

All Rights Reserved By HDM For This Digital Publication
Copyright 1999 Holiness Data Ministry

Duplication of this CD by any means is forbidden, and
copies of individual files must be made in accordance with
the restrictions stated in the B4Ucopy.txt file on this CD.

* * * * *

WHAT IS TRUTH?

By Luke Woodard

By the same author:
The Morning Star
Gathered Fragments
Poems For The Fireside
Sketches of a Life of 75

"Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." -- John 8:31-32

Press of Knapp, Peck, and Thomson
Auburn, New York
1901

* * * * *

Digital Edition 06/30/99
By Holiness Data Ministry

* * * * *

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Luke Woodard was a Quaker minister, and one of the witnesses whose holiness testimonies were published in S. Olin Garrison's book, "Forty Witnesses." HDM currently has one other book by Luke Woodard in our Library: "Sketches of A Life of 75" -- hdm0870.tex.

Argus E. Ogborn, a previous owner of this printed book, inscribed in the front of the book the following about Luke Woodard -- (arrangement mine):

"Auburn, N. Y., 1901
"1st Ed. (of the book)

"Author -- The Quaker Minister of Fountain City (Old Newport) Ind. Quite a prolific writer -- We have a number of volumes from his pen.

"Luke Woodard & Alvira Townsend married at West Grove Wayne Co. Ind. 4th Mo. (April) 14, 1853. The Woodards, Parkers, Peels came from England. The Townsends came from England with Wm. Penn in the good ship 'Welcome'." -- A. Ogborn

* * * * *

PREFACE

In issuing this book, whatever may be the estimate of its readers as to its merits, the author is conscious of a worthy aim -- to answer in some measure the question that constitutes its title, What Is Truth.

A book of this character, cannot in the very nature of the case as to its subject matter, be original. While the style and arrangement are the author's, he has endeavored to avoid adducing anything as a truth for which he did not feel he had sufficient authority. The truths dealt with are of two classes: natural, and supernatural or spiritual. The appeal has been accordingly, to scientists for the one class, and to the Bible for the other. If any should take issue with the conclusions reached, their contention must necessarily be not with the author of the book, but with the authorities to which he has appealed. Its plan is such as to require it to be read entire in order to be fairly and intelligently estimated. It is prayerfully commended to the candid reader, and to the blessing of Him for whose cause it has been written. I may adopt the language of Cowper:

"But all is in his hand whose praise I seek,
Whose frown can disappoint the proudest strain
Whose approbation prosper even mine."

1901

* * * * *

To Him
To Whom I Have
Dedicated Myself,
And
To Whose Cause
I Have
Dedicated My Service,
I Now Dedicate
This Little Volume.

* * * * *

CONTENTS

01 -- INTRODUCTORY

Various kinds of Truth -- Natural and Spiritual. Each must be sought on its own line.

* * *

02 -- REVELATION

Revealed or Spiritual Truths, known only as God has revealed them. What they are. Progressive revelation. What is meant by the term.

* * *

03 -- INSPIRATION

What it is. Distinguished from Revelation. Both the Old Testament and the New inspired. Genius not inspiration. Relative authority of the sayings of our Lord and of His apostles.

* * *

04 -- THE BIBLE

Evidence of its inspiration. Old and New Testaments. Their inter-relation. Genuineness and authenticity of each confirmatory of the other.

* * *

05 -- FAITH

Objective -- Subjective. Over-Credulity believing too easily, results in superstition and imposture. Incredulity believing too little, results in infidelity. Reason and faith; the province of each.

* * *

06 -- THE ATONEMENT

In what it consists. Various views, Moral influence theory, specious yet dangerous. Importance of this subject. Its bearing on other doctrines -- Sin, The divine government and the Deity of Christ.

* * *

APPENDIX A -- Geology and Genesis

* * *

APPENDIX B -- Modern Theory of Evolution

* * *

APPENDIX C -- The Human Life of Our Lord

* * *

APPENDIX D -- The Fatherhood of God

* * *

APPENDIX E -- "The Truth Shall Make You Free"

* * *

APPENDIX F -- The Divine Immanence

* * * * *

01 -- INTRODUCTORY

What is truth? This, Cowper says, "was Pilate's question put to truth itself." It is an important question. It is one which has found expression in some form, in every age, and by every class, It is still the question of humanity. It is true it is not asked by all with equal candor, nor with reference to the same things, for there are various kinds of truth. But the inquisitive nature of the child which manifests itself with its opening intelligence in puzzling questions as to the "what," the "how," the "wherefore" of numberless things, has its counterpart in every succeeding stage of human life, and shows itself in varied and endless investigation. A desire to know is innate. It is the gateway to knowledge. No sooner is one truth discovered than it leads to a desire to know some antecedent, or consequent, or relative truth, and the field widens, and the more we come to know, the more we find there is that we do not know, hence the ceaseless inquiry What is truth?

I have said there are various kinds of truth. These may be classified as (1) Natural truth, and (2) Religious or Spiritual truth. The first embraces the historic and the scientific; religious or spiritual truth embraces the historical, the doctrinal and the experimental.

Every truth in whatever realm it is found as contrasted with error, is important, but all truths are not equally important. We might in some things mistake error for truth, without serious results, but not so in everything. Candor and sincerity are valuable qualities, and may greatly aid in reaching correct conclusions, but sincerity in the pursuit of a wrong path, cannot relieve us from the consequence of our mistake, as when a traveler on a cloudy day having lost the points of the compass takes the wrong end of the road, however confident and sincere he may be, he arrives at the wrong point. Indeed his confidence and sincerity operate to his disadvantage if they induce a

neglect of needful inquiry, or a disregard of trustworthy information. If such a traveler only suffers the inconvenience and extra expense and labor of a useless day's journey, the mistake is comparatively trivial, and may soon be corrected; but if, trusting to a guide board, carelessly or designedly placed on the wrong side of the road, and pointing the wrong way, he pursued a course the opposite of the one he should have taken, and fell among thieves who strip him, rob him and leave him maimed for life, his sincerity did not save him from disaster, nor does it relieve him of the life-long consequence of misplaced confidence. He is the more inexcusable if he passed without inquiring of those who could and would have informed him better; more inexcusable still, if, in over-confidence in the correctness of his own decision, he disregarded the timely warning of those who were in a position to know.

Every kind of truth must be sought on its own line. For one kind we search with the telescope, for another kind we employ the microscope; the astronomer has no use for the microscope in his survey of the heavens, nor does the microscopist employ the telescope in his field of research. For historic truth we study history, not mathematics or chemistry. Some truths are discovered or confirmed by exploration and travel; others by experimentation. Some are axiomatic, or self-evident.

Theoretical problems may be investigated by deductive and inductive methods, but no conclusion reached by such a process can scientifically be accepted as a certainty until it can be shown that such result and no other, is within the bounds of possibility. It may be plausible, but it cannot be said to be proved.

We gain a knowledge of truth often by our own observation through the medium of one or more of our senses. This we call positive knowledge. We acquire information concerning many things through the testimony of others. The principal part of our knowledge is obtained in this way. So conclusive is the evidence in a great variety of things which we believe on such testimony, that we do not hesitate to say they are true. Judicial decisions involving the most sacred interests of men -- position, property, reputation, liberty and even life itself are based upon human testimony. Legal proceedings are instituted where evidence is called into requisition to answer the question, What is truth? An amount of evidence sufficient to justify a conclusion is called proof. In weighing such evidence, the veracity of a witness, his opportunity to know, his accuracy of observation, and his capacity to judge; any possible bias, or otherwise, through personal interest, together with the corroborative testimony, or the contrary, of other witnesses, must all be taken into account.

Thus, in our search after natural truth, we do not hesitate to avail ourselves of the knowledge and researches of others. This involves faith in men and reliance on human testimony. Without this the ordinary affairs of society could not be carried on. Our schools, our textbooks, our histories, our geographies, our biographies, would be almost useless. But in this way the events of past generations, those beyond the sphere of our own observation in lands we never visited, the scientific discoveries in regions which we have never explored; the results of painstaking experiments and investigations, which we did not ourselves make, become a part of our own stock of knowledge when we acquaint ourselves with, and credit the statements of others. Books on Astronomy, Geology, Biology, Botany, etc., are capable, if I study them, of putting me in possession of facts which the writers of those books learned, it may be, by persevering research, investigation, and experiments. I reap the results of their labors, and gain the same knowledge

without repeating the process of investigation. Thus, I cannot measure the distance of the sun from the earth, but another, fully taught in mathematical astronomy, tells me he has calculated that distance and it is so many millions of miles; on the supposition that his statement is correct, I know what he knows in this particular -- the distance of the sun from the earth.

Truth is absolute, and not a variable quantity. No truth in any department can be contradictory of any other truth. If there is positive disagreement between two theories concerning the same thing, it is certain that both can not be correct.

A partial truth, or rather part of a truth, while not contradicting other parts, will be misleading if accepted as the whole. Thus, a man may tell me a certain church tower has a clock dial on its east side. If I infer from this that it has but the one dial, when in fact it has one on each of its four sides, I am wrong in my inference, while he is correct in his statement. If he says there was but the one dial, because he saw but one, I must know he was in position to see, before I accept his testimony as true.

Truth but partially understood may appear to be inconsistent with some other known truth. Thus: We will suppose someone of observing mind, living all his life on some hot tropical island, one who had never come in contact with books or people from colder latitudes, till at last some explorer of intelligence visits him. To the question: What effect has heat upon metals? the islander would answer -- "It expands them." His answer would be the same if asked -- What effect has it upon liquids? This would be true as far as he had had opportunity to observe; but not absolutely true, as we know that water, varying from the law as applied to metals, expands with both heat and cold. Reasoning from analogy in the absence of certain data had led to a wrong conclusion. The seeming contradiction, in the light of further discovery, disappears.

* * * * *

02 -- REVELATION

Much of what we call religious, or spiritual truth, is such as is not discoverable by the unaided powers of the human mind. If it is not knowable in this way, is it knowable at all? Agnosticism says, no. Christian faith, and the truest reason say, yes. How? Truth of this class must be sought on its own line. It is first of all a matter of revelation.

Revelation means putting back the veil, so that that which was unknown, or known but imperfectly, might be known, or better known. To admit the existence of a God is to admit the possibility of a revelation; that is, that a Being of infinite power and wisdom can make known to man all those things which are embraced in what is commonly understood by the term revealed religion, which, if known by us, must be revealed. Of this class are the being and attributes of God; the creation of the universe; of animate nature, life, spirit; especially the creation of man, and those higher orders of beings, angels; the introduction of moral evil into the world, and not only the origin of sin, but what it really is; the future life and the immortality of the soul; the resurrection of the dead, and the final judgment; the future destiny of the earth; the second coming of Christ and the ultimate triumph of His kingdom. Added to these are some other doctrinal elements of Christianity,

embracing experimental religion. The making known these truths and others related to them is revelation.

The place of reason in matters of revelation will be treated of in a future paper. To the statement already made that truest reason accords with the idea of the possibility of the omnipotent Creator making known "secret things" to His rational creature, man, I will simply add that a belief that He has done so in no wise conflicts with a rational conception of man's position in the scale of being, and of his accountability to his Sovereign Creator.

There is much in nature as we see its various aspects, and observe its manifold phenomena that confirms in no inconsiderable degree the truths of revealed religion. [1] How true the Psalmist's expression, "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament sheweth His handiwork." When the Lord, speaking to His Servant Job out of the whirlwind would humble him under a sense of His majesty, wisdom and power, He caused to pass as it were, in panoramic view before the mind of the patriarch the handiwork of the infinite Author of Nature. The inspired apostle testifies that "the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and godhead," and in reasoning with the learned Athenians he rebukes their idolatry by a reference to the works of creation as evidence of the prior existence of a Creator, who, in the very nature of things must be distinct from, and infinitely greater than His works. Thus, atheism with its declaration -- there is no God; pantheism, which regards Him as identical with the material universe; and polytheism manifested in various pagan idolatries with its lords many and gods many -- in one nation, in the worship of the host of heaven, sun, moon, and stars; in another in that of birds, beasts and creeping things; in another in the worship of images of wood and stone graven with art and man's device; and in yet others in the deification of heroes mythical, or real -- these which are so unequivocally condemned by revealed religion as embodied in the Holy Scriptures, are also incompatible with a truly enlightened interpretation of the book of nature.

But while it is true nature furnishes indubitable evidences of the existence of her Divine Author, the insufficiency of such proofs to convey to the human mind an adequate and satisfactory knowledge of the Divine Being is abundantly evidenced by the facts of universal history. The natural, rather than the moral attributes of God, "even His eternal power and godhead," are manifested "by the things that are made." While it is true that many indications of wise forethought, and benevolent design can be traced in the outward creation, it is in the Holy Scriptures alone that we find explicit and consistent testimony that God is love; that He is holy, merciful and just. Throughout their pages He is made known as He proclaims Himself to Moses: "The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long suffering, abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty." Ex. 34:67.

That God is a spirit, that He is one Lord, and yet subsists in a mysterious trinity of being as Father, Son and Holy Ghost -- this great truth of revelation is such as no research by the natural powers of the human mind, wherever directed in the heavens above, or in the earth beneath, could ever have discovered. To the question, "Canst thou by searching find out God; canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" we can truthfully give none but a negative answer. "Oh the depth of

the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out?"

Man also finds in, and relating to himself, mysteries that his natural powers could not have discovered, and which his reason can not resolve. Man's existence can not to the rational mind be accounted for on any other ground than that he had a Creator; yet while this may be stated as a postulate of natural religion, revelation alone can supply any of the particulars. From that source we derive the information that "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul." [2]

In reference to the origin of the human family, the question, What was man's primeval condition in a moral point of view? naturally suggests itself. Was he made as we see him now, under the dominion of sin, prone to evil, with the works of the flesh, "emulation, wrath, strife, lasciviousness, lust, envy, pride and such like," manifesting themselves in practical life? This puzzling and inexplicable "mystery of iniquity," to be seen wherever man is found, and which has marked all the ages of human existence, is accounted for in the Holy Scriptures. So far from being created with a corrupt and distorted moral nature, revelation informs us that "God made man in His own image; in the image of God created He him," and this image is defined as righteousness and true holiness. In common with the other works of His hand, he was pronounced "good." In vain would reason search by its own light, even by the aid of science, for an explanation of the origin of this degeneracy. Revelation alone has given it to us. Here we are informed that "by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners; by one man sin entered the world, and death by sin; in Adam all die."

This of itself is not the solution of the whole mystery. Man naturally presses the inquiry further. What induced primeval man to sin? But he is dependent on other powers than his own to obtain the true answer. The earlier chapters of our Bible, interpreted by New Testament writers, break the awful secret to us. The scene in Eden is depicted for us, where the serpent, that old serpent which is Satan, the devil, beguiled Eve by his subtlety, leading her, and through her influence, her husband, the first man Adam, to transgress the law of God. This brought the penalty of death in a spiritual sense, and ultimately of temporal death, and through this natural head of the human family, entailed the same as an awful heritage upon all his posterity.

The revelation of related truth naturally raises inquiry in regard to that which is antecedent to it. Hence the account just mentioned of the temptation and fall of our first parents, involves the previous question as to the agent tempting. Who is Satan, and whence did he originate? Here we must admit, we have reached, as regards the past, the boundary of direct historic information. The existence of such a being as the devil, like that of God himself, is assumed, rather than explained by the sacred writers; yet the authority so far as the Bible is concerned, for believing there is such a being, is of the same character as that for belief in the existence of a God -- viz., repeated mention of him in language which by no rules of fair interpretation, could be applied to anything other than an intelligent personality, as much independent of and distinct from man, or any other being, as one man is distinct from another, or from any other creature. This statement must suffice for my purpose here without adducing verifying examples.

The Scriptures, however, while not furnishing us with elaborate details, give us some glimpses touching this mysterious problem. First, as to the origin. Since God is the Creator of all things by Jesus Christ, (for "by Him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by Him and for Him; and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist,") as therefore, Jehovah is the only self-existent being, it follows that the devil is a creature, and was brought into existence by the creative power of God. But He being infinitely good, it cannot be supposed He would create a being who at the time of his creation, was wholly evil. In seeking the solution of this mysterious problem we are entirely dependent upon revelation, and even here we are shut up to a picture, as it were, in shadowy outline, rather than in clear perspective, and well-defined detail.

