifica-



tion. Nor does he implant a germ of holiness and leave it to fight its way against opposing influences. It is by no inherent vitality that the soul perseveres in a holy life. We need the sanctifying and reviving influences of the Spirit of God. In times of spiritual declension we pray, "O Lord, revive thy work." At all times we pray, "Lord, increase our faith."

3. The Spirit works through means. Our Saviour prayed, "Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth." Hence sanctification is a duty, and we are responsible for the use we make of the means of grace. The outward and ordinary means are the word, sacraments and prayer.

---

#### THE MEANS OF GRACE.

WHEN our Lord had raised the maiden from the dead, "he commanded that something be given her to eat." This illustrates the difference between regeneration and sanctification. Spiritual food will not impart life to a dead soul, though it will nourish and strengthen one already quickened. New life is due to the direct exercise of divine efficiency, but growth in grace results from spiritual nourishment. In regeneration the Spirit works immediately; in sanctification he works through means. Hence the apostle says: "Desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby." Holiness is a duty. Without it no man shall see the Lord. Hence, in addition to faith in Jesus Christ and repentance unto life, God requireth of us a "diligent use of all the outward means whereby Christ communiceth to us the benefits of redemption." These outward means are God's ordinances, especially the word, sacraments and prayer.

## I. THE WORD.

By the word is meant the Bible. It is the rule of duty. All questions, both of creed and conduct, are to be determined by it. To know what is true we are not to go to church councils, creeds or catechisms, but to the Bible. To know what is right we are not to consult private opinion or public sentiment, but the Bible. It is given by inspiration of God, and is therefore "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." Do we desire to learn the way of God more perfectly? Then the Holy Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation. Are we in heaviness through manifold temptations? Then let us consider Him who endured such contradiction of sinners against himself. Are we faint-hearted? Let us turn to the promises. Are we growing cold and formal in the service of Christ? Then the Epistles of Peter should stir us up by putting us in remembrance. Have we to do battle against the enemy of souls? Then let us wield the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God. The Bible reflects God's glory; and beholding in it as in a glass the glory of God, we are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord. The word of God is quick and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. How is the sanctifying influence of the word accounted for? There are three answers to this question.

1. Some say that the influence which the Bible exerts is only the natural result of the presentation of moral truth to the mind.

2. Lutherans say that there is an inherent virtue in the word which, if not resisted, produces blessed results in those to whom it is presented. Its influence is not due to the nat-

ural force of truth, but to the Spirit of God working in and with it.

3. The Reformed doctrine is different from both the foregoing views. The first view is not correct, inasmuch as the presentation of the truth to the mind does not enable a man to understand the truth, nor does it open his heart to the reception of it. This is the work of the Spirit. The second view is not correct, because it denies the personal agency of the Spirit as separate and distinct from the word. The doctrine of the Bible is that the word sanctifies by being made efficacious through the Spirit. The word may be presented without the attending influence of the Spirit, for it acts by no inherent power, and the Spirit works when and where he pleases. The word must be attended by the efficacious influence of the Spirit, or it is preached in vain. Hence the necessity of praying for the aid of the Holy Ghost in order that we may study the Scriptures with profit. Hence, too, the need of praying that God would give his word success, and that his Spirit would lead us into all truth.

## II. SACRAMENTS.

Our Lord has enjoined upon his followers the observance of two ordinances through which, as well as through the word, he is pleased to communicate his grace. These ordinances are the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. "A sacrament is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ, wherein, by sensible signs, Christ and the benefits of the new covenant are represented, sealed and applied to believers."\* "The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments rightly used is not conferred by any power in them, neither doth the efficacy of a sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it, but upon the work of the Spirit and the word of institution, which contains, together with the precept authorizing the

\* Shorter Catechism, Q. 92.

use thereof, a promise of benefit to worthy receivers.”\* These statements express the idea of the sacraments entertained by the Reformed Churches. They are opposed—

1. To the Roman Catholic doctrine. The Church of Rome says that the sacraments contain the grace they signify, and convey it *ex opere operato*. As food has power to support life, so baptism regenerates and the eucharist affords spiritual nourishment without regard to the faith or want of faith of those receiving the sacraments.

2. To the Lutheran view. Lutherans deny the *ex opere operato* doctrine as taught by Romanists. They hold that faith is necessary to the efficacy of the sacraments, but they hold that when received in faith the sacraments convey grace by an inherent virtue, just as they maintain that the word sanctifies by an inherent virtue. The doctrine of our Church is that both word and sacraments are made efficacious by the work of God’s Spirit, and not by any inherent power in themselves.