We are, to use a figure, like the astronomer who, looking into the stellar heavens, sees unmistakably, numberless stars in remote regions of space, yet is unable by all available means, to discover such minutia as to attendant Systems of planets, satellites, comets, etc., as the telescope reveals concerning our own solar system. The Bible informs us that there is a higher order of beings called angels; that there are myriads of them; that their abode is in heaven; that they are employed in the service of God, sometimes in ministering to men -- ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation; sometimes have been sent with messages direct from God; sometimes to execute upon the ungodly His righteous judgments. This is more than the unaided powers of man could have discovered, and minute details are still veiled in mystery. Just when the angels were created, and how, -- that is. whether from a single created pair, as with the human race, the rest descended by some mysterious law of generation, or whether they were all immediately created -- upon these, revelation is silent, and for us to speak where God has been silent, is folly and sinful presumption.

This much further is revealed; that there were angels that "kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation," that they sinned, and were cast out of their happy abode, and are reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." We are further told that the devil abode not in the truth, a murderer, sinning from the beginning; as he is spoken of as having angels under him, it is clearly inferable that he is the prince of this rebellious host; but where their "own habitation" was, all that may be involved in the phrase "their first estate," in precisely what their sin consisted, and how long before man was created their rebellion occurred -- these are unrevealed. The poetic genius of a Milton may entertain us with striking pictures of imagination, but cannot be accepted as a discovery of truth. Such flights of imaginative genius, if accepted only as such, as the author intended, may be harmless, but cannot be taken as an answer to the question, what is truth?

That this apostate angel, the devil, tempted our first parents; tempted our Saviour; tempts man still, going about as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour; that there is a legion of diabolical spirits, called demons that are able to take possession of men, under at least some conditions, and that through these diabolical agencies, the kingdom of Christ and His work, are being stoutly resisted by a power too strong for mere human strength, and a cunning too great for mere human wisdom, is clearly revealed in Holy Scripture; yet we are assured withal, that upon condition of complete trust in Jesus Christ and continued watchfulness and prayer, the devil and all his host will be foiled and the child of God will be made victorious, and that finally the devil and

his angels will be vanquished by our all-conquering Lord, and cast into the awful abode which is prepared for them.

I have already remarked that man finds in, and relating to himself, mysteries which his own unassisted powers can not resolve. This applies not only to his origin, but also to his destiny. The analogy of nature -- the worm, the chrysalis producing the butterfly; the germination and growth of seeds and plants, whose nourishment is supplied by the decay of other organic substances; the universal belief, even among the wildest tribes of uncultivated men, in a future life; the recoil of our very nature from the thought of extinction -- these go far to suggest the probability of a future state, but they are not proofs. All history shows that they do not afford a satisfactory answer to the question: "If a man die, shall he live again?" How thankful we should be that a truth of so much concern to us, has been revealed. Our blessed Redeemer coming into the world to save sinners, has likewise brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. He gives His followers the consoling assurance that in His Father's house are many mansions, and that He goes to prepare a place for them. "And," said He, "if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also." To the thief in the hour of his dying He said, "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise."

The inspired apostles in varied, but unmistakable language, make known the same glorious truth. How explicit the statement of the apostle Paul: "To depart and be with Christ is far better." Such utterances teach us that death neither ends, nor suspends our conscious life. But where shall we find the answer to the question: "Will some other event, possibly in remote ages to come, totally extinguish our being?" Science, philosophy, reason, nature, cannot answer this question. Revelation unfolds to us the certain prospect of an endless perpetuity of existence. Christ declares concerning those who attain that world and the resurrection of the dead, that they cannot die any more, and will be as the angels of God in heaven. In the great day when, sitting upon the throne of His glory, He judges the nations, He will welcome the righteous to their inheritance of the everlasting kingdom, when "these shall go into life eternal." Here again the apostles take up the refrain, and utter the same lofty truth. The saints in light are represented as having an "eternal inheritance," one that fadeth not away; in the city of God there is to be "no more death, for the former things have passed away.

But here arises another question which revelation alone can settle for us: Will the future life involve, as our present, the intermingling of good and evil? No. The angels are to gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; the Son of Man will separate the righteous from the wicked as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats; into the heavenly Jerusalem nothing unholy will be permitted to enter; there the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest. The separation is to be a final one. Between the two classes there is a great gulf fixed, so as to admit no passing from the one to the other, and endless existence is the heritage of one equally with the other, the difference consisting in place and state, rather in the matter of duration. "These (the wicked) shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into everlasting life." Matt. 25:46.

There is another point relating to our own being regarding which we are dependent on revelation alone for information. It is the resurrection of the dead. The Lord Jesus announces this truth in language not to be mistaken: "The hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall

hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall come forth; they that have done good, to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, to the resurrection of damnation." Repeated apostolic statements confirm the same. "There shall be a resurrection both of the just and the unjust." Christ's own resurrection, a historic fact of the gospel authenticated beyond all reasonable question, is brought in proof: "By man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead; but every man in his own order, Christ the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at His coming."

And associated with this sublime doctrine, equally important, and equally a matter of revelation, is that of the translation of the saints. A mystery hidden from reason, is yet shown by revelation: "Behold I show you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." The reader will find this mystery further unfolded in other portions of the fifteenth chapter of 1st Cor. from which the above quotation is made, and one very similar in I Thess. 4:13-18, as well as other texts, which for brevity sake I will not transcribe.

It will also appear, as these texts are read, that still another important truth is referred to, which is perhaps as clearly revealed as any in all the New Testament. I refer to the second coming of the Lord. He, Himself, repeatedly spoke of it; the angels at His ascension announced His return; it was a prominent theme with the apostles both in their preaching and writings. This blessed hope and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Savior Jesus Christ, which no human sagacity could have discovered, is one of unspeakable comfort to the expectant believer, who joyfully responds: "Even so, Lord Jesus, come quickly."

His triumphant and eternal reign from that time forth, is another important fact of revealed truth, as is also His present intercession in heaven, where He is gone to appear in the presence of God for us. His miraculous birth, His oneness with the Father and the Spirit, His invisible presence with the true believer in the person of the Holy Spirit, and the believer's union with Him; the soul's regeneration and the sanctifying efficacy of His precious blood, and the power-enduing fullness of His Spirit; the doctrine of justification by faith: these are not matters searched out by mere human reason, but revealed to us by the Spirit, and recorded for our learning, and some of them blessedly known by experience.

One other point remains to be mentioned as a part of revelation -- the future destiny of the earth on which we live. Much as science may aid us to a knowledge of the present structure of the earth, and in regard to the geologic changes of the ages past, it leaves us uninformed as to its future. Scoffers may begin to say, "Where is the promise of His coming, for all things continue as they were from the beginning?" On this mistaken assertion they may base an expectation of the uninterrupted continuance of the present order of nature. But such an expectation is doomed to disappointment. "For the heavens and the earth which now are," says divine revelation, "are reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men... For the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night in which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, and the earth, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up." To this startling truth of revelation, is added yet another one of assured hope:

"Nevertheless, we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." [3]

* * * * *

03 -- INSPIRATION

Inspiration is distinguished from revelation in that the former relates to the means and the method, the latter to the result. We say a man is inspired; a truth is revealed. A belief in revealed religion simply involves this: That the infinite God has chosen in the past, at sundry times, and in divers manners, to communicate to mankind, through agents of His own selection -- patriarchs, prophets, His own Son, His apostles, a knowledge of His will, and of many things it is of the utmost importance we should know, some of which, at least, could be known only as he was pleased to reveal them, and these communications were, by His authority and under His superintendence, committed to writing and preserved for the information of those whether in contemporaneous, or succeeding times, to whom no such immediate communications were made. In other words it was a revelation made first to men, then through men. The method of communication was in "divers manners," as by audible voice of God or angel, by vision, by dream, or by an immediate, intelligible influence of the Spirit of God.

It will thus be seen that revelation, such as we have been considering, necessarily implies divine inspiration; that is, that the persons so employed were inspired -- they spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

This selection of a comparatively few special agents, instead of communicating immediately to each human being, does not imply any limit of His power; but the choice of His wisdom: "I thank thee," said our blessed Lord, "O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so Father, for so it seemed good in Thy sight." To be employed thus as mediums of divine communication, does not imply a supernatural cast of beings, or of men who, as men, were free from the limitations and infirmities belonging to the human family; or that they were possessed of infinite knowledge. As was said of Elias, one of the most remarkable of prophets, so it might be said of all the sacred writers -- they were men "subject to like passions as we are." All that is necessarily claimed for them is that their natural faculties were, for the time being, and for that specific purpose, supernaturally influenced. An attempt to explain inspiration, would be like an attempt to explain the miracle of creation, or other miracle, such as the feeding of the multitude from a small supply of food, when creative power was brought into exercise. Such things belong to the realm of the supernatural, and are not susceptible of explanation or demonstration by merely natural means. Such facts may be known, but the how, is an insolvable mystery. The solution of the miraculous, divine inspiration included, is found only by referring all to the wisdom and power of God. This much, however, as we search the Holy Scriptures, becomes apparent -- that those holy men of old were conscious of receiving messages from God which they were authorized to communicate to others. When they heard an audible voice of God or angel, as on various occasions occurred, it was for them to make intelligible report of at least the import of the message; if God spoke by dream, the dream, if God so directed, could be told; if a vision was granted, he who beheld it could describe it whether he understood its meaning or not. Sometimes in such cases, explanations

were given and sometimes they were withheld. These unexplained visions, such as some of Ezekiel's, Daniel's and those of John in the book of Revelation -- are not to be discarded as useless. Events yet to occur, will, we doubt not, make their interpretation plain, as fulfillment has made other prophecies plain, and as anti-type reveals the meaning of type.

It is not necessary for us to understand how God made extensive communications to men with the minuteness of exact description with reference to both past and future events, as He did to Moses, touching creation, and in some of the latter chapters of Deuteronomy, foretelling the fate of His people; as He did to Job in that sublime poem which finds no parallel on any uninspired page; as He did to Isaiah, in his predictive prophecy -- so accurately fulfilled generations afterwards, of the downfall of Babylon, the glory of kingdoms, and the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency -- it is not needful for us to know precisely how such things were made known to those holy men, in order to accept them as given by inspiration of God, and therefore true.

But, it may be asked, if we claim inspiration for such portions of the Bible as those just mentioned, why claim it for those which appear in the form of common history? The distinction already drawn at the beginning of this chapter, between revelation and inspiration, must be borne in mind. A man may be inspired, supernaturally influenced, and directed by the Spirit, to commit to writing things which he knew by the ordinary sources of information, as well as those supernaturally revealed. This is what is claimed for the historic portions of the Bible where simply current events are chronicled; that the Lord made known to his servants, the patriarchs, the prophets, and the apostles, what He would have them record, directed and superintended them by His unerring Spirit, so that the narration was truthful, assisting their memory in the recall of events and conversations of the past. This statement finds support by such Scriptures as Numbers 33:2-49, where it is written: "And Moses wrote their goings out according to their journeys, by the commandment of the Lord." And again in Deut. 31:24-26 where Moses is mentioned as writing "the words of this law in a book until they were finished." Such texts as these, and the form of the four later books of the Pentateuch, give strong ground to believe that Moses by divine direction, kept a journal-like record of the history of Israel up to near the time of his death; that this was followed perhaps by Joshua, and on through succeeding ages, by others who were in like manner divinely directed in this work. So also the four Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles, which appear in the form of history, may be accepted not only as correct, but as written by the authority, and under the direction of the Holy Spirit, whom Christ promised to send to His disciples; who should guide them into all truth, and who should bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever He had said unto them.

Such a miraculous, (if we may call it so,) assistance of the minds of those thus employed, is neither impossible, nor unreasonable in the light of the unlimited power of the great Revealer, nor is it inconsistent with the amazing end for which the Gospel is given.

It is not necessary to suppose that inspiration made of one so inspired a mere automaton, with every thought clothed as it were in ready-made dress. Any one who reads attentively his Bible, will find many instances where express words were spoken in the ears of patriarchs, seers, prophets and apostles; other instances where, under an immediate divine afflatus of the most extraordinary kind, they gave expression to thoughts not of their own thinking and uttered in phrases to which the Holy Ghost, rather than themselves gave form. Such, doubtless, were some of

the sublime and poetic strains of the prophets; such impromptu songs as those of Mary, Zacharias and Elizabeth, and the speaking with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance. But where simple narration of facts is all that is involved, it detracts nothing from the true idea of inspiration to suppose that the speaker or writer was left free to express the ideas or facts he wished to communicate in a style characteristic of his own peculiar cast of mind. Hence, we find men equally inspired, as Peter, John, Paul and James, exhibiting a style each peculiar to himself. Indeed, we find some of the sacred writers describing the same thing with considerable variation in their modes of expression. It is well, however, to bear in mind that variety is not contradiction. The testimony of two witnesses is valued all the more, where there is sufficient variation to remove all ground of suspicion of collusion, and yet where there is substantial accord as to matter of fact.

We therefore believe, that the writers of the Holy Scriptures were so influenced by the Spirit of God, that their records of history, prophecy and doctrine are true, and entitled to the claim accorded by the apostle, viz.: That they were "given by inspiration of God and are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

The question is sometimes raised as to the relative authority of the sayings attributed to Christ, and those of His prophets and apostles. As to a comparison of the persons in the two cases respectively: no true believer will for a moment hesitate in according to our Lord a place far above man or angel; but in communicating divine messages, those of which He was the author and inspirer through His Spirit, though conveyed through human instruments, should not be assigned a place of less authority, than those expressed by Himself without any mediate instrumentality. This is a necessary conclusion, if we admit the inspiration of prophets and apostles. Such inspiration the prophets claimed for themselves. When they spoke it was as the mouthpiece of Jehovah. "Thus saith the Lord," was the phrase with which they introduced their messages. The apostles ascribe their sayings to the Holy Ghost, saying He spoke by the mouth of David, or Isaiah, or other prophet. Peter says it was the "Spirit of Christ in the prophets, that testified before hand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow, to whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister the things which are now reported unto you, by them that have preached the gospel unto you, with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." I Peter 7:11-12. Also in the first and second chapters of Hebrews the Lord Jesus, the prophets, and the apostles, are classed together as mouthpieces of the Most High: "God also bearing them witness, both with signs, and wonders and divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to His own will." Christ said to His disciples that He had chosen, ordained, and sent them; and "he that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me." The Spirit He promised, was to guide them into all truth. "He shall glorify me, for He shall take of mine, and show it unto you; and He will show you things to come." John 13:20; 16:13-14.

Furthermore, since the Lord Jesus did not commit His own sayings to writing, the apostles are our authority for the report of His words; why are they any less trustworthy when they report that which they spoke or wrote by the revealing of His Spirit?

Granting the inspiration of the apostles, since all true believers receive the Spirit, are we justified in the position taken by some who claim that men are inspired now, as really as the writers of the Bible? It is important to distinguish inspiration in the sense in which it has acquired

a standard meaning, from those ordinary influences of the Spirit which any believer has a right to expect for his comfort, instruction, and the spiritual enlightenment of his understanding, and especially for divine ability rightly to perform his Christian duties.

We can not, in many instances, determine the right application of a word by its etymology, apart from the meaning it has acquired by general custom. It has come to be the fashion of late with persons of a certain school of thought, to confound inspiration with genius. I have heard some of them say that Browning, and Tennyson, and other poets, were as truly inspired as Paul! Why not then assemble a modern council to settle on a new Scripture canon, and make selections from the poets, from Homer down, to augment our book of Psalms? Why not put Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, men certainly of great genius, by the side of Paul; and their philosophies on a par with the Epistle to the Romans?

The loose way in which some men treat of the subject of inspiration, is doubtless due in some instances to the pure blindness of ignorance, or indifference, as to the right use of words. In other instances it is evidently due to a disbelief in genuine inspiration; and while employing orthodox words, these men import into them a heterodox meaning, which they know is at variance with the prevalent and strictly legitimate definition. This is very much after the manner of piratical seamen who display the flag of a friendly power, that they may allay suspicion, and make a prize of some passing merchant ship!

"The inspiration of the Scriptures signifies a supernatural qualification, or special divine authority in the books of Scripture as depositaries of truth. When the theologian asserts any book of the Bible to be inspired, he means that it possesses an authority different from any other book, that it contains truth not merely as any ordinary book may do, but by a special divine impress. It is different from ordinary books, as conveying under a more immediate and direct activity, and therefore in a more authoritative manner, divine truth."

Since, then, the supernatural influence of the divine Spirit which controlled the minds of the writers of the books of the Bible was distinguished from the ordinary influences of the same Spirit, in method, in object and result, as well as in degree, it may well be designated, as no other mental or spiritual phenomenon has any legitimate claim to be, namely INSPIRATION. There are familiar terms by which all other phenomena genius, with all its varied results, included may be defined without danger of confusion, or misleading.