3. To the Zwinglian view. According to this view, the sacraments cannot be properly called means of grace. They are only symbolical modes of stating Scripture truth. The doctrine of our standards is that the sacraments not only represent, but that they seal and exhibit or apply to believers, the benefits of Christ’s redemption.

In studying this subject we are to guard against two extremes. First, we are to be careful not to undervalue the sacraments or ignore the fact that they are channels of grace; secondly, we are to be careful not to regard them as channels of every grace, for they are sanctifying, but not regenerating, ordinances.† Passing from these remarks on the sacraments in general, let us consider each of these ordinances separately.

\* Confession of Faith, chap. xxvii., § 3.

† “The substance of this matter may be embodied in these two positions: 1. That the Holy Spirit ordinarily employs the sacraments,

1. BAPTISM.—And here we are met by three inquiries: 1. The idea of baptism; 2. The subjects of baptism; 3. The mode of baptism.

1. The idea of baptism. A Hindoo, let us suppose, applies to the missionary for baptism. Shall the missionary take the ground that baptism is a regenerating ordinance, and baptize him without making any inquiry respecting his state of mind? Or shall he take the ground that baptism is the ordinance in which a profession of faith in Christ is made, and satisfy himself that the person applying for baptism is a Christian? If he follows New Testament precedent, he will adopt the latter course. The case supposed is analogous to the instances of baptism recorded in the New Testament. In this, and in all other cases of adult baptism, it is clear, therefore, that baptism presupposes regeneration, and cannot be a regenerating agent. If baptism ever regenerates, it must be in the case of infants. But we concede freely to the Baptist denomination that the New Testament does not give a single unmistakable instance of infant baptism. Baptismal regeneration is therefore discountenanced by every instance of baptism recorded in the Bible. Its only claim to be regarded as a doctrine of Scripture when received by persons duly qualified and rightly prepared, as means or instruments of conveying to them clearer views and more lively and impressive conceptions of what he has done and revealed in his word with respect to the provisions and arrangements of the covenant of grace and their special application to men individually. And, 2. That the Holy Spirit, acting in accordance with the principles and tendencies of our constitution, ordinarily employs the sacraments as means or instruments of increasing and strengthening man's faith with reference to all its appropriate objects, and thereby of imparting to them in greater abundance, all the spiritual blessings which are connected with the lively and vigorous exercise of faith—that is, all those subordinate blessings, as in a certain sense they may be called, which accompany and flow from justification and regeneration.”—Cunningham's *“Reformers and Theology of the Reformation,”* p. 287.

rests on a few isolated texts of Scripture, and these it can be shown will not bear the interpretation which the advocates of Sacramentarianism put upon them.

One of these passages is John iii. 5: "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

But it is not clear that "born of water" refers to baptism; and if it does, it is not clear that "kingdom of God" means heaven. Another text is found in Titus iii. 5: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Here again there is good reason to believe that no reference to baptism is intended. The probable meaning is: "We are saved by that washing which is regeneration, namely, the renewing of the Holy Ghost."\*

Baptism, being administered to adults on profession of faith, is to them a sign and seal of regeneration, not as effecting it, but as witnessing that it has been already effected. Regeneration and baptism are in this way closely related ideas, and this will explain such passages as the following: "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins;" "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins."

2. The subjects of baptism. The heathen just referred to would be treated in the same way by a Presbyterian or a Baptist missionary. Neither would baptize him except on a credible profession of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. And as the cases of adult baptism in the New Testament are analogous to the one supposed, they need not be the occasion of any difference of opinion (save as to the mode of baptism) between Presbyterians and Baptists. It is agreed that the converts to Christianity from Judaism or heathenism are to be baptized on profession of faith. To this ex-

\* Hodge, "Systematic Theology," vol. iii., p. 596.

tent Presbyterians are firm advocates of "believers' baptism." But suppose that the heathen above referred to had children? What then? Should the missionary baptize them also? If he were a Presbyterian, he would; if he were a Baptist, he would not. And here we reach the real difference between our Baptist brethren and ourselves. The question between us is simply whether the children of believers are entitled to baptism. In answering this question two concessions are to be freely made. 1. That the New Testament does not contain one clear case of infant baptism. 2. That the doctrine of infant baptism does not rest on a positive command of Christ, but is arrived at inferentially. Neither of these concessions affects the case. It is not strange that the New Testament makes no specific mention of infant baptism. Let us illustrate: A Presbyterian missionary goes to a heathen land to preach the gospel. As the result of his preaching a heathen is converted. He is baptized, and the fact is reported. But in reporting the baptism the minister only wishes to emphasize the fact that this heathen has made a profession of religion, that being the important thing. If the convert has children, they are likewise baptized, and he may or may not refer to it. If he does refer to it, he will refer to it as a subordinate fact, and say that the children were baptized or the household was baptized. Now, the cases of baptism in the New Testament were cases like the one supposed. And while it is not strange that there is no typical case of infant baptism, like that of Cornelius, it is more than likely that where the sacred writers say that "he and all his" were baptized they are recording as a subordinate fact the baptism of the convert's children as well as of the convert himself. Nor is it a valid argument against infant baptism that our Lord does not command children to be baptized. He did not enjoin the observance of the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath.

We have not space enough to enter into an argument in defence of infant baptism. These, however, are the principles which govern us in the matter.

(a) The Church of the Old Testament and the Church of the New are one and the same Church.

(b) Children of believers were members of the church under the Old Testament dispensation. They are entitled to membership, therefore, in the Christian church, unless it can be shown that this right no longer exists. The difference between us and the Baptists is a question concerning the burden of proof. We affirm the doctrine of infant church membership because it cannot be shown that it is contrary to New Testament teaching. They deny the doctrine of infant church membership because it cannot be proved by direct testimony of the New Testament.

(c) If we are right in claiming for children under the New Testament the privileges which they enjoyed under the Old until it is proved that those privileges have been revoked, we are right in claiming that they are entitled to baptism; for if they are entitled to membership, they cannot reasonably be denied that which is the sign of membership. The view we have taken furnishes a natural explanation of those passages which refer to the baptism of Lydia and her household, of the household of Stephanas, of the jailer and all his. It is possible that there were no infants in these households, but the probabilities are the other way; and the references are just such as a missionary at the present day would make if he were reporting the conversion of a heathen and the subsequent baptism of himself and his family.

3. The mode of baptism. Baptism is a washing with water in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. How much water is used and how it is applied are matters of small moment. Baptism may be performed by immer-



sion, affusion or sprinkling. Baptists claim that baptism means immersion, and that sprinkling is not baptism. For this position, however, they have no authority.

(a) The use of the words "bapto" and "baptizo" does not warrant it. These words are used where Nebuchadnezzar is said to have been "wet with the dew of heaven," where the washing of the hands, of pots and cups and tables (couches) is spoken of, and in Mark vii. 4, where we read: "And when they come from market, except they wash, they eat not."

(b) The use of the Greek prepositions translated "in," "into," "out of," does not sustain the Baptist position. Philip and the eunuch went down, both of them, "into" the water. But this does not necessarily mean more than that they went down to the stream and stood beside it. If it necessarily conveys the idea of immersion, we must hold that Philip was immersed too, for they both went down "into" the water.

(c) The cases of baptism recorded in the New Testament do not sustain the Baptist position. Three thousand converts were baptized on the day of Pentecost. Considering the short time in which this was done, and the scarcity of water in Jerusalem, it is hardly possible that they were immersed. The account of the baptism of Cornelius suggests the idea that water was brought for the purpose. "Can any man forbid water?" The Philippian jailer was baptized at midnight and in prison. It is highly improbable that he was immersed.

(d) The Baptist position is not supported by the remaining references to baptism in the New Testament. The Israelites were baptized in the Red Sea, but they were not immersed. We receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit, but we are not immersed in the Spirit. He is poured out upon us.

2. THE LORD'S SUPPER.—There are four leading views

in respect to this sacrament, the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, the Zwinglian and the Reformed.

1. The Roman Catholic Church teaches that by the act of the officiating priest the elements of bread and wine in the eucharist—or, as they call it, the mass—are changed into the body and blood of Christ. This is the doctrine of transubstantiation. The scriptural arguments in support of this are John vi. 53: “Then said Jesus unto them, Verily, verily I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you;” and 1 Cor. xi. 24: “This is my body.”\* The mass is both a sacrament and a sacrifice. As a sacrament it imparts spiritual nourishment *ex opere operato*. But as a sacrifice it is a satisfaction for sin. Romanism is a huge, though consistent (and this is more than can be said of high Anglicanism), perversion of Bible truth. It makes the minister a priest, the memorial meal a sacrifice; and instead of teaching that Christ was once (once for all) offered to bear the sins of many, it makes the satisfaction for sin depend on the repetition of that sacrifice in the mass.

2. The Lutherans deny that the substance of the elements is changed, but they believe in the corporeal presence of Christ *in, under and with* the elements. This is consubstantiation. They hold that faith on the part of the communicant is necessary in order that grace may be received, but they hold, likewise, that, as in the case of baptism, the eucharist has an inherent virtue.