* * * * *

04 -- THE BIBLE

Since we appeal to the Bible as the record of those things which we accept as religious truth, the honest inquirer very properly seeks satisfactory evidence of the validity and authenticity of that record. Such an investigation pursued in a proper spirit, and with a right motive, is commendable.

The Bible comprises two divisions -- The Old and the New Testament. What is the relation existing between them, and the authority of each respectively? If they are authentic, how are they

authenticated? It is necessary to discover what each of these two divisions purports to be. First, as to the Old Testament. Its prime object, to which every other is subordinate, is to make God known to men -- and to prepare the way for the introduction of the Gospel; to make Him known not only as the self-existent, great First Cause, but as the moral governor of the world. Therefore, to give to mankind a more complete knowledge of His character and will, and the nature of human responsibility; the nature and consequences of both virtue and vice, He has, (according to the Bible's own showing) moved holy men of old to chronicle past and passing events; the doings of good and bad men, showing by special manifestations of His favor His approval of right doing; and by signal and varied judgments, His disapproval of wrong doing. This on a limited scale in the lives of individuals; on a yet broader scale, in families and tribes; and more largely still, in the rise and fall of nations and kingdoms; thus making known the nature of His moral government. All this was rendered more emphatic by a law which He gave and required to be promulgated, prescribing various duties and services, forbidding certain things, enforcing obedience by specified penalties. This embodied many things which belong to the law of unchangeable morality, and other precepts and observances, which were temporary in their character; right because commanded, and serving a good purpose for the time then present, and yet designed eventually to give place to more excellent things to come, of which they were typical, and for which they were the preparation. To make manifest His sovereign power and authority, and to confirm the word of those who spoke in His name, He sometimes gave miraculous signs, or, what served the same purpose, He bestowed on some the spirit of prophecy, the fulfillment of whose predictions became the proof that they were authorized by Jehovah.

And further, in regard for the welfare of future generations, He also inspired them (His prophets) in various ages to utter and write predictive prophecies concerning events in the distant future -- events so varied and minute, as to place them beyond the realm of possible conjecture. Among such prophecies, one of the most prominent and oft-repeated, was that concerning the coming of that Just One to whom Israel all through pre-Christian times, looked with confident hope as their coming Messiah-King. These prophecies, when verified by accurate fulfillment, would tend to counteract the tendency to idolatry and preserve the worship of God, and to authenticate the claim of the prophets to divine inspiration. The Spirit of God also indited through persons specially fitted, lofty poetic strains of devotional, commemorative and prophetic utterances, to aid His people in, and to incite them to worship; to commemorate His acts in the past, and to guide and awaken their expectations for things to come. In view of the fact that a nation's songs and hymns have much to do in shaping a nation's character, the Psalms are not the least important part of the Old Testament Scriptures, especially as they have survived amid all changes of literary taste, and are cherished as a most sacred legacy by the best and most enlightened people of the world.

A conspicuous feature of the Bible is its unity -- the agreement of its various parts as to its doctrinal teaching. This is the more remarkable when we consider the number of writers who were employed, the difference in their circumstances and their surroundings; the great length of time which elapsed (one thousand years, or more,) in the progress and completion of the books of the Old Testament. There is one way to account for this remarkable agreement, and only one which, to an unbiased mind, seems reasonable, namely: It was done under the enlightenment and direct supervision of One Mind -- that while the penmen were many, the real Author was God.

Let us trace the connection. Beginning with the basis of all history -- the creation -- we have presented to us in the earlier chapters of Genesis, a brief historic summary of the peopling of the earth; the early degeneracy of the human family, the awful result of the fall of the first pair in Eden; the genealogy of Noah who, with his family were preserved through the flood which destroyed the rest of the world for their wickedness. Then follows the account of the re-peopling of the earth through Noah and his descendants; of the call of Abraham, from whom descended the chosen people of Israel; their history through their Egyptian bondage; their miraculous deliverance; their receiving the law through Moses at Sinai; their wilderness wanderings; their conquest of Canaan under Joshua; their government by judges, afterwards by kings; the building of the temple at Jerusalem by Solomon; the ministry of various prophets; the frequent invasion of surrounding nations; their captivity by the Assyrian and Babylonian monarchs; the return of the Jews under Cyrus, king of Persia, to occupy once more their own land, and rebuild their desolated temple, and so on till the last prophetic voice under that dispensation -- that of Malachi -- announces the coming of the Lord's messenger, to prepare the way of the Lord who should "suddenly come to His temple."

The history of this chosen people of God, has been termed the miracle of history, and the history of a miracle -- an appropriate aphorism in view of the facts. For was it not miraculous that during so great a lapse of time, in which other nations perished, or were absorbed in those which conquered them, that this people, though often attacked, sometimes subjugated, and captivated; sometimes under kings of their own, that for lawlessness and idolatry exceeded the neighboring heathen; through the varied forms of government -- the theocracy under Moses; a kind of military rule under Joshua; a kind of disjointed tribal rule under the Judges; and then a succession of monarchies for many hundreds of years -- was it less than miraculous that they should maintain their national identity under these many changes, and that the Mosaic polity, a combination of the civil and the religious form of government, should not have been grossly mutilated or totally lost?

We must not omit to notice another remarkable feature of the Old Testament. In nearly every book the writer claims to be speaking by the authority of God. The Lord spake unto Moses, or Joshua; or the word of the Lord came unto Isaiah, or other prophet, as the case might be. How often did the prophets preface their messages with, "Thus saith the Lord!" What audacity, what falsehood, if it was not true! How impossible to explain the attesting miracle, as when Moses smote the rock, or Elijah obtained the fire from heaven, to confound the prophets of Baal, on any other ground than that their claim to be the mouthpiece of God was true! The same may be said of the fulfillment of their predictions. This claim must be admitted, or miracle and predictive prophecy denied.

Another peculiar characteristic of the Bible is the connection to be seen between the different books, one writer after another referring to previous ones, with evident endorsement and acknowledgment of the divine authority of the author so quoted, or referred to. Moses speaks of the patriarchs; Joshua, of Moses, as leading the people, and receiving the law from the Lord. The same is true of various succeeding writers, who sanctioned the Mosaic writings as of divine authority. Samuel and other prophets, some of the good kings, as Asa and Josiah, Nehemiah and Ezra, instituted and affected important reforms by reviving and enforcing the Mosaic law as having been given by divine direction. Malachi, the last of the prophets personating the Lord, exhorts his people to "remember the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all

Israel, with the statutes and judgments," Mal. 4:4. There are also repeated instances where one prophet refers to and endorses another. Daniel, for example, refers to Jeremiah, and the word of the Lord that came to him concerning the seventy years' captivity. See Dan. 9:2. Comp. 2 Chron. 36:21, Jer. 25:9-11 and 27:10. The Psalms also abound in references to Moses, and some of the miraculous events recorded as having occurred during his leadership -- the plagues of Egypt; the dividing of the Red Sea; the sending of manna, and quails; the miraculous supply of water from the rock; the pillar of cloud and fire -- these are all specifically mentioned. See Ps. 78 and 105 and 114. Thus is to be seen an unbroken connection between the books of the Old Testament from Genesis to Malachi.

Let us turn now to the New Testament. After the voice of prophecy had been hushed for four hundred years, the silence was at last broken by the voice of one crying in the wilderness, saying Prepare ye the way of the Lord; the kingdom of heaven is at hand. The long-looked for Messiah had come. His forerunner pointed Him out saying Behold the Lamb of God.

When Christ began His public ministry, He chose twelve apostles to learn the truth from His lips; to be witnesses of His miracles, to testify to the same to their own generation, and to write the history of His life for future generations; hence we have what purports to be such a history in the four Gospels. Have these writers given a correct portraiture of the Galilean Prophet? Is their narrative true? What is truth?

There are three answers to these important questions. The first, that denies the whole story, and pronounces it both as to the Hero, and the accompanying details, as a baseless fabrication. This is no longer alleged by any one who has any just claim to historic information and literary intelligence.

The second allegation is, that there was such a person as Jesus of Nazareth who lived at the time and in the country which the New Testament assigns; that He was the founder of what is known as the Christian religion, which, beginning in Judea, soon spread to adjacent regions, till during the first century, there were numerous Christian churches, established in various parts of the known world, extending to imperial Rome itself; that Jesus Christ suffered death by crucifixion under Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor, at the instigation of the Jews who bitterly opposed His teachings; that following this tragic event, His disciples met with like opposition for preaching His doctrines, and testifying that on the third day after His death, He rose from the dead; that, notwithstanding the most severe persecution on the part of the Jews, in which they were soon joined by pagan rulers and idolaters, a persecution which raged during the reign of several Roman emperors -- notably under the cruel tyrant Nero -- yet the number of Christians rapidly multiplied, till in the reign of the Emperor Constantine, A. D. 325, Christianity was acknowledged as the religion of the empire.

Thus far the Jews, and the higher critics belonging to what is popularly known as the school of the New Theology, are in accord with the great body of orthodox or evangelical Christians throughout the world. But here the divergence between the two classes begins. The evangelical body acknowledges the genuineness and trustworthiness of the four Gospels, together with the other books of the New Testament. The new school, on the other hand, while admitting certain historic facts as given in the Gospels, have discredited others embodied therein, and some

of them express their disbelief of other parts of the New Testament. Here is a quotation from one of them: "Happily... the Genesis creation myths, and the Adam, Noah, Lot and Jonah legends... and the prophecies regarding anti-Christ, and the early date of the book of Daniel, have now been relegated to the limbo of outworn beliefs." [4] It will be observed that all of the historic characters and facts mentioned in the above extract, are, according to the evangelists' statements, referred to by the Lord Jesus, as veritable facts of history. The endorsement of unfounded legends, and fabulous myths, supposing them to be such, proves ignorance, or disregard of truth, on the part of our Lord; or it shows a willful, or careless, or ignorant misrepresentation on the part of His biographers. Either way of disposing of the matter is fatal to a claim of His infallibility and for the inspiration and trustworthiness of the evangelists. [5] When once the testimony of a witness is impeached in any one important point, his testimony as a whole becomes unreliable. What statement in the Gospel narrative may not be set aside by this method of dealing with that narrative? It is quite in keeping with the above quotation, that the same author adds: "So, too, scientific research has, as we have seen, been obliged to admit the existence of much mythical and legendary matter as a setting for the great truths, not only of the Old Testament but of the New Testament." How strange then that our Lord did not enlighten us when He said "Search the Scriptures... for they testify of Me," so that we might know what was fact, and what was fable.

Here is another quotation from White: "With ample learning and irresistible logic he proved that Old Testament history is largely mingled with myth and legend; that not only were the laws attributed to Moses in the main of far later development, but that much of their historical setting was an after-thought; also that Old Testament prophecy was never supernaturally predictive, and least of all, predictive of events recorded in the New Testament." [6]

Put such an arraignment of Moses and the prophets, by the side of the testimony of the evangelist Luke who tells us he had perfect understanding of those things which are surely believed among us, having received a faithful account from the beginning, from those who were eye witnesses and ministers of the word. Thus does he report our Lord's sayings to some of His disciples after His resurrection: "Then said He unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to have entered into His glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself." Again to His disciples after He was risen: "These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets and in the Psalms concerning Me. Then opened He their understandings that they might understand the Scriptures. And He said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

To sustain the allegations of the higher criticism as represented by A. D. White (and he may be taken as a fair representative,) requires that we charge the Evangelist Luke, and the other New Testament writers as well, with bearing false witness as to matters of history, including the resurrection, and the sayings of Christ, or that we impute to the risen Lord either gross ignorance or downright imposture! Could infidelity ask more?

We often hear the remark, even by the professed friends of the Bible, that "revelation is progressive." There is no reasonable objection to this statement, if it be admitted that the earlier, as well as the later was a revelation. Our objection lies against the phrase when it is made to mean, that the Old Testament is a conglomerate of truth and unhistorical and mythical legends; that the progress was in human conceptions, rather than in the revelation; that Abraham, Moses, Joshua and David, with conceptions of Jehovah largely affected by popular pagan ideas, had really no divine warrant for their acts often when they claimed to be acting under a divine command. We enter a decided protest when the idea of a progressive revelation is made the basis of a denial of the inspiration of the sacred writers, as was the case in a recent letter received by the writer in which it stated that "the Apostle Paul in his earlier Epistles was influenced by the Jewish thought of the time, and that later he sloughed off much of this Jewish thought."

The contention urged by the German rationalists, and others in the early part of this century, against the genuineness of the books of the New Testament, claiming that the four Gospels were of later date than that commonly assigned them, and that they were an enlargement and fictitious embellishment of a relatively small number of facts of history, into which miracle -- legends were interwoven by hero-worshippers -- this contention has been shown to be untenable by the investigations and arguments of Christian scholarship of more recent years. "If criticism should make out that the Gospel narratives were 'mere unapostolic digests of the second century,' it would only make out a greater wonder... Except by the contemporary delineation of a real life, how came there to exist such a portrait that history has not produced His peer, and one which befits none but a Divine Being? What literary or poetic genius in the church of the primitive centuries was at all adequate to the production of such a portrait, simply as an ideal, or at all otherwise than as an actual biography? The further one removes the date of such a composition, the greater is the wonder it excites." "The inventor," said Rosseau, the French infidel, "would be a more astonishing character than the hero himself." "It would take a Jesus," said Renan, "to picture a Jesus." The inventor of such a life would have to conceive and depict a character so matchless that the universal verdict would be in every age that of Pilate, "I find no fault in Him," and would have to formulate His unparalleled teaching, construct His wonderful parables, and put into the mouth of the imaginary hero a ready answer to captious cavilers sufficient to silence and confound them; would have to blend fearlessness with submission, gentleness with austerity; the most lofty bearing with the most profound humanity; wisdom without arrogance; love, with uncompromising hostility to evil -- all these without discord or inconsistency. Easy enough for eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses, divinely aided, to accomplish -- otherwise impossible.

Admitting that the great facts of the Gospel, as we have them recorded in the writings of the four evangelists, were believed and preached in the same country, and immediately after His death, by the disciples of Christ, and that thousands of various ranks accepted those facts -- believed them so fully, and adhered to this belief so firmly, that rather than renounce it, they suffered the most bitter persecution, loss of property, banishment, and in many instances, death itself -- how shall we account for the fact that under these circumstances, within a few weeks they "filled Jerusalem with their doctrine?" The solution is this: The apostles believed what they preached, the principal fact being the resurrection of Christ. This to their minds was the sufficient authentication of the whole Gospel story. There is no rational explanation for such belief, except that it was true, and that they had indubitable proof of its truth. With nothing to gain, and everything to lose, they would not have preached it, if they had known it to be false. And it could easily have

been disproved, had it not been true. The fact that the Jews, so hostile to the Nazarene, did not disprove it, is evidence, *prima facie*, that they could not.

But as Christ after His resurrection did not show Himself openly to all the people, but to witnesses chosen before, how came those thousands to believe the report of His resurrection to be authentic? One answer only is reasonable -- It was fully authenticated. "With great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord, and great grace was upon them all." "God also bearing them witness both with signs and wonders and with divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Ghost according to His will. The people heard, they saw, they were pricked in their hearts, they saw their eternal interests were involved in the truth to be believed; that the crucified One was now the living Lord and Saviour, to be loved and served with an assurance of salvation from sin and its eternal consequence, and with a blessed promise of a great reward in heaven.

With the genuine acceptance of this gospel, there was wrought in the soul, an unseen, yet vital, supernatural change; they were spiritually re-born; the Spirit of God wrought it, and attested it to their consciousness; they had the witness in themselves. [7] Christ was in them, the hope of glory; His spirit vitalized their spiritual being; His love absorbed them. It was a love stronger than death, and they loved not their lives unto the death. This is the Scriptural, and in the true sense of that word, the rational, explanation, of the rapid propagation of the Gospel. To admit the historic fact of such rapid propagation, and yet reject the Gospel narrative, claiming it to be legendary and mythical, denying the resurrection of Christ, taxes one's powers of believing far more than to believe that Gospel with all of its miracles, and such a disbeliever must take his rank among the most credulous of men. In attempting to explain the Gospel without accepting its miracles, he accepts the gravest and most important propositions, without reasonable evidence. This is rationalism against itself. One of the strange inconsistencies of unbelief, is its demand: "Show us a sign from heaven," and then to reject the sign when given!

But the Gospel was not for that generation only, it was for the world. Those eye-witnesses soon passed away; what is the foundation of the faith of after generations? It is a written Gospel embodying the same great historic facts and doctrinal truths. As Christ Himself left no written account of His life, it was left for those whom He chose to attend Him as witnesses of His words and works, to chronicle the same, or a condensed summary thereof, for the use of future generations. The purpose of this as expressed by John, was that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that believing, ye might have life through His name.

But no miracles are wrought for us, as in the first introduction of Christianity. What to us, is its authentication? This involves the subject of "Christian evidences," which I cannot now discuss at length. To the candid, prayerful, earnest inquirer, no difficulty is presented. To such, Christianity is its own evidence. The experimental is, after all, the strongest proof. "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." Blessed as it was to look on the risen Christ, we who have not seen may yet believe, and in so believing, may be blessed. He said to Thomas, "Because thou hast seen Me, thou hast believed, blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." Besides, the experimental, the internal and the historical evidence in favor of the books of the New Testament, place their genuineness and authenticity beyond reasonable doubt. A chain of historic evidences, connecting us with the early Christian fathers, and the Christian fathers with the apostles themselves, establishes the genuineness of the books composing the New Testament. If

they are genuine, they are true, according to the plainest logic, and the most consistent processes of reasoning. Take the one item of the resurrection of Christ; it may safely be asserted that there is no other event of equal antiquity, so susceptible of proof, and so well authenticated. If this is true, the truth of the Gospel is established; Christ was the Son of God, and His apostles were inspired.

But the battle ground upon which the Higher Critics have taken their stand has been shifted within the memory of living men. The point of attack is not so much the New Testament, as the Old Testament. Strauss, with his mythical theory of the Gospels; Baur, with his denial of the genuineness of the Gospel of John, and most of the other parts of the New Testament; Renan, with his naturalistic explanation of the life of our Lord, have largely lost their following, and a more recent school of Higher Critics, headed by such men as Willhausen and Kuenan, have appeared on the field, assailing the Old Testament with very similar methods to those employed by their predecessors in their attacks on the New Testament. By these critics the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is denied; they declare that "the accounts of creation were simply transcribed, or evolved, from a mass of myths and legends, largely derived by the Hebrews from their ancient relations with Chaldea, rewrought in a monotheistic sense, imperfectly welded together, and then thrown into the sacred books which we have inherited. The account of man's physical origin in Genesis, is expressed in the simple terms of prehistoric legend, and unscientific, poetic description," and "modern science, in substituting the reign of law for the reign of caprice, the idea of evolution for that of creation, has added, and is steadily adding, a new revelation divinely inspired." They maintain that the book of Job is unhistorical; the story of Jonah is fictitious; a large part of the book of Isaiah was not written by that prophet, and that the book of Daniel was a forgery of some unknown author of far later date. The genuineness of other books of the Old Testament is also denied, or called in question.

There are different methods of answering these arguments of the Higher Critics; there is the historical, the literary, and the critical. These have all been taken up, and successfully prosecuted by some of the most able, evangelical scholars of the century, and I will leave in such hands, this line of defense, and take up that which is the most simple, more suited to the less scholarly, and yet, as it seems to me, the most convincing of all. It is that which plants itself upon the doctrine of the Deity of Jesus Christ, and the doctrine of Inspiration. We have already considered the question of the inspiration of the New Testament writers, and the authenticity of their writings. It remains to consider the interrelation between the New Testament and the Old Testament. An examination shows that they are two parts of one whole; that, therefore, they must stand or fall together. One is the lock, the other the key. One says: "Thus saith the Lord;" the other, exact as a responding echo, answers "Thus it is written." Numerous quotations from, and references to the various books of the Old Testament are found in the Gospel, the Acts, and the Epistles. Both Christ and His apostles put their endorsement upon them with an express or implied acknowledgment of their divine origin, and their ultimate authority. With them the Scripture "could not be broken." All parties agree that our Lord ascribed the Pentateuch to Moses. Now admitting that Jesus Christ is God, it follows that His teaching is infallible, and that the New Testament is His word. The unanswerable argument against "the theory which denies that the Old Testament history is trustworthy, is, that Jesus and the whole New Testament teach, in multiplied instances, and in unmistakable terms, that the Old Testament is true history, a correct record, whose supreme and responsible author is God." The authority of our Lord is the principal factor in the discussion; and what Christian will not, with Canon Liddon, prefer disbelieving the theories of the Higher Critics, to believing the fallibility of

the knowledge of our adorable, divine Saviour. There was wisdom in His speech, and there was wisdom as well, in His silence. Never man spake like this Man. When He spoke, it was only truth, for He was full of grace and truth. He came into the world to bear witness unto the truth. Where He is silent, His reserve could not arise from ignorance. To charge Him with fallibility, is nothing short of a blow directed against His Deity. To own His infallibility, is to acknowledge the authority of His apostles and the divine authority, and the authenticity of Moses and the prophets and the Psalms; the trustworthiness of the very portions rejected by the Higher Critics, as Hebrew legends, rabbinical tales and heathen myths, namely: the account of the flood, the overthrow of Sodom, the story of Jonah, and the book of Daniel the prophet, since He places His endorsement upon these very portions.

Sir William Dawson, a man eminent for his scholarship, and for his able defense of the traditional view of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, thus expresses himself: "It is easy for shallow men on whom religious feelings have little hold, or who regard religion merely as a thing of sentiment, or a device to tickle the senses, and quiet the conscience of the multitude, to say they can reject Moses without rejecting Christ, but common sense cannot be deceived in this way, and Strauss is in this, merely an example of an honest thinker, who, having drifted from a belief in revelation, has founded his faith on what, in many cases incorrectly, he fancies to be proved results of science." Strauss, adopting Darwin's theory of evolution, says: "If we could speak as honest, upright men, we must acknowledge we are no longer Christians."

The apostles were chosen by the Lord Himself. He thus addressed them: "As the Father hath sent Me into the world, even so send I you. Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bear fruit, and that your fruit should remain." He assured them of His perpetual presence. He promised them the Holy Ghost who should guide them into all truth. "It is not ye that speak, but the spirit of My Father that is in you." Thus endued, they went everywhere preaching the Word. The only Scriptures they had, were the Scriptures of the Old Testament. To this they appealed, opining and alleging that Jesus was the Christ. Paul in time takes his rank as not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles. While he had the endorsement of the other apostles, it was because they perceived the grace of God that was given unto him, and they gave him the right hand of fellowship. He declared he was not made an apostle by man but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. His was no second hand ordination. He heard a voice saying unto him in the Hebrew tongue: "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. But arise and stand upon thy feet, for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness, both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee, delivering thee from the people and from the Gentiles to whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, to turn them from darkness unto light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith that is in Me." This was further confirmed by the word of Ananias who came to him by revelation and said: "The God of our fathers has chosen thee, that thou shouldst know His will, and see that Just One, and shouldst hear the voice of His mouth; for thou shalt be His witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard." The apostles, including Paul, thus ordained, and thus equipped, went forth to their work. Their constant reference to the Old Testament, leaves no room to doubt that they gave full credit to those Scriptures as having been given by inspiration of God. They declared that events then occurring were the fulfillment of the Old Testament predictions. With them the account of man's creation, his temptation, his fall, the personality of Satan, was not legend and myth, but Holy

Scripture. If they preached that Christ died for our sins, it was "according to the Scriptures;" that He arose again the third day, it "was according to the Scriptures." They gave the law its designation of a shadow of good things to come, and confirmed the wisdom that formed the type, by pointing out the varied anti-types in the Gospel. Where is the room to question the visions and revelations of one who solemnly avers that he was caught up (how he did not know), into Paradise, the third heaven, where he heard unspeakable words which it is not possible for men to utter? Is not such an one competent to show us mysteries, such as the resurrection, which he says he utters by the word of the Lord. Is not such an one to be credited, when in the spirit of prophecy, he tells of the future development of the mystery of iniquity and of anti-Christ, the man of sin, and the coming of the Lord?

* * * * *

05 -- FAITH

Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.

These things are written that ye might believe.

If the Bible is what we claim for it -- a message from God to man, it follows that it is of supreme importance that we search it, endeavor rightly to interpret it, believe, and practically heed it. This duty should be approached, and pursued with a candor, prayerfulness and diligence, which its importance demands. The Bible is not like an amulet or charm, whose supposed virtue is communicated by having it about us, but rather like the mine which yields its stored-up treasures to those who patiently toil where they are to be found. In such an investigation, both Reason and Faith are inseparably united, and mutually aid each other. In their legitimate sphere they are never antagonistic. The proper limit, however, of each must be observed.

Faith is not irrational believing; such is over-credulity, believing too easily. Such excessive credulity produces superstition, and makes one an easy victim of imposture and deception. To this may be traced a belief in witchcraft, necromancy, or modern spiritism, and Christian Science; in the pretended revelations of Joseph Smith, the founder of Mormonism; and of Mohammed, and the whole list of the false prophets. To the same cause we look for an explanation of the irrational beliefs and practices of various pagan nations, with their divining priests and lying oracles. Sleight of hand performers, and fortune tellers gain patronage from the over-credulous. Except for this tendency, there would be no believing in the infallibility of popes, the preposterous doctrine of transubstantiation, in the false assumptions of priests to forgive sins, to deliver souls from purgatory, or to consign them there. Such unsupported claims are opposed alike to true faith and sound reason, and the rejection of them is not culpable unbelief, but the part of rational believing. Both the Old and the New Testaments, contain emphatic warnings against this danger of over-believing. Moses instructed his people not to accept even supernatural signs and wonders, as of themselves being a divine authentication, but to reject all such when adduced to justify a departure from the revealed truth of the true God. See Dent. 13:1-3. Christ also gave the most solemn warning against the danger of believing even where great signs and wonders were wrought in support of the claim of another than Himself to be Christ. "Then if any man shall say unto you: Lo! here is Christ, or there, believe it not. For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets,

and shall shew great signs and wonders insomuch that if it were possible they shall deceive the very elect. Behold I have told you before." Matt. 24:23-25. In perfect agreement with this, is the apostle's warning, "Let no man deceive you;" warning them that one should come whom he terms "that Wicked, whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders." I Thess. 2:3-9. John also admonishes the believer not to believe every spirit, but to "try the spirits, whether they be of God." I John 4:1.

While, as we have said, Reason and Faith mutually aid each other, they also in some sense, counterbalance each other, like the centrifugal and centripetal forces operating to hold a revolving sphere in its orbit. While we need the aid of Reason in pushing out in the realm of investigation, we need faith as well, to hold us from flying off on a ruinous tangent. Reason pushed beyond her proper bound, operates like the fly wheel of a machine where there is no regulator to check it. Faith, too, needs, its balance wheel. This, reasonable caution supplies. Without such caution, faith degenerates into excessive credulity, and superstition and deception are the result. But caution carried to excess, is as if the balance wheel were converted into a brake, and belief is supplanted by skepticism, and faith by infidelity.

Reason rightly asks "What?" and "Why?" before we are justified in saying "I believe;" she has a right to ask "Whom?" before we say "I trust." Reason is rightly employed in religious and spiritual things, as well as in natural and material things. It is its function to consider statements of fact, to compare and weigh testimony, and by inductive and deductive processes to ascertain causes and to arrive at conclusions. The difference in the lines of investigation of natural and spiritual truth, lies in the difference of the respective subjects investigated and in the nature of the evidence, and not in the mental processes by which conclusions are reached. I have already said (in chapter 1) that every truth must be sought on its own line. Spiritual truth cannot be verified altogether by such evidence as we use in verifying a theory in natural science. Nor do I forget that some degree of spiritual illumination is requisite to enable us to understand spiritual things. But the Spirit's influence is given to aid, not to supersede, our natural faculties.

Belief, and faith, while having in some degree a common meaning, and are sometimes used interchangeably in Scripture, have at the same time different shades of meaning. Faith has both a subjective and objective significance, and implies not only a person confiding, but one confided in. Faith must necessarily have an object. Believing in, or believing on, is tantamount to objective faith, while believing, in its ordinary sense, refers rather to subjects or statements.

Skepticism has sometimes entrenched itself in the plausible, yet erroneous position, that one is not required to believe what he cannot understand. I say plausible, because there is a sense in which the position is correct. Belief must be founded on knowledge. Applying his reasoning to matters of religion, the apostle asks: "How can they believe on Him of whom they have not heard? And how can they hear without a preacher." This reasoning will apply to believing in other things. There must be intelligible communication of any given subject, before well-defined belief of the same is possible. We are not just here speaking of methods of communication. But to make plain my meaning, let us suppose some one addresses me in an unknown tongue. He may make truthful statements of fact, perfectly intelligible to one acquainted with his language, but to me, who am ignorant of the language, his communication is unintelligible, and therefore not within the scope of my belief as a matter of fact. I may believe in the man; may have the utmost confidence in his

intelligence and veracity; thus far faith must be distinguished from belief. Now, in such an instance let an interpreter come to my aid, who translates the message into my own tongue. On the supposition that I confide in both the original speaker and the interpreter, I believe what before I could not believe, because it was not understood. If, however, I have implicit confidence in an individual, I will believe his statements to be true, although his meaning may not be comprehended. I may believe this as fully before his message or declaration is interpreted for me, as afterward, provided I have been furnished with sufficient reasons for believing him to be informed and truthful. In fact, if his testimony brings to me a knowledge of things which I had not previously acquired, I believe his statements because I believe him to be truthful.

Let this reasoning be applied to Scripture truths and characters. Were the utterances of our Lord read to me in the language in which He spoke, I should not comprehend them. Unless I knew whose they were, I should not feel warranted in saying I believed those statements to be true. But the moment I came to know they were the utterances of the Lord Jesus in their essential meaning, with my present faith in Him as the infallible Son of God, I should not hesitate to say they were true, though what that truth was, I did not yet understand. If His words were translated for me, I might believe, and be informed by the message. I say might, because some of His utterances need to be interpreted to us in their meaning, as well as in their language. Take, for example, some of His parables, His predictions concerning the coming tribulation, and the end of the world -- whether I am sure I have put the right construction on them or not, I unswervingly believe them to be true, not that I understand them comprehensively, but because I believe HIM. These remarks apply as well to other portions of the Bible. There are many portions in the writings of Moses and the prophets, which, like the Ethiopian eunuch, I can read because they are translated into the language I understand. I have sufficient reason for believing they are genuine, and were originally given by inspiration of God, and that the rendering of translators has been faithfully performed, incorporating the essential meaning of the original. Up to this point my reasoning faculties have been brought into exercise. Here comprehension and analysis must give place to faith. Concerning many portions of the Old and New Testaments, if asked, as Philip asked the eunuch, "Understandest thou what thou readest?" I should make the same answer: "How can I, except some one guide me." I do not doubt the truth of these mysterious portions. There are prophecies whose future fulfillment will be their ultimate, and undeniable verification. But I unhesitatingly expect them to be fulfilled, because I believe them to be true. I can say with the learned Dr. Adam Clarke, concerning the book of Revelation: "I frankly confess I do not understand the book." I admit with Peter, that in Paul's epistles are some things hard to be understood." Yet I believe these same things, though I do not understand them.

It may be asked, of what advantage is a revelation that is not comprehended? Here there is a striking analogy between nature amid revelation. In the former, quite as much as in the latter, are things whose utility is not apparent, such as poisonous insects, reptiles and plants. It is said there are parts of our body which are of no known use. The astronomer finds in his study of the heavens many things, the utility of which is at present unknown. Of what use are comets, meteors, and nebulae? It is unscientific, and unwise, to say a thing has no utility, because its utility is not known. Science in its advance has unfolded mysteries which were unknown to the ancients, and what was once regarded as waste, is now converted into valuable commodities of commerce, and we have gained such a mastery over some of the forces of nature, once the occasion of superstitious dread, as to make of them most useful servants. Doubtless many new discoveries in the realm of nature

await the toilers in the field of science. Is not the human mind benefited by such industrious application of its powers and is it not at the same time taught a valuable lesson of humility in view of its own limitations, in comparison with the Infinite Mind that originally contrived all with such matchless skill, and with a wisdom so profound, that all its depths, even after ages of research, have not yet been penetrated? Why then should skepticism raise an objection against revelation because of its mysteries? Are not both mind and heart, benefited by the discipline in being required to trust where we cannot comprehend, and to search for spiritual truth as for hid treasure?

Yet, after all, what we really most need to know, is plainly expressed. Take for example, the great central truth of Christianity: "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3:16. Here in a text embodying the most important of all truths, nearly every word is a monosyllable. Equally simple as to language, is the great sum of the Bible in its historical, doctrinal and preceptive portions.