3. The Zwinglian view regards the Lord’s Supper simply as symbolical, and as a means of grace only as it is another mode of presenting truth to the mind.

4. The Reformed doctrine is opposed to all the foregoing. It is opposed to the Zwinglian view, inasmuch as it teaches that the Lord’s Supper is a channel of grace. It is opposed to the Lutheran, inasmuch as it teaches that this

\* See the commentaries on these verses.

grace is conveyed not by any inherent virtue in the ordinance, but only as the Holy Ghost uses it for our sanctification; and of course it is still more opposed to the Roman Catholic view.

Our Shorter Catechism says: "The Lord's Supper is a sacrament, wherein, by giving and receiving bread and wine according to Christ's appointment, his death is showed forth, and the worthy receivers are, not after a corporal and carnal manner, but by faith, made partakers of his body and blood, with all his benefits to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace."\*

Looking at this ordinance as it is expounded in the symbols of the Reformed Church, and especially of our own, we may distinguish four leading ideas.

(a) The memorial idea. "Do this in remembrance of me." The love which brought salvation and the way by which salvation came are to be kept fresh in our minds by the periodic observance of the ordinance which commemorates Christ's death.

(b) The symbolical idea. As baptism teaches by symbol the doctrine of depravity and the necessity of regeneration, so the impressive ordinance of the Supper speaks to us of guilt and of the atonement. A Socinian theology has no adequate explanation of the eucharist.

(c) The social idea. This service is a memorial meal. It is the "Lord's table" which is spread, the "Lord's Supper" of which we partake. It is a communion of Christians with their Lord and with one another. The followers of Christ are brethren, and he is the Elder Brother of them all.

(d) The sacramental idea. There is no word which exactly expresses the thought which we wish to express under this head. High Churchmen speak of the sacramental principle, but by it they mean to convey the idea that the sign

\* Shorter Catechism, Q. 96.

and the thing signified always accompany each other. We use the word sacramental in this connection because it serves better than any other to express the thought that this ordinance, besides being a memorial service and symbolical of precious truth, is really a means of grace to those who receive it in faith, that in a real, though not in a bodily sense, Christ is present, and that in a spiritual, though not in a corporal manner, believers do feed upon him to their spiritual nourishment and growth in grace. It is a mistake to suppose that the Lord's Supper is only a memorial service or that it is merely a symbolical ordinance. The language used respecting it in the New Testament forbids our taking such a low view of it. Rejecting the Roman Catholic and Lutheran interpretations put upon the words of our Lord, it is nevertheless true that he did say, "This is my body," "This cup is the new testament in my blood." Remember, too, that Paul uses this strong language in regard to the eucharist: "Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let him examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation (judgment) to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." 1 Cor. xi. 27-29. We read also, 1 Cor. x. 16, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which he brake, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?"\* In this ordinance we not only remember Christ—we receive him.†

\* For remarks on these passages, see Bannerman, "The Church of Christ," vol. ii., p. 188.

† "Christ is really present to his people in this sacrament, not bodily, but in spirit, not in the sense of local nearness, but of efficacious operation. They receive him not with the mouth, but by faith; they receive his flesh and blood, not as flesh, not as material particles, not as human life, not the supernatural influence of his

The Lord's table is spread for the Lord's people. None but Christians should come to it, and none who are Christ's should be kept from it. Hence, in admitting persons to sealing ordinances, it is not right to require them to subscribe to an elaborate creed, or to exact from them more than a credible profession of faith.\* Men cannot read the heart, and Christ does not recognize a vicarious conscience.

Our Directory for Worship says: † "Children born within the pale of the visible Church, and dedicated to God in baptism, are under the inspection and government of the Church, and are to be taught to read and repeat the catechism, the apostles' creed and the Lord's Prayer. They are to be taught to pray, to abhor sin, to fear God and to obey the Lord Jesus Christ. And when they come to years of discretion, if they be free from scandal, appear sober and steady and have knowledge to discern the Lord's body, they ought to be informed it is their duty and their privilege to come to the Lord's Supper."

glorified body in heaven, but his body as broken and his blood as shed. The union thus signified and effected is not a corporeal union, not a mixture of substances, but a spiritual and mystical union due to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. The efficacy of this sacrament as a means of grace is not in the sign, nor in the service, nor in the minister, nor in the word, but in the attending influence of the Holy Ghost."—Hodge's Systematic Theology, vol. iii., p. 650.