In the study of the Bible, our faith in it as a product of divine inspiration, should lead us to a prayerful dependence on its Divine Author, in order that we may rightly interpret it. By the aid of the Spirit alone, shall we be able to discern the deeper meaning which often lies, as it were, beneath the surface of even some of the simplest of Scripture texts. It is a peculiarity characteristic of the Bible, that often a text with which we may have long been familiar, will take on new shades of meaning, not before perceived by us, and afford us a degree of comfort and instruction not before gleaned from it.

There is a possibility, however, of carrying this matter of so-called spiritual interpretation to a dangerous extreme. This is the error of the mystics. Spiritualizing too far, or spiritualizing the wrong word, has been the fruitful cause of some of the most specious forms of infidelity, converting into mere figures of speech some of the essential realities of the Christian system. As an example, the doctrine of the atonement by the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ, has sometimes been misrepresented, and even set aside, by spiritualizing words and phrases which should be literally interpreted. Such a method of interpretation is that which spiritualizes the precious atoning blood of Christ, instead of spiritualizing the eating and the drinking, in those sayings of our blessed Lord where He speaks of eating His flesh, and drinking His blood, in the sixth chapter of John. A careful study of the Bible has led me to the conclusion, that while our Saviour and the apostles often employed metaphorical language, yet in no instance is His sacrifice, His atoning blood, so spoken of as to be itself spiritualized. The opposite extreme, however, of insisting too far on a literal application, overlooking the obvious intent of metaphor and figurative speech, is less dangerous than the other error, is nevertheless one to be guarded against. Extreme literalism, has led to the various phases of ritualism. Even those who have not formally connected themselves with The Friends church, have in many instances acknowledged that the Christian world at large is, in a measure, indebted to that church for its outspoken protest against a literalism that has produced, or perpetuated, a ceremonialism not in keeping with the spiritual nature of the Christian dispensation.

It would seem to be safe in interpreting any portion of Scripture, to adopt that which is most agreeable to a simple, literal rendering, unless the context, the nature of the subject, or some other obvious reason, should make it plain that a different construction should be given.

While it is possible to place too great dependence on expositors and commentators, such helps are not to be totally discarded. We should remember that the Bible, as we have it, is a translation, and that we are indebted to Christian scholarship for the privilege of reading it in our own tongue. Critical exegesis is simply the attempt of scholars to give us what they regard as the best rendering.

A knowledge of history, geography, and of oriental customs, such as may be gained from the writings of those who have made these things a study, will aid us materially in our study of the Bible. It was putting the Bible into the hands of the common people, and an intelligent study of it, that effected the reformation, emancipating them from priestcraft, and a blind following of blind leaders, in the person of popes, cardinals, bishops and priests.

Let us revert again to the rationalistic sophism, that we are not required to believe what we cannot understand. This false reasoning must be met by a reference to the necessary distinction between apprehension, and comprehension. If in matters of revelation, I accept as true, and believe as a fact, that which transcends my powers of comprehension, I do no more than every man, however wise and learned, does in the department of nature. As Tupper says, "All things in being are a mystery. By mysteries we expound mysteries." We see everywhere many things which we know to be facts, whose mode we cannot explain, as, for example, the germination and growth of seeds and plants. There is a vital principle in the grain which may be destroyed, without breaking its structure, or lessening its weight. The dead grain cannot be made to germinate. Why? Because the life is gone out of it. What is that mysterious thing we call life? Where has it gone? The miracles of the Bible no more baffle the powers of reason, than do these which we call common occurrences in the realm of nature. In both instances alike, we apprehend a fact, we see that something is, without in either case being able to explain the "how." The difference between what we call miracles and the usual processes of nature, is primarily in the fact that the one class is exceptional, the other common. For, though we can trace the connection between the ripened grain and the seed which produced it, and know that this process of reproduction has been going on in unbroken continuity for untold ages, yet we are carried back to a first grain, which, not by germination, was produced by creation. This, if it occurred for the first time under our observation, we would call a miracle. What is it but a miracle removed from us by a great lapse of time?

The impossible is manifestly unreasonable, but it does not follow that what to us seems impossible, is really so. Hume denied miracles because they were contrary to experience. This was simply begging the question, and gauging the experience of all men by his own. But that which neither Hume, nor the profoundest philosopher of his time, was able to forethink, has been accomplished, and is now a thing of everyday occurrence. We can imagine with what scorn a philosopher of that day would have treated the mad man, (as he would have been called) who should affirm, contrary to experience and probability, that he could stand in an office in London and dictate instantaneous instructions to his agents in New York, or South Africa; or who could hold an audible conversation with a business man in Aberdeen, or Liverpool. Yet relatively a small amount of knowledge, attained by a few electricians, has rendered this miracle, beyond the thinking of any one a few generations ago, familiar to the ordinary business man who knows nothing of the laws of electricity. This fact reason apprehends, but who comprehends the mystery? The doubter who disputes a miracle because he cannot solve the mystery by applying to it the

known principles of natural laws, to be consistent must deny the existence of God, and believe in the eternity of matter.

A miracle is not explicable by any analytical process. Reason in spiritual things, addresses itself to the consideration of an asserted fact, even if a miraculous one, and of the evidence by which that fact is attested; and in case the evidence is sufficient, belief takes shape accordingly, and that which is incomprehensible in its mode, is accepted as unquestionably true.

Let us take the miraculous feeding of the multitude: No one is puzzled as to the method of producing an ordinary loaf of bread. Yet the steps backward from the baker to the miller; from the miller to the farmer, brings us to nature's mystery of the growth of the seed; and thence backward to the origin of the first seed by creative power, to which reference has heretofore been made. There the incomprehensible confronts us. Nothing more incomprehensible is presented to our thought, when, in a way we do not understand, the Lord Jesus, in the exercise of His omnipotence, produced a large quantity of food to feed hungry thousands. As we believe there was a time when the Creator put forth His power to produce what was before non-existent, it is just as easy to believe that the self-same Being, still omnipotent, could, on the occasion referred to repeat Himself in creative act.

The possibility of miracles being admitted, their credibility hinges upon other considerations. Heathen mythology abounds in stories of the marvelous. Let us compare these with the miracles of the Bible. While our powers of reason are inadequate to comprehend, or explain miracles, they may be legitimately employed in a consideration of them, and in comparing them with the startling claims of mythology. It requires but a moment to see how infinitely, in point of rational consistency, the former transcend the latter. Reason itself revolts at the recital of the alleged transformation of monsters into men; of men to monsters, or to gods; of metamorphoses of animate to inanimate, or the reverse. Compare the miraculous conception of the Son of God, or His resurrection from the dead, or His ascension, with mythology's report of the image of Diana that fell down from Jupiter, and with the ridiculous stories of the incarnation of the heathen deities, and of their translation to the region of the stars.

Or let us compare the miracles of Jesus, as narrated by the four evangelists, with those recorded in the Apocryphal Gospels where the Boy Jesus is made to pose as a wonder-worker seemingly for no other purpose than to amuse or astonish his playmates.

Weighed even in the balances of common sense, the beam quickly turns in favor of Bible miracles, against the preposterous claims of mythology, and puerile exploits of the youthful hero of the Apocryphal Gospels. The true miracles were always consistent with a rational conception of such a Being as the Bible represents our Heavenly Father to be. They were not mere displays of power to excite wonder. They were the exercise of power directed to a moral and benevolent end; to promote the reverential fear of God, to vindicate His authority and to show forth His righteousness, and to promote His benign government. We can think of no more suitable and convincing confirmation of the great truths of revealed religion, of which they are rightly regarded as a divine attestation. Suppose Jesus Christ had come into the world in the way of ordinary generation, had wrought no miracle, had died and given no proof of rising from the dead, or of His ascension. Who of us would adore Him as the Son of God, or trust Him as a divine Saviour? The

triumph of His impious opposers, who insolently said, what sign showest thou? would have been complete. Infidelity itself demands a sign from heaven, and emphasizes its glaring inconsistency in denying, or repudiating the very thing it demands!

But objectors have said: You regard the report of a miracle equivalent to witnessing it, and the record of miracles as authenticating the writings in which the record is found. This, however, is not a correct statement of our position. It is true that we believe the fact that a miracle was wrought can be established by human testimony, as well as any other fact, sufficient for the most confident belief; indeed can be so fully proved, that to doubt would be more irrational than to believe. This is precisely the state of the case in regard to the resurrection of our Lord. Witness His language to Thomas: "Because thou hast seen me thou hast believed, blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

In regard to the other objection, no one claims that the Bible is proved to be true by its having on its pages a record of miracles. The reality of miracles, on the other hand, is verified by establishing the truth of the Scriptures. That being done, then those miracles therein recorded, certified beyond all reasonable doubt, serve for us the purpose they served for those who witnessed them, namely: to certify that those who wrought them were not deceivers, and that they were bearers of messages from God.

Faith is more than the acceptance of mere statements of truth. It is the acceptance of Christ. The purpose of revealed truth is to bear witness to Him; to guide us to Him. "These things," said John in reference to his Gospel narrative, "are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, and that believing ye might have life through His name." Faith is thus the gateway to experience, and experience is the confirmation of faith. "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." It is through faith in Jesus Christ that we receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, whose office it is to take of the things of Christ and show them unto us, and to guide into all truth. In this way can the true answer be found to the question, what is truth?

There are various subjects of faith -- those things which are revealed for our believing. There is one object of faith -- God Himself -- God in the three-foldness of His being, as Father, Son and Holy Ghost. It is into this three-fold, incommunicable name that we must be baptized; by which, in true spiritual union, we are united to Him -- we in Him and He in us.

Faith is operative. It works by love. There can hardly be such a thing as dead faith, for faith, like fire, when it dies, ceases to be.

Faith to be saving, must take the direction of trust in the Saviour; the One who only can save. The manner of trusting in Jesus Christ and trusting in a human being may be quite similar so far as mental processes, the disposition to believe, to confide, are concerned; but the results in the two cases will be vastly different. He that trusts in Christ is saved. Neither is there salvation in any other. Trusting in any other for salvation, will result in the loss of the soul.

* * * * *

The Christian doctrine of the atonement is one of supreme importance. Taken in connection with the person of Christ, it occupies a central position. To fail to accord to this doctrine its true place, is to break the harmony of the entire Christian system.

But while it forms the very buttress of Christianity, it is, and has ever been, the principal point of attack on the part of its enemies. In the days of its infancy, Christ crucified was preached to the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Greeks foolishness. The offense of the cross has not ceased. The natural pride of the human heart revolts against the idea of a way of salvation that robs man of all merit, and requires absolute submission to One who was despised and rejected of men.

The importance of this doctrine being conceded, the necessity of a devout, prayerful consideration, and of a correct understanding of it, will at once be seen.

What are we to understand by atonement? The etymology of the word, atonement, implies reconciliation, which signifies bringing into agreement parties who were at variance, restoring friendship. In theology, it signifies the restoration of the union between God and man which has been lost by sin. But the Scriptures do not warrant us in limiting the word to the definition which simply means that experimental change from one of enmity, to one of loyalty and favor. This would involve the idea of not one atonement, but many, for it would be repeated in every instance of individual conversion, and would necessarily limit it to the number who were saved. Would it be consistent with the evident scope of Scripture teaching to tell an unconverted man that Christ has made no atonement for him? If so, on what ground could he hope to be saved? Surely the Scriptures teach us that He made atonement for all men; that He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world; that He made peace by the blood of His cross; that we who were alienated, and enemies in our mind by wicked works, He hath reconciled in the body of His flesh through death. Col. 1:21-22. In a Scriptural sense, the atonement was distinctively, and in a very important sense, exclusively made, when Christ offered up Himself without spot to God, having appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. This was unmistakably taught by the Levitical dispensation whose priesthood, sacrifices, and various rites, were a shadow of good things to come: were types, figures, of the true substantial gospel realities. Under that economy there was a special service which bore the designation of "making atonement." It was performed once a year, the day being called, the day of atonement. Three things were essential for the accomplishment of this service, -- a priest, an altar, and a sacrifice, involving the taking of the life of the animal whose blood was employed in the work of making atonement. Concerning this, the divine Law-giver said: "For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls, for it is the blood that maketh atonement for the soul." Lev. 17:11. The officiating priest on that day, was the high priest. He went alone into the most holy place; "And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation, when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place."

As there is necessarily a resemblance between a shadow and the object which produces it, so we must expect to find between these typical features of the law, and the realities of the Gospel of which that law was a shadow, unmistakable resemblances. Such are easily traceable. Christ is called an High Priest; He is besides, the sacrifice: "But Christ being come an High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is to say, not of

this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place having obtained eternal redemption for us." Heb. 9:11-12. That the high priest performed this without sharing it with another; that there was no man allowed in the tabernacle of the congregation when he went in to make an atonement; that the blood of the one goat that was offered as a sin offering was sprinkled in behalf of all the people -- these things, besides numerous others, foreshadow most clearly some of the prominent features in the work of our Lord in effecting our redemption. On Him as the anti-type of the scape-goat that bore away the sins of the people into the wilderness, was laid the iniquity of us all: No one shared with Him His agony in the garden, and on the cross; He trod the wine-press alone, and of the people there was none with Him; by no other blood are we redeemed, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot; He is the merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, who makes reconciliation for the sins of the people. By one death only can rebel man be reconciled to God. We are reconciled to God by the death of His son. Man's part in the atonement is to receive it, not to perform it; not to perform any part of it: "we joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ by whom we have now received the atonement."

As under the law, without shedding of blood there was no remission of sins; as the blood was given upon the altar to make an atonement for the soul, so it is with the anti-type under the Gospel -- "We have redemption through His blood even the forgiveness of sins. We are justified by His blood." Rom. 5:9. "This," said our Lord Himself at the last supper, explaining the true significance of the cup as He handed it to His disciples, "this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Matt. 26:28.

Various views of the atonement have marked the progress of ecclesiastical history. There have been from the beginning of speculative Christian theology, and continued within the several churches, many shades of difference, amounting in some instances to theories quite opposite between those who have written with a view to explaining the exact nature of this mediatorial work.

Some of the Christian fathers regarded the sufferings and death of Christ as a ransom price paid to the devil. Origen, St. Augustine, and Gregory of Nyssa were of this number. Athanasius opposed this theory, and maintained that it was an offering made to God. Later on, Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, sharing this view of Athanasius, advocated the vicarious character of the sacrifice of Christ. Between Anselm and the Reformation, little progress was made in the development of this doctrine. Luther and Calvin emphasized the doctrine of the Atonement, but held, in connection with much that still holds a place among the orthodox churches, some extreme and partial views in regard to it.

An opposite extreme, known as Socinianism subsequently gained a following in some quarters. This was much the same as the position held by modern Unitarians. It regarded the death of Christ in the light of a mere martyrdom, and taught that justification and reconciliation were based on repentance and amendment of life; that this, by an act of His will, puts man in a new relation toward God. By this act, he is reconciled, at one with God.

Another view of the atonement, if that may be called another which, in many of its features, and in its last analysis, is identical with Socinianism, is what is known as the moral influence

theory. The most able modern expositor of this theory, perhaps, is Horace Bushnell. True in some degree, it is yet at best but a half truth, and is, when put for the whole truth, a most dangerous error. It maintains that the death of Christ was not vicarious in the commonly accepted meaning of that word; that beyond the effect it has upon us as a most illustrious example of devotion to truth and the good of men, we are not concerned with it. That the only sacrifice, atonement, or satisfaction with which the Christian has to do, is a moral and spiritual one, not the pouring out of blood, but the living sacrifice of a life devoted to God, breathing the prayer "Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God" -- a sacrifice in which the believer has a part as well as his Lord; that Christ's death, cheerfully met in the inevitable sequence of faithful duty, was only one of many links in the chain of instrumentalities by which man's deliverance is effected. It was a proof, such as could be given in no other way, of trust in God, and immortality; of fidelity to duty and love to mankind. In those who earnestly contemplated it, and saw all that it implied, it awoke a tender response of gratitude and confidence, which softened the obdurate heart and opened it to serious impressions, and the quickening influences of a religious spirit. To state it more briefly: This moral influence theory teaches that Christ achieves our redemption by revealing God's love; the orthodox theory, on the other hand, teaches that Christ reveals God's love by redeeming us, offering Himself as a spotless sacrifice to God. The difference between these two views, which, to some seems unimportant, is nevertheless radical and immense. The one makes repentance and amendment the ground of our acceptance, tends to lessen in the view of accountable beings the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and provides for no amends for the breach sin has made in the moral government of God. This half truth excludes the farther reach of the atonement, as presented in the Scriptures, and limits its effects to that portion of the human family that are made acquainted with the Gospel history. It ignores, furthermore, the two-fold aspect of the mediatorship of Christ, namely: that in doing the will of the Father, He deals with God in man's behalf and with man in God's behalf. If it displays the divine pity, it fails, adequately to uphold the divine righteousness. It fails alike to show how man can be just with God, and how He, as the divine Law Giver and moral governor of His creation, can justify the ungodly, and yet maintain inviolate the sanctity and authority of His throne.