\* "The principle (of communion), as it is notorious that the Presbyterian Church has always held it, does not constitute the pastor, elders or congregation judges of the actual conversion of the applicant, but, on the contrary, lays much responsibility on the applicant himself. The minister and kirk-session must be satisfied as to his competent knowledge, credible profession and consistent walk. They must determine negatively that there is no reason for pronouncing him not to be a Christian, but they do not undertake the responsibility of positively judging of his conversion."—Candlish, quoted by Hodge in "Outlines of Theology," p. 516.

† Chap. ix., § 1.

## III. PRAYER.

God is our Father. He loves us; he is able and willing to help us. We have access to him, and he has promised to hear us when we come to him in the name of Christ. We are invited to come boldly unto the throne of grace. We are assured that the Spirit maketh intercession in us, and that Christ ever liveth to make intercession for us. It is natural, then, that the child of God should seek communion with his Father in heaven. Saved by his grace, kept by his power, led by his Spirit, it would be strange if the Christian did not rejoice in the privilege of going to God with the language of adoration, thanksgiving, confession and petition on his lips.

And as prayer is the natural expression of religious feeling, so we might naturally expect that the religious life would be promoted by a prayerful habit. The face of Moses shone when he came down from the mount where he had talked with God. Nothing will impart radiance and beauty to Christian character like communion with God. He who would be God-like must walk with God as Enoch did. He who would resist the temptations of the world must descend to the daily duties of life from the mountain-top of prayer.

But it would be a great mistake to regard prayer as only a means of heightening our religious feelings and convictions, or to value it only for its reflex influence upon ourselves. One element in prayer is petition. God's blessings are given in answer to prayer. God says, "I will be inquired of by the house of Israel." Our Saviour says, "Ask," "seek," "knock." He tells us that earthly parents are not so willing to give good gifts unto their children as God is to give his Holy Spirit to them that ask him. Paul says, "Pray without ceasing." "In everything by prayer and thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto

God." We cannot complain if we lack the blessings which we have never craved. The Westminster Confession of Faith says, "Prayer, with thanksgiving, being one special part of religious worship, is by God required of all men; and that it may be accepted, it is to be made in the name of the Son, by the help of the Spirit, according to his will, with understanding, reverence, humility, fervency, faith, love and perseverance."\*

The subject of prayer presents difficulties to some minds.

1. It is asked how the unqualified promise of our Saviour, "If ye shall ask anything in my name I will do it," is to be reconciled with the fact that so many prayers are not answered, and with the additional fact that, in the nature of the case, all prayers cannot be answered, as, for instance, when on the eve of battle both armies pray for victory. In replying to this question we must inquire who are meant by "ye" in the passage referred to. Does Christ pledge himself in this promise to answer every request which may be made, without regard to the persons who make it or the spirit in which it is preferred? Surely not. The promise is to his disciples, and must be limited in its application to Christians. But do Christians desire that their requests should be unconditionally granted? Does a Christian so far forget himself as to presume to know better than God what he needs? Surely not. Then the words of our Saviour are to be explained by the words of John: "This is the confidence that we have in him, that if we ask anything *according to his will*, he heareth us." 1 John v. 14. It is a great blessing that God does not answer all our prayers.

2. It is said that since the physical world is under the control of law it is irrational to pray for rain in dry weather, for a prosperous voyage or for recovery from sickness. To this we reply that a theory which makes God the slave of his own laws, which represents him as leaving

\* Cap. xxi., § 3.

the universe under the exclusive control of physical causes, is unscriptural. We believe that "God's works of providence are his most holy, wise and powerful preserving and governing all his creatures and all their actions." Believing this, we believe that the area of prayer is as wide as that of our wants. Nor are we doubtful respecting the efficacy of prayer because we do not understand how it is answered. Whether God answers prayer by a direct exercise of divine power, or whether he does so by means of second causes, it matters not.\* "Prayer and the answer of prayer are simply the preferring of a request upon one side and the compliance with that request upon the other. Man applies; God complies. Man asks a favor; God bestows it."† This is enough.

3. It is urged again that if God has foreordained whatsoever comes to pass, prayer is unnecessary, since it cannot change his purpose. But God's purpose is all-comprehensive. He foreordains the prayer as well as the answer to the prayer. He has no more decreed the one than the other.

\* "I believe that God commonly answers prayer by natural means appointed for this purpose from the very beginning, when he gave to mind and matter their laws, and arranged the objects with these laws for the accomplishment of his wise and beneficent ends, for the encouragement of virtue and the discouragement of vice, and among others to provide an answer to the acceptable petitions of his people. God, in answer to prayer, may restore the patient by an original strength of constitution or by the well-timed application of a remedy. The believer is in need of a blessing, and he asks it; and he finds that the God who created the need and prompted the prayer has provided the means of granting what he needs."—Dr. McCosh in *Contemporary Review* for October, 1872.

† Chalmers, quoted by Dr. Hodge in "Systematic Theology," vol. iii., p. 694



## THE FUTURE STATE.

THE question of destiny is now to be considered. It is appointed unto men once to die, and after death—what? Before an answer is given to this question, notice must be taken of certain great events which are predicted in Scripture, and the occurrence of which will bring about the final consummation. These are, 1. The second advent; 2. The resurrection; 3. The judgment.

1. THE SECOND ADVENT.—The Church as Christ's army is to push its conquests until Jesus is owned the world over as King of kings and Lord of lords; then the Lord will come. That he is to come in person is abundantly taught in Scripture. He left the world with the promise that he would return: "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death, till he come." The disciples who watched his ascension heard these words from the angels: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." The writings of Paul abound in allusions to "the appearing of our Lord," "that day," "his coming," "the day of Jesus Christ;" and the Apocalypse closes with the prayer which is so often on Christian lips: "Even so, come, Lord Jesus, come quickly."

2. THE RESURRECTION.—The Scriptures clearly teach that there is to be a general resurrection of the righteous and the wicked, and they associate this event with the second coming of Christ: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Dan. xii. 2. "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall

come forth ; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life ; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation.' John v. 28, 29. " I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God : and the books were opened, and another book was opened, which is the book of life ; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the book, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell gave up the dead which were in them." Rev. xx. 12, 13. " We who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent [precede] them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God ; and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air ; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." 1 Thess. iv. 15, 17.

3. THE JUDGMENT.—Besides the doctrines of the second advent and the resurrection of the body, the Scriptures teach that there is to be a final judgment, and there are good reasons for believing that these three events are to be contemporaneous. The following are among the leading passages which refer to this subject : " For he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained." Acts xvii. 31. " We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. v. 10. " The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels : and then he shall reward every man according to his works." Matt. xvi. 27. " When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory ; and before him shall be gathered all nations ; and he shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth the

sheep from the goats; and he shall set the sheep on the right hand, but the goats on the left," etc. Matt. xxv. 31-33. "Then cometh the end." "The heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat; the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up."

We do not know how near or how remote the end may be. We do know, however, that when Christ comes those who are alive shall be changed and all who are in their graves shall come forth; and we know, moreover, that both quick and dead are to appear before the judgment seat of Christ.

In considering the subject treated in this lesson, we shall speak first of the state of the soul between death and the judgment, and, second, of its condition after the judgment.

#### I. BETWEEN DEATH AND THE JUDGMENT.

The doctrine of our Church on the condition of men between death and the resurrection is thus expressed in the Westminster Confession of Faith: \* "The bodies of men after death return to dust and see corruption, but their souls (which neither die nor sleep), having an immortal subsistence, immediately return to God who gave them. The souls of the righteous, being then made perfect in holiness, are received into the highest heavens, where they behold the face of God in light and glory, waiting for the full redemption of their bodies; and the souls of the wicked are cast into hell, where they remain in torments and utter darkness, reserved to the judgment of the great day. Besides these two places for souls separated from their bodies, the Scripture acknowledgeth none." This view is opposed, 1. To the doctrine of the "sleep of the soul;" 2. To that of "Hades;" 3. To the doctrine of "purgatory." Let us notice these briefly.

1. THE SLEEP OF THE SOUL.—Archbishop Whately has

\* Cap xxxii., § 1.

given the weight of his influence to the revolting idea that the soul falls into a state of unconsciousness at death, and remains in this condition until the resurrection. It is true that the Bible does speak of death as a sleep and of Christians as those "who sleep in Jesus;" and were there nothing positive on the subject in the Scriptures, we might think, perhaps, that the reference is to the soul as well as to the body. But it is difficult to understand how those who acknowledge the authority of the Bible can entertain this opinion. The dying Stephen saw the heavens opened and Jesus standing at the right hand of God. His last words were: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Jesus said to the penitent thief: "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Paul desired to "depart and be with Christ, which is far better." To depart and remain unconscious for two thousand years would not have been far better. Christians have died in every age of the Church, and are dying every day, in the confident expectation of entering heaven and of seeing Jesus. We shall need more evidence than Whately has furnished to assure us that they have all been deceived.\*