What we maintain as the true, Scriptural view, on the other hand, shows God's grace and righteousness as existing, and proceeding in perfect harmony. All the need of guilty man is met -- pardon for his guilt, cleansing for his pollution, deliverance for his enslavement; a reign in life through abundant grace and the gift of righteousness, instead of death in trespasses and sins; the abiding gift of the Holy Spirit, instead of the spirit of the evil one, the spirit that now worketh in the hearts of the children of disobedience; and, to crown all, a meetness for a possession of the inheritance of the saints in light; and all this at the same time that it emphasizes man's demerit and his helplessness, exalts the divine holiness, magnifies the law and makes it honorable, and makes sin exceeding sinful, and yet shows how God can be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus; and besides, it represents the atoning sacrifice of our Lord as affecting the entire race of man, if not, indeed, as seems to be intimated, (Col. 1:20) affecting all the created intelligences both in heaven and earth.

According to the plain teaching of the Holy Scriptures, the death of Christ was a Sacrifice offered to God: "Christ also hath loved us, and hath given Himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for a sweet-smelling savor." Eph. 5:2, "He through the eternal Spirit, offered Himself without spot to God." Heb. 9:14.

It was a sacrifice for sin To sum up the teaching of the New Testament in confirmation of this statement, would require that we transcribe a very considerable portion of its contents. The concurrent testimony of our Lord and His apostles, is, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures. It was a prominent feature of both the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations, that they had their altars on which sacrifices as sin-offerings, were offered. Isaiah speaks of Messiah whose soul was made an offering for sin.

This way of salvation for a lost world was no after thought on the part of Jehovah. It was foreordained, and being foreordained, it was foreshadowed from the time of Abel, who offered a slain victim of the firstlings of his flock, thenceforward to the time when the true Lamb was sacrificed for us. Of Him it is said, He was a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world; who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world; He was delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.

But Christ's sacrifice was not more ordained in love by the Father, than willingly made by the Son Himself. It was voluntary. "No man," said He, "taketh my life from me. I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father." No jealous claim, or rivalry, divides the cross and throne. In this is revealed the coequal love of the Father and the Son, and the worthiness of the Lamb that was slain. The sacrifice of Christ was therefore, on God's part, not something to which He was moved by the entreaties of another, for God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son. It was not in payment of a debt due to man, but an act of sovereign, unmerited grace, for Christ by the grace of God tasted death for every man. Obedient unto death, it was on the part of the Son, but a loving response to God the Father, to whom He said: "Lo, I come to do thy will, O God."

The sacrifice of Christ was vicarious. I am aware this is not a Scripture word, but I have no hesitation in saying it conveys a Scriptural truth. It is perhaps the best word to express that sublime gospel doctrine so clearly enunciated in that remarkable fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, which is allowed by the Christian world to refer to Jesus Christ. To construe that chapter otherwise than as meaning, that He who was the subject of that prophecy, was the person who suffered death under Pontius Pilate for His claim to be the Son of God, the Messiah, is to deny that it ever has had a fulfillment; for it manifestly suits no other character that ever lived. Furthermore, to deny that the language teaches that He was to suffer vicariously, not only on account, or in behalf of another, but in the place of another, is to do violence to the plainest principles of rational interpretation. If He was not our substitute, what is the explanation of such phrases as -- "Surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows, yet we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted. But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all. He was cut off out of the land of the living, for the transgression of my people was He stricken. Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise Him, He hath put Him to grief, when thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin, He shall see His seed, He shall prolong His days. By His knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for He shall bear their iniquities. He hath poured out His soul unto death, and he was numbered with the transgressors, and He bare the sins of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."

Prophecy is history in advance, and this prophecy which is clothed in the language of accomplished events, is an epitome of the life, death, and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. The New Testament records these facts of history, and applies them to Him. The apostle Peter referring to Christ says: "Who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree, that we being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness, by whose stripes ye were healed. For ye were as sheep going astray, but are now returned unto the Shepherd and bishop of your souls." Again: "For Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God." Other apostles bear the same testimony. John says: "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because He laid down His life for us." Paul says: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." "For He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him" "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them." "God, sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."

The death of Christ was a ransom, a redemption price. Our Lord Himself so terms it: "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." Matt. 20:28; Mark 10:45. Paul says: He gave Himself a ransom for all to be testified in due time. Peter tells the believers that they were redeemed with the precious blood of Christ, and the new song which John heard addressed to the Lamb that had been slain, was redemption's story: "Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof, for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood." Paul declares that we are not our own, that we are bought with a price.

These words -- ransomed, redeemed, bought, all have the same signification, and had allusion to the release of one in bondage, or devoted to death by the payment of a price. It was equivalent to atonement, and was deliverance by something substituted instead of the thing or person so redeemed, and pointed as a type to our deliverance who were carnal, sold under sin, and liable to its penalty of death. A deliverance effected by the substitutionary Sacrifice of Christ, who suffered, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God. By this means guilty man, through faith, is redeemed, justified, reconciled, cleansed. We have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins -- the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin.

The death of Christ was propitiatory. There are three places in the New Testament where the word propitiation is used, -- twice by John in his first Epistle where Christ is declared to be a propitiation for the sins of the whole world. I John 2:2, 4:10. The other instance is in Paul's Epistle to the Romans, chap. 3:25. In this chapter the apostle sets forth the fact of the universality of sin -- that all have sinned; and the necessity of another way of justification than by the law, which, being violated, worketh wrath. This way is that in which sinful man is "justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiatory Sacrifice through faith in His blood." -- (Conybeare and Howson)

The ordinary meaning of the word propitiation is "the act of conciliating a person offended." In theology its equivalent is the atonement, or atoning sacrifice. Among the Jews, the propitiatory was the mercy seat -- the lid which covered the sacred ark in the Tabernacle. It is, hence, regarded as a type of Christ. It was God's meeting place with His people. "There will I

meet with thee and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel." Ex. 25:22. It was here on the great day of atonement, the high priest sprinkled the blood of the sin-offering. Lev. 16:15. How beautifully typical of our great High Priest, who, serving in a greater and more perfect tabernacle, offering not the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood, has entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. Heb. 9:11-12. He is the mediator, through whom alone we come to God. He is our propitiatory, our mercy seat. Having made peace by the blood of His cross, He is our peace; through Him, offending man may come boldly to a throne of grace, and obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need. The guilty transgressor is thus reconciled to God.

We are not to infer from the above definition of propitiation, that God was in any sense implacable, and needed the sacrifice of His Son to render Him favorably disposed toward man. By no means. The atoning sacrifice of the Son of God was not the cause, but the result of His love: God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have eternal life. The offering made by Christ on the cross did not effect, and was not designed to effect, any change in the nature of God. It was to make possible our forgiveness. It was a provision of grace on the part of the righteous Law-giver, to show forth His righteousness, as well as His forbearance and mercy, not in the condemnation, but in the pardon of the transgressor -- as the apostle tersely expresses it, "that He might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." The death of Christ was not to appease anger, but to meet the demands of His holiness. It was not to satisfy retributive justice, but public justice. The sinner therefore who accepts Christ, his propitiation, will be dealt with very differently from the one who does not accept Him. God, being perfectly holy cannot feel indifferent toward sin. His unalterable holiness places Him in uncompromising opposition to all unrighteousness. Hence we read that the "wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold the truth in unrighteousness." The penitent and yet believing sinner is freely forgiven, and has peace with God: the impenitent is under, and in that condition must ever remain under condemnation. The wrath of God abideth upon him. While God pities, even loves the sinner, He abhors his sins, and as sin is not a mere abstract thing, therefore, so long as the sinner refuses to submit to God's way of salvation, his sins must necessarily remain as a barrier to the bestowal of God's mercy. The change of procedure on God's part in pardoning the penitent, shows His divine favor in a very real and practical way -- this all being done in virtue of the merits of Jesus our Lord who died for all, justifies the expression, "He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world."

Avoiding that unscriptural representation of God as a stern and inflexible Judge, who could be conciliated only by the interposition and sacrifice of a more merciful Son, we should guard equally against the opposite extreme which opposes His grace to His righteousness. There is perfect agreement between these two qualities of the divine Being. When grace becomes triumphant through our Lord Jesus Christ, it is not that the sanction and authority of divine law are weakened, or that the righteous Law-giver has become in the slightest degree indifferent to its requirements. Before the penalty can be removed, the offense must be pardoned. Before this pardon can be granted there must not only be repentance, but reliance upon One who has suffered the penalty in our stead: That penalty was death. Christ met it for us. He, by the grace of God, tasted death for every man. The Lord laid on Him the iniquity of us all. He suffered, for sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God. Those, who by faith receive Him, receive

abundance of grace, and the gift of righteousness, and therefore reign in life through Him who died to atone, and now lives to save. Thus sin, personified as a monarch with awful tyranny reigning unto death, is now defeated, his victim is delivered from his power and his dominions, and grace reigns instead through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. In such an administration of the divine government, the law is magnified and made honorable, mercy and truth are met together, righteousness and peace have kissed each other: truth springs out of the earth, while righteousness looks down from heaven. Ps. 85:10-11.

God's way of salvation through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, shows forth His righteousness, as well as bestows the grace by which we are freely justified, and God is just at the same time that He is the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.

We can not too fully emphasize the great truth that God is love, but we should not consider His love as mere indiscriminating good nature. Since God is holy, a righteous and an unrighteous man cannot be the same to Him. The modern revulsion against the representation of what is termed the wrath of God as frequently displayed in His dealing with individuals and with nations, and as Revelation forewarns us will be displayed in awful severity in the judgment of the great day, is usually accompanied with weakened conceptions of the holiness of God and of His moral government; of the malignant nature of sin; and a rejection, or at least a very partial view of the doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ -- conceptions based upon human reason in its attempt to determine what is suitable for the Judge of all the earth to do, rather than upon the unequivocal declarations of Holy writ.

The term "Satisfaction" is often employed by writers on this great theme of the atonement. Properly used and understood, there can be no objection to its use. It applies to the mediatorial work of our Saviour by which the righteous demands of the government of God, and the need of a revolted race are provided for. A work with which God is satisfied, well pleased; and by the term we mean such act or acts, as accomplished all the moral purposes which, to the infinite wisdom of God, appeared fit and necessary, and which must otherwise have been accomplished by the exercise of retributive justice upon transgressors in their own persons. [8] Had man never sinned, his perfect obedience would have satisfied his Creator. This not being the case, some means of satisfying the divine Law-giver other than unfailing obedience, must be provided. Such means are furnished in the Gospel of God's grace. "For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." In lieu of the obedience which was due from us, and yet which we had failed to render, Christ in His life perfectly fulfilled all the righteousness of the law, and yet, as though He were the transgressor, He suffered the penalty which we deserved. "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them."

In this non-imputation of sin, and a positive imputation of the merit of Christ to the believer, whose faith is counted for righteousness, Christ is made unto him wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption. Thus, by faith putting on Christ, He becomes by experimental union with Him, the Lord our righteousness. We are accepted in the Beloved. We are found in Him not having our own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith. This is satisfaction in its two-fold aspect as it relates to

what Christ has done for us, and to the resultant work in those who believe in Him. He has wrought in us that which was wellpleasing in His sight. If we call this imputed righteousness, we see in it something beyond a bare reckoning, a transference of merit; it is as well, impartation, a transfusion. He becomes our life. We are made partakers of the divine nature.

The Christian plan of salvation is by trust in a person -- "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." This appeal is based on the assumption that He has done something for man which He could not do for Himself, and because of what He did, there is pardon, deliverance, life for sinful men. There is no denying the fact that the New Testament connects the forgiveness of sin with the death of Christ; that in some wonderful way the passion of our Lord is the ground of our pardon.

Some have urged as an objection that it was not a prominent feature in the teaching of our Saviour Himself. While He did not so largely dwell on His atonement as did His apostles, the reason doubtless was, that its significance would be better understood after its accomplishment. Yet He did not infrequently refer to His coming death in a way that showed He regarded it as having an essential connection with the redemption of the human race. He, as well as all the apostles, attaches to His death a significance which is nowhere attributed to anything else in connection with His person. He never speaks of living His life to ransom, but of giving it. He does not say my teaching is for the remission of sins, but my blood is shed for that end. He refers to Himself as lifted up on the cross, "as Moses lifted up the brazen serpent, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." He ascribes to His thus being lifted up, a world-embracing result: "I will draw all men unto me. This He said signifying what death He should die." In anticipation of that event, then near at hand, He said, "For this cause came I unto this hour." After His resurrection He said: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

Here we may be met with the question: "Do you make enough of the life of Christ? Are we not told that we are saved by His life?" Everything in the Gospel History has its purpose, and our care should be to ascertain that purpose, and hold all in proper balance.

As to the text, "We are saved by His life," it is true as the apostle states it, but not true as often explained. It occurs as a second member of a sentence, the first being: "While we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son;" and in immediate connection with the statement that Christ died for us, and that we were justified by His blood. There could be no death, without antecedent life; and there could be no resurrection, until there had first been His death. The text in question simply enforces the thought, that He who died to redeem us, rose again, and now lives to save us, imparting life to those who believe.

But does not the Bible say, "the blood is the life?" But what life? That life that was in the blood which was given upon the altar for an atonement for the soul. As applied to our Redeemer, the blood was not the life He lived, but the life He gave, of which He says He gave it a ransom for many.

We can hardly place too high an estimate on the spotless example, and perfect teaching of Christ. He is God's ideal of perfected humanity, and His teaching is in perfect accord with His own immaculate purity. He came to bear witness to the truth, and He was the truth. But His example and His teaching are the means of revealing the fact and the enormity of sin, rather than the means of deliverance from it. His example put by the side of our lives, like the carpenter's straight-edge, shows their crookedness, but does not make them straight; His teaching shows how we have come short, but does not rectify our failures. His word is a lamp, a light that reveals our pollution, but does not cleanse it. It is not the function of light to cleanse, but to make manifest the need of it. This is likewise the office of the Holy Spirit -- to convince of sin.

The consideration of the death of Christ necessarily involves two related points, namely: Who? and Why? Everything in the right examination of the Gospel turns upon these two questions and the correct answer.

We have hitherto discussed the second one, that is, why did Christ die? and the answer we have given is contained, essentially, in the apostle's testimony, "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures." We come now to a consideration of the other question. Who is He? It is His own question over again: What think ye of Christ?

To those who regard Him as man only, though the greatest and best of men, there is nothing of special moment in the fact that He died. The same may be said of thousands of good men, the death of many of whom, like that of Stephen, exhibited the highest loyalty to truth, and was attended by circumstances calculated to draw out our sympathy, to raise our admiration, and stimulate our devotion.

It is only when Christ is seen as both the Son of Man and the Son of God, that His death is rightly interpreted. His prophetic reference to it, not as a mere sequence of the faithful performance of duty, but as an event pre-determined in the counsels of heaven; His designation of it as the hour; the scene in the Garden before human hands were laid upon Him, the bloody sweat, His groans, His prayer, the angel attending to strengthen Him; then again the scene at the cross -- His majestic calmness in the hour of His intensest suffering; His address to the thief; His mysterious cry of desertion; the miraculous darkness, and the rending of the rocks and of the veil; and the opening of the tombs -- these all combine as an irrefutable confirmation of the testimony of the centurion: "Truly this was the Son of God."

We often meet with the phrase, "divinity of Christ." There is no impropriety in this, for He was divine. But divinity is often employed with a restricted, a diluted meaning. Persons who do not subscribe to the doctrine of the Deity of Jesus Christ will speak of His divinity and will contend that there is divinity in any good man, if not indeed a spark of divinity in all men. "Divine," is a Scripture word, but "divinity" is not, and for the reason that it has a variable meaning, it is better when we wish to convey the idea that Jesus of Nazareth was God, to use the unambiguous word Deity.

When the Christian is spoken of as being a partaker of the divine nature, reference is had to a Christlikeness of mind and heart. It is not said of Christ that He was made a partaker of the divine nature. He had such a nature, not as an attainment, or bestowment, but as His possession

from eternity. The pre-existent One, in the fullness of time, took on Him the likeness of men; "the Word that was in the beginning with God, and was God, was made flesh."