2. HADES.—This doctrine has always had its supporters, and it has many advocates at the present day. Briefly

\* "Here, for example, is a passage from David Brainerd's last days: 'Lord's day, September 27, 1747.—I was born on a Sabbath day, and I have a reason to think I was new born on a Sabbath day; and I hope I shall die on this Sabbath day.' 'I am almost in eternity; I long to be there.' 'I long to be in heaven, praising and glorifying God with the holy angels.' October 6 he lay as if he were dying. He was heard to utter in broken whispers such expressions as these: 'He will come; he will not tarry; I shall soon be in glory; I shall soon glorify God with the angels.' But Archbishop Whately thinks that for a hundred and thirteen years Brainerd has been utterly unconscious, and that all these anticipations are not to be fulfilled for perhaps several thousand years."—Adams' "Evenings with the Doctrines," p. 361.

stated, it is that there is a place intermediate between heaven and hell which is the abode of the dead during the period between death and the resurrection. The blessed dead go to Paradise, where they are in a state of happiness, though it is far inferior to that which is in store for them in heaven. The impenitent dead are in another region of Hades, where they await in misery the judgment of the great day and the infliction of the punishment of hell.

On this it is enough to remark that the foregoing doctrine is in harmony with the teaching of our standards in so far as it affirms that the righteous will not experience the highest blessedness until the resurrection. But it is at variance with them in affirming that there is a middle state or place which is the abode of departed spirits between death and the resurrection. The Bible knows nothing of this middle state or place of abode. Christ we know is in heaven, and those who die in Christ are with him.

3. PURGATORY.—The doctrine of the Church of Rome respecting the future state is embraced in its teachings respecting heaven, hell and purgatory. Heaven is the place of highest blessedness, and is the abode of three classes of persons: first, of the Old Testament saints who were detained in Hades as spirits in prison until the resurrection of Christ, when they were led out in triumph; second, of the few who attain perfection in this life; third, of those Christians who die without being perfect, and who are required to make satisfaction for their sins and to be purified by enduring the pains of purgatory. Hell is the place of endless torment, and is the abode of all heretics and of those who die in mortal sin. The doctrine of purgatory may be stated as follows: The atonement of Christ only delivers men from *eternal* punishment. Temporal punishments, and especially the pains of purgatory in the next world, still remain to be endured as satisfaction for sin. The Church of Rome has always claimed the right of regulating the kind and de-

gree of this punishment, and she has done this in three ways: (a) By indulgences. The doctrine of the Church of Rome is that the "temporal pain, owing to the justice of God, either before or after death, . . . may be remitted by an application of the merits of Christ and of the saints, out of the treasury of the Church, the dispensation of which treasure is given to the bishops." A man might take his choice of doing penance or buying an indulgence. (b) By the sacrament of penance. Mortal sins, if not forgiven, render men liable to the pains of hell. To be forgiven they must be confessed to a priest. He then absolves from the penalty of eternal death, and prescribes the penance which must be performed as a temporal satisfaction. (c) By the mass. This is a propitiatory sacrifice, and avails for those for whom it is intended by the officiating priest, whether they be on earth or in purgatory. Thus it will be seen that this doctrine places the destinies of men in the hands of the Romish priesthood; and it can readily be inferred that it is a source of great power and emolument. But it is as false as it is pernicious.

(a.) There is not a syllable in the Bible which lends it the least support. It is true that our Lord said the sin against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven either in this world or in the world to come. He did not mean, however, that some sins may be forgiven in the next world, but only that this sin shall never be forgiven. The Scriptures teach that nothing that defileth shall enter heaven, and it is not claimed that men reach a state of sinless perfection in this life. But these facts do not prove the doctrine of purgatory, nor are they enough to show that the Christian carries the infirmities of his sinful nature with him into the next world; we reach a different conclusion from these facts. For since it is true that men do not attain to sinless perfection in this life, and that there is nothing sinful in heaven, and that Christians go to heaven when they die, we conclude that the

“souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness.”

(b.) The doctrine is based on a false assumption. Those who maintain it assume that Christ has not made a complete satisfaction for sin. Hence there is great similarity between the doctrine of purgatory and the creed of a certain class of Universalists. The latter reject the atonement, and say that God always punishes men for their sins. Men who lead wicked lives, they say, must expect to be miserable in the next world. But the end of punishment is the good of the offender, and the result of it will be universal restoration to holiness and heaven. What the Universalists of this class believe respecting all men the Roman Catholics believe respecting all who go to purgatory. The answer to both is the same. We cannot make satisfaction for own sins, and we need not, for Christ has borne our sins in his own body on the tree.