While the fact that in His human life, He was made in all things like unto His brethren, yet without sin, gives us a comforting sense of His nearness to and of His sympathy with us, yet it is surely His infinite dignity in the glorious godhead, the assured reality that He was God manifest in the flesh, that Stamps His atonement with infinite merit, that ransom price with incalculable value, and that enables us to rest with assurance upon Him as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.

The crowning proof of His Godhead is His resurrection. This event was the unanswerable argument employed by His disciples to prove Him to be the Son of God, and the long-expected Messiah; an argument which the enemies of Christ attempted to invalidate by bribery and falsehood. But it was a vain attempt. "With great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord, and great grace was upon them all." Not only so, by His resurrection which He ascribes to His own power in conjunction with that of His Father, He not only triumphed over His enemies, He vanquished death itself. The apostle says, He abolished death. How much is comprehended in this phrase! What a conqueror is death! He reigned from Adam to Moses; and when Moses gave the Law, that could not give life, nor abolish death. The commandment which was ordained unto life, was found to be unto death, for that was the penalty attached to its violation, and the whole world is found guilty before God.

Man by legal enactments has abolished many things, but there is one thing he has never been able to abolish, and that is, the custom of dying. The old patriarchs lived nearly one thousand years, but at last it was said of these, one by one, "He died." New discoveries in the curative art, health resorts, hospitals -- much has been done to prolong life, but an elixir to render man immortal has never yet been found. Men come on the stage of being, whirl through a busy life of success or failure, till death, that mighty hunter, earths them all. Births and deaths stand even on the balance sheet. Earth teems with peoples, as ants upon an ant hill, but they will soon be gone, just as millions upon millions have gone before them. We shall be swept on with the resistless tide, and mother earth will receive these countless hordes of the children of the dust. "It is appointed unto men once to die." Death has done for six thousand years a wholesale business. He has an empire of darkness where he reigns as king. Who is able to cope with him? Summon all the sovereigns of earth with all their legions -- can they? No. Ask an angel -- can he? No. Ask the archangel -- Tell him to gather all the hosts of angels -- Will not death flee before them? No! he is too strong for them! What! Has he then no conqueror? Yes; Christ, the prince of life -- He is master of death. He proclaims Himself thus: "I am He that liveth, and was dead, and, behold, I am alive forever more: Amen, and have the keys of hell and death."

He could not abolish death without meeting it. He tasted it. He conquered by first yielding. He laid down His life that He might take it again. Through death He destroyed him that had the power of death, that is the devil. Where was death on the first Easter morning? The women went to the sepulcher and looked in expecting to see death, it was not there! John also went, expecting to find death, but no, it was not there. Peter made a yet closer search -- He went into the tomb; but he could not find it. Where was it? It was abolished! The Lord was risen indeed. Angels proclaim the glad news. He Himself announces it: "Behold, I am alive forevermore. Amen, and have the keys of

hell and of death." Those keys which had been turned on earth's millions whom death had locked in his dreary prison, the risen Christ, the Prince of Life, has wrenched from death's grasp, and when He will, He will unlock those long-bolted doors, and the Captain of Salvation will lead captivity captive, and all shall be raised from the dead, for "the hour is coming when all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God and shall come forth, they that have done good, to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, to the resurrection of damnation." The ransomed of the Lord will then reign with Him in the power of an endless life. Death will be swallowed up in victory!

Crucifixion was a Roman mode of punishment, inflicted upon their enemies. In the popular estimation one thus dying was branded with disgrace. The clamor of the Jews when Christ was on trial before Pilate, "crucify Him, crucify Him," had in it a double object:-- First, that they might bring to an end the career of One whom they hated, and yet One whom they both envied, and feared; and in the second place, they designed to throw over His death such an eclipsing infamy as would darken His whole life, and make His memory odious in the minds of those who had once been His enthusiastic admirers. But why did the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? There was impious sarcasm in the mocking salutation of Herod's men of war, when they bowed before the thorn-crowned Sufferer, crying, "Hail! King of the Jews," but the inappropriate thing was not their language, but their spirit, and their insincerity. Whatever might have been Pilate's motive in placing on the cross the title: "This is the King of the Jews," he wrote better than he knew, for such was He, the Crucified, though without visible robe, scepter or crown.

The derisive cry of the priests as they stood before the Cross, "He saved others," though uttered as stinging irony, was true in fact. "But Providence, by an irony infinitely subtler, and more terrible than the priests, was to prove their genius but idiocy. Their elaborate attempt at refutation by odium became only the more splendid opportunity possible for the exercise of Christ's transforming might. The cross did not eclipse His name, His name transfigured the cross, making it luminous, radiant, a light for the ages, the sign of the gentleness of God." [The source of the preceding quotation was not given -- DVM]

In one aspect the death of Christ is the lowest point of His humiliation; in another it is "the hour," as He termed it, "in which the Son of Man is glorified." When other kings die, their reign ends, and the crown is placed on another; with the death of Christ, His reign as the King immortal and eternal, most triumphantly begins. Having spoiled principalities and powers, He made a shew of them triumphing over them. From the head once crowned with thorns, the inimitable crown of glory is never to be removed; the scepter in the pierced hand in which was once placed in derision the reed, will never pass to another. His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom. Such mighty achievements were accomplished on the cross, such glorious and eternal interests flow from it, that it will henceforth be regarded as His throne. While the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness, to us who are saved, it is the power of God. No tribunal so magnificent; no regal throne so glorious; no triumphal pomp so splendid; no chariot so sublime, as was that cross on which Christ vanquished all the hosts of darkness, and bruised Satan utterly under His feet.

* * * * *

APPENDIX A -- GEOLOGY AND GENESIS

One of the positions assumed by the advocates of what is popularly called "The New Theology," and one which is urged against the inspiration of portions of the Old Testament, is that the account of creation as given in the first chapter of Genesis, does not harmonize with the facts of science. For example: the writer heard one of this school say that "the only agreement between Geology and Genesis is in the initial letter."

Another who is an author of considerable note thus expresses himself: "The accounts of creation were simply transcribed from a mass of myths and legends derived by the Hebrews from their ancient relations with Chaldea, re-wrought in a monotheistic sense, imperfectly welded together, and then thrown into the sacred books which we have inherited." This "creation myth," as he terms it, "and the Adam, Noah, Lot and Jonah legends," he says, "have happily been relegated to the limbo of outworn beliefs."

Similar extracts from other writers might be given, but for brevity's sake these must suffice. As these assertions are in the nature of an appeal to science, I take great pleasure in subjoining some quotations from a man whose claim to scientific knowledge none will presume to dispute. I allude to the late Sir William Dawson, LL. D., F. R. S., F. G. S., principal and vice-chancellor of McGill university, Montreal, Canada, author of several works on Geology, and recognized as an authority in this country and England. Here is what he says: "The order of creation as stated in Genesis, is faultless in the light of modern science, and many of the details present the most remarkable agreement with the results of sciences born only in our day." *Nature and the Bible*, p.26.

He says further, speaking of the six day periods of Geology, and of the corresponding six days of creation, as recorded in Genesis: "Happily, however, so much light has now been cast upon that subject that few intelligent men see any contradiction between them." Page 78.

"I may venture further to maintain," he continues, "that the harmony of the Bible with natural science, so far as the latter can ascend, gives to the word of God a pre-eminent claim on the attention of the naturalist."

* * * * *

APPENDIX B -- MODERN IDEAS OF EVOLUTION

The hypothesis of evolution, brought into prominence by Charles Darwin within the last half century, has since been, and continues to be, a prominent topic among both scientists and theologians. It is extensively accepted by leading men of both classes, though not without many variant, and even conflicting theories. Those who accept the hypotheses are divided into two classes, one of which is known as the atheistic or agnostic school; the other as theistic, admitting the existence of a Creator to whose wisdom and power all organisms and life must be ascribed. Theistic evolutionists, however, while conceding the necessity of an intelligent First Cause, deny His special intervention in producing by creative acts, the various forms of plant and animal life which naturalists classify as distinct species. It will be seen, therefore, that the hypothesis of evolution does have relation, not only to science, but to theology as well. The reliability of Bible

history and doctrine is more or less involved. It is because of this relation that I devote a few pages to a consideration of this theory.

It is important in the first place to observe and preserve a well-defined distinction between evolution and development -- words which are used very often as synonyms the one of the other. Thus, we speak of the full-grown fowl as having evolved from the egg; or the corn, with stalk, blade and ear, as having evolved from the single grain. Without contending as to the propriety of such mode of expression in such cases, it is not, strictly speaking, what scientists mean by evolution -- at least by the latter term a different thing is meant in this article.

I have no contention with the theory that maintains that our earth, for example, with its present arrangement and adaptation to the requirements of vegetable and animal existence has evolved, (if that is the word one chooses to use) through many successive stages, covering an inconceivable lapse of time, from a state of chaos; that the gradation in both vegetable and animal forms of life has been on an ascending scale. In this particular, the Bible and modern science are in complete harmony.

Nor is it denied that by climatic influences, by culture, and crosses, and careful human management, many species, both of plants and animals, have been changed into new, and, in many instances, into greatly improved varietal forms -- forms sometimes so variant from the original stock, that they might, by those not well versed in scientific classifications, be considered as a different species. But tracing the steps or stages of development backward brings us to a parent form of the same species as the matured seed, or the adult animal; so that what is enunciated in the first chapter of Genesis as an established law of nature -- each class "after its kind," is well known to be the established order still; while the evolutionary theory requires us to believe in the transmutation of species -- to express it, as the writer once heard an advocate of this hypothesis express himself in regard to the origin of man: "We never had any first parents -- it is now certain that man has evolved from lower forms of life." Evolution may be briefly defined as the theory that every existing form of animal or plant life, even man himself, has been gradually produced or evolved, during countless ages, from a few primal monads, or animalcules. I suppose Darwin's statement would be admitted by evolutionists generally: "The mind of man has, I fully believe, been developed from a mind as low as that of the lowest animal." Let it be understood, then, that in this discussion, I confine myself to that phase of the evolutionary theory which thus professes to account for the origin of man. After having read on both sides of the question, not only its earlier advocates, but more recent ones who belong to the most orthodox of the theistic school, including such as Drummond and LeConte, I unhesitatingly record my dissent therefrom. Among others, the following are some of many reasons:

1. It is unproved. Even Darwin himself admits that it is only an hypothesis. The same may be said of Huxley. He says: "After much consideration, it is our clear conviction that it is not absolutely proven that a group of animals, having all the characteristics of species, has ever been originated by selection, whether artificial or natural."

Darwin is obliged to admit that "there is not now on the face of the earth, and that there has not been found in the geological ages, an animal from which man could have sprung."

2. It is opposed by leading scientists. Mr. Alfred Russell Wallace, a distinguished naturalist, contemporary with Darwin, may be cited. While traveling in the east, unaware of Darwin's cognate researches and speculations, he formed, and committed to writing, a theory of development by natural selection. His subsequent acquaintance with Darwin's works led him to write a resume of the same, which he entitled Darwinism, in which he commits himself to that author's opinions in part, but differs from him in the theory of sexual selection, and closes with proofs that a spiritual power has intervened to produce a new element repeatedly, in the history of life. Against the theory of man having evolved from lower forms of life, he urges this: "We have seen the average cranial capacity of the lowest savages is probably not less than five-sixths of that of the highest civilized races; while the brain of the anthropoid apes scarcely amounts to one-third of that of man; in both cases taking that of the average. Or, stated in figures, anthropoid apes would be represented by 10; savages, 26; civilized man, 32."

Prof. James D. Dana, LL. D., geologist, says: "The systematic succession in the progress of life made manifest by facts derived from the rocks; leads many to hold that the whole has been as much a growth under the control of physical law as is proved to be true of the development of the earth's features. Geological history has accordingly been appealed to for evidence as to whether species, instead of being independent types of structure, are so linked together by gradual transitions that we cannot reasonably avoid the conclusion of their production from one another by gradual change. That evidence it has not yet afforded. Geology has brought to light fewer examples of gradual transition than occur among living species. The bones and skeletons of the stone age (Neolithic) in no case show a race inferior to the lowest of existing races, or intermediate between man and the man-apes, the species among the brutes which approach him most nearly. Until the long interval is bridged over by the discovery of intermediate species, it is certainly unsafe to declare that such a line of intermediate species ever existed, and as unphilosophical as it is unsafe. Geology strongly confirms the belief that man is not of nature's making. Independently of such evidence, man's high reason, his unsatisfied aspirations, his free will, afford the fullest assurance that he owes his existence to the special act of the Being whose image he bears." Dana assures us that "since man appeared Geology does not disclose a single new species of plant or animal."

The change which is said to have taken place in Prof. Dana's views in regard to the hypothesis of evolution, can not be held to invalidate the facts of science to which he had committed himself, nor render them any less forcible as an argument against that hypothesis. But one can not but wonder how he performed the marvelous feat of leaping over "the long interval" as yet unbridged by the discovery of any intermediate species between man and the ape.

The above cited conclusions of Prof. Dana are fully supported by those of other eminent scientists.

Agassiz in his work entitled, *Outlines of Comparative Physiology*, upholds the doctrine of the successive creation of higher organized beings on the earth. In his latest paper on the subject of evolution he says: "As a paleontologist I have from the beginning, stood aloof from this new theory of the transmutation of species now so widely admitted by the scientific world. Its doctrines, in fact, contradict what the animal forms buried in the rocky strata of the earth tell us of their own introduction and succession on the surface of the globe." From *Dawson's Nature and the Bible*. p. 241.

"The theory is a scientific mistake untrue in its facts, unscientific in its method, and mischievous in its tendency."

Prof. Agassiz says further: "There is not a fact known to science tending to show that any being in the natural process of reproduction and multiplication, has ever diverged from the course natural to its kind, or that a single kind has ever been transformed into any other." *Methods of study in Natural History*, page 281.

"To me the fact that the embryonic form of the highest vertebrates, recalls in its earlier stage the representative of its type in geological times, and its lowest representatives in the present day, speaks only of an ideal relation existing, not in the things themselves, but in the mind that made them.

"I cannot repeat too emphatically, that there is not a single fact found in embryology to justify the assumption that the laws of development now known to be so precise and definite for every animal, have ever been less so, or have ever been allowed to run into each other. The philosopher's stone is no more to be found in the organic than in the inorganic world; and we shall seek as vainly to transform the lower animal types into higher ones by any of our theories, as did the alchemists of old to change the baser metals into gold." *Ibid*, p. 318-319.

To these extracts we subjoin others from Sir William Dawson, a more modern and not less distinguished authority on science: "The oldest men whose remains have been found are not of a different species from modern men. The cranial capacity of these earliest men shows that they were as much lords of creation, and as little allied to the brutes, as their successors are. They show no signs of affinity with brutes." Speaking of human remains which he terms paleocosmic skeletons he says: "If their antiquity be conceded they really take away all semblance of probability from the doctrine of the origin of man by derivation."

"In the meantime, it is becoming more and more apparent, that the brilliant fabric of speculation erected by Darwin, can scarcely sustain its own weight, still less afford any solid ground on which to build a satisfactory theory of the origin of species."

"The record of the rocks is decidedly against evolutionists, especially in the abrupt appearance of new forms under several specific types, and without apparent predecessors." "So we shall find in the progress of organic being, that every grade of life was in its highest and best estate when first introduced, and before it was made subordinate to some higher type. This is in short one of the great general laws of creation suggested in Genesis and worked out in detail by Geology."

3. A third ground of dissent from the hypothesis of evolution as it relates to the origin of man, is that it comes in conflict with the Scriptures.

This objection will be of little weight with the atheistic and agnostic school, but the fact that scientific skeptics allege the objection ought to have much weight with those who regard the Scriptures as a divine revelation. Samuel Kiuns, Ph. D., considers the Bible and evolution as

irreconcilable. The same is true of Herbert Spencer. Sir William Dawson says of him: "The bare, hard logic of Spencer, the greatest English authority on evolution, leaves no place for this compromise, [between evolution and Christianity] but shows that the theory carried to its legitimate consequences, excludes the knowledge of a Creator and the possibility of His work."

It is instructive to observe that Darwin, prior to his becoming an evolutionist, was a believer in Christianity. After acknowledging that when he wrote *Origin of Species* he believed in a First Cause, "yet," he says, "since that time this belief has very gradually, with many fluctuations, become weakened. But there arises the doubt, can the mind of man, which has, as I fully believe, been developed from a mind as low as that of the lowest animal, be trusted when it draws such conclusions? I confess I cannot throw the least light on such abstruse problems."