(c.) The doctrine of purgatory contradicts the word of God. The Bible says that there is no condemnation to the Christian, that he hath eternal life, that when he dies he is blessed, and that for him to depart is to be with Christ.

## II. AFTER THE JUDGMENT.

The statements of Scripture in respect to the judgment are very explicit. Thus, we read, “The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day.” Jude 6. “Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. . . . Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. . . . And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal” Matt. xxiv. 34–46. In

these passages the Scripture doctrine of hell and heaven is unfolded—to wit: that the wicked shall share the fate of the devil and the fallen angels and be the subjects of eternal suffering, and that the righteous shall be welcomed into the enjoyment of everlasting happiness. Let us state the doctrine more fully.

1. HELL.—The teaching of Scripture and the belief of the Christian Church is that the impenitent are punished in the next world, that the punishment is everlasting, and that it consists in pain. This doctrine is opposed (*a*) by the Universalists, properly so called, who deny that any punishment awaits men in the next world; (*b*) by the Restorationists, who admit the fact of future punishment, but deny that it is everlasting; (*c*) by the Annihilationists, who agree with the orthodox view in respect to the fact and the duration of future punishment, but deny that it consists in positive suffering or pain.

(*a*.) The Universalists. The Bible says that God is not willing that any should perish, and that he is the Saviour of all men, especially of those who believe. It says, too, that Christ “tasted death for every man,” and that he died “that the world through him might be saved.” We cannot discuss the meaning of these and similar passages which are such favorites with the Universalists, but we know that they do not teach that all men go to heaven, for the Bible distinctly asserts that some do go to hell. “These shall go away into everlasting punishment;” “The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them who know not God.” To say, as Ballou says, that the punishment spoken of in the Bible refers exclusively to sufferings endured in this life is simply absurd. Better renounce the authority of the Bible at once than trifle in this way with its most solemn facts.

(*b*.) The Restorationists. A great many, probably the



greater number, of those who belong to the Universalist denomination in this country admit that there is a punishment in store for the wicked in the next world, but they deny that it is eternal. They support their position by saying that God is too benevolent to allow his creatures to suffer eternally; that it would be derogatory to God's majesty for evil to have a place in his universe through all eternity; that punishment is for the good of the offender and must result in the sinner's restoration; and, finally, that the word *aionios* does not mean everlasting but only a limited period. To which it is enough to reply that we are not competent to say what God may or may not do; that there is no argument against the continuance of evil in the world which would not apply as well to its introduction and to its present existence; that the Bible does not intimate that the punishment of the wicked is a remedial measure; and that if the words used to express the duration of punishment do not teach that it is eternal it is difficult to tell how the idea of eternity could have been expressed. The same word is used to express the duration of punishment which, in a coordinate clause of the same verse, is used to express the duration of happiness. "We must either admit the endless misery of hell or give up the endless happiness of heaven."

(c.) The Annihilationists. The argument mainly employed by this class of men is based on the alleged meaning of the words "life" and "death." Put into syllogistic form, it comes to this: Life always and only means existence; death, non-existence. But the punishment of sin is death; therefore the punishment of sin is non-existence, or extinction of being. It must be admitted that if the word "death" is correctly defined in this argument it overthrows the doctrine of eternal punishment, but it must also be admitted that it makes nonsense at the same time of half the passages in which the word occurs. But death, as descriptive of the punishment of the lost, does not mean annihilation or extinc-

tion of being, for there are degrees of punishment, but no degree of death in the sense referred to. One stone is as dead as another. Death does not mean extinction of being, for the punishment of the wicked is torment: "And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever. . . . And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death." Rev. xx. 10, 14.

2. HEAVEN.—In answer to the question, What benefits do believers receive from Christ at the resurrection? the Shorter Catechism says: "At the resurrection, believers, being raised up in glory, shall be openly acknowledged and acquitted in the day of judgment, and made perfectly blessed in the full enjoying of God to all eternity." If the Bible fails to gratify our curiosity by answering all our inquiries respecting heaven, it does not leave us altogether in the dark. We know that this mortal shall put on immortality, and that the body of the believer is to be fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body. The Christian shall see Christ, shall behold his glory, shall be like him, shall be welcomed into the joy of his Lord. Faith will become sight and hope fruition. Now he knows in part, but then shall he know even as also he is known. He will sin no more, sorrow no more. His inheritance is incorruptible, undefiled and fadeth not away. Tears are wiped away from all faces. Entering heaven, the weary finds rest, the wanderer a home, and the pilgrim leaves his tent for a city that hath foundations. Earth's sinning Christians shall wear white robes. Earth's sorrowing disciples shall waken notes of joy from harps of gold.