Here is a quotation from a living author, who is at the same time, a minister: "It is impossible to reconcile this idea of a corporate, as distinct from an individual fall, with anthropology, the man of Eden certainly not being the ancestor of all races... It is hardly satisfactory to a consistent evolutionist to represent the incarnation of the life of God in the world as an isolated event, occurring at the Christian era, rather than as the greatest of many incarnations manifest in a historical process, that is coeval with the existence of life on the earth. Nor does the evolutionary conception of the unity of life, both in its finite streams, and in its infinite fount, permit one to regard the problem of the union of natures in Christ as anything but obsolete."

A book has recently appeared with rather a strange title -- "The Gospel According to Darwin." The author is a man of considerable learning, was at one time a member of an evangelical church. In adopting the theory of evolution, he takes his stand mentally and sympathetically outside historic and revealed religion. That evolution is inconsistent with that religion, he clearly sees, and simply chooses evolution.

We shall probably be told that all evolutionists are not atheists, or agnostics, or even infidels. This is fully granted. I would not for a moment question the Christian standing* of some who are committed to this theory...[Here I interrupt the text.]

[*What!? Woodard would not question the "Christian standing" of an Evolutionist!? Why not!? Their false notions do not square with Scripture, and undermine the whole foundation of Christianity, making it impossible for them to be true Christians! I confess that this statement by Woodard, one of Garrison's "Forty Witnesses" to holiness, disappoints me. To allow a "Christian standing" to an Evolutionist is going too far! Woodard's statement smacks of a "charity" that violates "verity" -- an admission of what cannot be so. To allow such, even for the sake of argument, lends credibility to falsehood. Why this good man allowed that some evolutionist were Christians is beyond me! A firmer, and more faithful, "hewing to the line" that divides Truth from Falsehood would have spoken better of him. Only a complete simpleton could at one and the same time profess to believe the Truths of Christ and the Falsehoods of Darwin. Nonetheless, after expressing all of this, I think that the preceding statement of Woodard was an "error of the head," and not indicative of any wrong sentiments in his heart. His following comments make it clear that he believed both that the false teachings of evolution did not harmonize with the Bible and that they were perilous to the soul. -- DVM]

...I have endeavored to show that the hypothesis itself, according to the judgment of men who on the sciences involved, stand as high as any evolutionist, is not only unproved, but is also unscientific -- that is, that the facts of science are against the theory, and that some of these individuals, regarding the Bible as a revelation from God, pronounce the evolutionary theory of the origin of man, both unscientific and unscriptural. We have also seen that another class, not in sympathy with the others on the question of revealed religion, are yet in accord with them on the one point, viz.: that the Bible and evolution do not harmonize.

The conclusion seems irresistible that that which both friends and foes of the Bible regard as opposed to important portions of the sacred volume, cannot, without peril to the spiritual interests of men, be taught and accepted as true. Adopting a sentence found in the Columbian Encyclopedia: "The full hypothesis known as evolution, with its brilliant speculations and assumptions, may wait till it is proved before it ranks as a science requiring reconciliation with the Scriptures." [But no falsehood can ever be proven true! -- DVM]

Let us hear Dr. McCosh. After acknowledging our indebtedness to scientists who by their researches have thrown much light on the processes of nature in its advance from chaos to the present order, he adds: "But we must at the same time point out the necessary limits of the doctrine [of development] and rebuke the unwise, because conceited men, who when they have made a few observations in one department of physical nature, being profoundly ignorant of every other -- particularly of mental and moral sciences -- imagine that they can explain everything by the one law of evolution. But there is a large and important body of facts which these hypotheses cannot cover.

In making the objection that evolution does not harmonize with the Bible, instances to verify this objection may be called for. Eminent scientists have already been cited. But that I might obtain the view held by those who claim to be able to reconcile the evolutionary hypothesis with the sacred volume, I wrote to one of this class asking for information as to the ground on which himself and those he represented, based their conclusions, citing various portions of Scripture, which, to my mind, were evidently opposed to the theory. His answer contained what he characterized as "a summary of some of the most important proofs." These were five, but not one of them could fairly be termed proof. They were all either hypothetical in fact, or hypothetical in their application. Indeed, in the most important one of the five so-called proofs, namely, the parallel between the development of the human embryo or fetus before birth, and the "way through which, (according to evolutionists) the race has come slowly," he is cautious enough to say that evolution "is best explained by supposing" that that theory is correct. This is arguing in a circle. It first assumes a theory to be true, then takes results which the argument maintains depend upon the thing assumed in proof of the assumption, when in fact those results are by the best scientific authority, otherwise accounted for. A study of biology shows that at first the human embryo resembles any other germ. At a more advanced stage, when the circle of similarity is narrowed, the resemblance between that of a fowl and of a dog and of a man is still remarkably close, but when the final stage is reached it resembles, only other human infants. And no instance is known to science, whether of biology, geology or natural history, where an embryo of one species has matured into a species of a totally different kind. There is no perceptible difference in the first stage between the fertilized cell of the egg of the turkey and of that of the peafowl, but each develops a fowl like its parentage. The same is true of the different species of animals; just as true

of the human species, and to maintain that it was ever otherwise is to adopt an hypothesis which is not only unproved, but one which some of our ablest scientists tell us is negatived by the well-known facts of science, and these same scientists deny that a historical evolution gives the only rationale of the individual development.

When it came to the point of reconciling evolution with the Bible, the mode adopted by the individual to whom I wrote, was really no reconciliation at all. It was a sacrifice -- such an attempted explanation of the Scriptures as was equivalent to a denial of their truthfulness and consequently of their inspiration.

Concerning the account of creation in Genesis he says: "So far from being revealed it was but an adaptation of a theory of creation which the Babylonians had before the Hebrews." "The same can be said of Genesis 2 and 3, the material of those chapters is Babylonian." He cited me to certain authors, not one of whom could fairly be termed evangelical; authors who like himself, pronounce the first chapters of Genesis unscientific, legendary and mythical, and hence not inspired.

The fall of man he tells me "is a step upward in one sense." He does not think the belief in the existence of such a being as Satan is consistent with a belief in the omnipotence and goodness of God; he regards evil as a part of God's economy, really working greatly to man's advantage.

Having cited him to the apostle Paul's references to Adam: "Paul took that," he says, "with much else from the Jewish thought of the time," and "as time went on he sloughed off much of this Jewish thought." "The origin of sin was a scientific problem" with which it was not "Paul's task to deal."

What an impeachment is this of the great apostle! What unbiased mind can read his own account of his commission, "not from man, but from the Lord" Himself (see Acts 26:16-18) or his declaration of his apostolic authority ("not a whit behind the chiefest apostles;") or his heavenly vision when he heard unspeakable things, 2 Cor. 12 :2-4; who can study his life, witness his devotedness, and contemplate the multiplied seals to his ministry; who can read his sublime testimony in the hour of his martyrdom -- "I have kept the faith;" what honest and devout mind in view of all this, will not recoil with a holy revulsion from such an impeachment as my correspondent brings against this heaven-sent ambassador, to whom the world is indebted for his unfolding of "the mysteries of God!" If this is the mode of reconciling evolution with the Scriptures -- and such I find it essentially to be in all instances where I have consulted their books -- I must feel myself justified in not only declining to accept the hypothesis, but in cautioning others against its acceptance, more especially since a man of such eminence as a scientific authority as Professor Agassiz, says it is a scientific mistake, untrue in its facts, unscientific in its methods, and mischievous in its tendency."

Common honesty would seem to require that what such as my correspondent claims is a reconciliation of evolution with the Scriptures, should cease to be designated by that term, since it is a destructive process demanding the surrender of the one to give standing ground for the other. Its friends, I am aware, have attempted to dignify it with the name of "a constructive method." The only sense in which it is such, is comparable to that which takes place when a new edifice of an

entirely different pattern, is erected on the ruins of a former one. Yet in the face of all this, my friend tells me, "We need not stand aloof from the evolutionary theory for theological reasons." Only those who regard certain portions of the inspired Scriptures as unhistoric legends, unscientific myths, and mistaken Jewish notions, can consistently do otherwise than stand aloof from that theory.

There are other difficulties besides those which have been mentioned, which stand in the way of accepting the hypothesis of evolution. One is, that when the transition was made from the brute to the man, the parent brute must have stood erect, having a double curvature of the spinal column, an anatomical condition necessary to an erect posture in normal walking; or that the first human beings had the single spinal curvature, rendering an upright posture in walking and running abnormal and not conceivably possible; or, thirdly, it presupposes miraculous intervention suddenly to produce an anatomical structure in violation of the known law of inheritance. This last is as little in keeping with the evolutionary theory as is the commonly accepted idea of man's creation.

Again, despite all attempts at reconciliation, the belief in miracles, such as the raising of Lazarus, the feeding of the multitude, the crossing the Red Sea and the Jordan, the preservation in the fiery furnace, a belief in special providences, and in the efficacy of prayer -- such a belief seems hardly consistent with that in evolution.

The same may be said of the Scripture doctrine of justification by faith, and instant regeneration by the supernatural energy of the Holy Spirit.

Nor can we fail to see the incompatibility of the theory under discussion with the deterioration of the race (at least in a physical point of view) as seems to be evidenced by archeology, and the Bible showing of the long lives of the ante-deluvians. And there is additional force in the fact that a high state of civilization and moral excellence has not, so far as history serves us, evolved from barbaric savagery and heathen corruption, without the aid of those more advanced than themselves. Further, the New Testament informs us prophetically that a condition of moral degeneracy, though coupled with an advanced state of material improvement in the arts and sciences, is to characterize the last days, when finally the Lord Jesus shall return, when the dead shall be raised with incorruptible bodies, and the living saints changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, when this mortal shall put on immortality, without that physical catastrophe which is named death.

If these great future events, foretold in prophecy, do not harmonize with the evolutionary theory, (and no author, so far as I have read, has attempted to harmonize them), which shall we accept, unproved hypotheses, or the "more sure word of prophecy?"

There is no conflict between true science and revelation. It is only psuedo-scientists, oppositions of science falsely so called, that need occasion any uneasiness, and these not on account of any injury they can do to the Bible. The danger is that some may be led into doubt in regard to its divine authority, and be turned unto fables.

Science is said to be the handmaid of religion. If this is true, and we believe it is, let her show becoming deference to her mistress. Her place is one of subordination and service, rather than of superiority. Let her be credited with all she has done -- and that is much -- to dispel superstition and widen the sphere of human knowledge in regard to the works of God. Let her be encouraged, rather than hindered in every legitimate sphere. Let her mount the giddy scaffold of induction to the very stars, and with telescope and spectroscope, traverse those regions of immensity above us, and whatever she can discover and demonstrate, let her make known. Let her with microscope, familiarize herself with whatever she can find in the realm of the minute. Let her explore the depths by deep sea dredgings. Let her, with pick and spade, exhume the buried cities of antiquity, and decipher their inscriptions. But let her votaries not rashly conclude that what mythological and polytheistic peoples have chronicled, whatever the date of such inscription, constituted the source of information from which holy men of old drew, when they wrote concerning the same things, such as creation, and the flood. For if the account of Bible miracles is true, it follows that Moses and the prophets had supernatural visions and communications from God. And it is unscientific to assert that Moses's account of creation was compounded from unscientific legends of the Babylonians, when it is quite as possible that these same legends may have been the disjointed and distorted fragments of truths in some way originally revealed and handed down by tradition.

Let science push her investigations still further in opening the rock-bound volume of the Geologic Record, but let her remember her work is that of discoverer, not that of author. It is not for her to attempt to complete what she may conceive to be an unfinished record by supplying missing leaves, or by writing her own hypotheses on its blank pages.

Science does not deal with the origin of things. The materials with which she engages herself, had to be originated outside of her realm. She must start, if she starts aright, with any assurance of rational and consistent deductions, with that basal truth with which the Bible begins: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." If she does this and places herself as becomes her, in devout attention before Him, as did the patriarch of Uz, when God answered him out of the whirlwind, she may hear Him say as did that patriarch: "I will declare unto thee and answer thou me." When the Infinite One plies His interrogatories, science is forced to confess her inability to give other answer than that in her unverified speculations, she had often uttered that which she understood not, things too wonderful for her which she knew not. She will, if true to herself and to the honor of the great Architect, whose works she explores, reverently say: "I know that Thou canst do everything, and that no thought can be withholden from Thee." The devout Christian Scientist finds, no matter how familiar he becomes with the works of the great Creator, that he can not by searching find out God, and that no amount of knowledge can supersede the necessity of faith, and humbly thankful that the infinite One has given to man a two-fold revelation -- His word and His works, in both of which is an element of the mysterious, he will carry into his study of revelation that which he must necessarily practice in his study of nature, the habit of believing where he cannot comprehend.

* * * * *

APPENDIX C -- THE HUMAN LIFE OF OUR LORD

The higher critics who deny the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and the historical accuracy of portions of it, together with that of the book of Jonah, and who dispute the genuineness of the book of Daniel, when reminded that the Lord Jesus endorsed those portions of the Old Testament, tell us that in His incarnate life He did not know all things; that in taking upon Himself our nature, He subjected Himself to human limitations. They cite such texts as Luke 2 :52 and Philippians 2:7-8.

They construct upon the text that applies to His growth as a child in wisdom and stature, the theory that during His life on earth, after His baptism and anointing with the Holy Ghost for His public ministry, as well as before, He was but a novitiate rather than an authoritative teacher.

The one text, however, and the only one they can cite in proof of their assertion that in His incarnate life He did not know all things is Mark 13:32: "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father."

To take this as proof that there were other things which He did not know, is wholly gratuitous conjecture. If we demand specifications, who is authorized to give them? If it be left for each one to judge, what portion of His utterances might not be relegated to the realm of doubt?

We may safely accept any statement made by our Lord as true. If this applies to the one thing He said He did not know, why not apply it to His utterances when He speaks as one who professes to know? What judge or jury competent to determine the value of testimony, would discredit the positive statements of a witness concerning things of which he was cognizant because he admitted there was one particular thing concerning which he was not informed?

How incompatible with an imputation of ignorance is our Lord's oft-repeated testimony concerning Himself, as, for example, His statement that "the Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father." And again: "I came down from heaven... For I have not spoken of myself but the Father which sent me, He gave me a commandment, what I should say and what I should speak." ... "Whatsoever I speak, therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak."

There was a man sent from God whose name was John. He was the herald of Christ, not inferior to any before him who had been born of woman. Jesus says of him that "he bare witness unto the truth." John's testimony concerning Christ is: "He that cometh from heaven is above all... and what He hath seen and heard, that He testifieth... For he whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God, for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him."

Who that has a right conception of Him as the Son of God can for a moment believe that He was an unreliable expositor of the Scriptures which His own Spirit had inspired (1 Pet. 1:11) when, after His resurrection He expounded them to His disciples? "And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself. And He said unto them, these are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. Then opened He their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures."

When the higher critics deny or question the authorship and authenticity of those books designated by the phrase "Moses and the prophets," the highest of all critics can be cited as having endorsed them. Nor should it be forgotten that He lived nearly two thousand years nearer the date when those books were written, and among the people, and was Himself one of the nation to whom were committed those oracles of God. Who has the best opportunity to judge? Who furnishes the best credentials? When some one of the modern critics submits to be crucified and then raises himself from the dead, we may allow him to challenge the risen Christ in claiming the first place among witnesses.

There is nothing in the earthly life of our Lord to justify the conclusion that His conceptions of religious truth were cast in the mold of the prevalent Jewish thought of His time. As a religious teacher He occupied a position of majestic isolation and lofty independence. So far from building on the traditions of the elders, He denounced them. He enunciated new truths, and gave to old ones new interpretations. His was not the attitude of the learner but of the teacher. He taught them as one having authority and not as the scribes. His familiarity with the Scriptures; His depth of penetration; His power of quick discrimination in discerning truth from its specious counterfeits; His readiness with unanswerable replies to captious cavilers, might well prompt the question, "Whence hath this man this wisdom?" And all that the Scriptures say concerning His humbling Himself, does not necessitate, or even warrant the conclusion that as a teacher He was not infallible.

In speaking and even in thinking of Christ, it is safe to follow his example. He never attempted any analytical explanations when speaking of His own being. He often spoke, without explanation, in terms that implied a conscious union of the human and the divine. We are awed into adoration, rather than shocked into perplexity, as the sacred biographers present Him to our thought as the babe in the manger and yet as Christ the Lord; as the Creator of worlds, and yet as a weary pilgrim sitting on the well-curb of Sychar appealing to an adulterous woman in the language of a dependent suppliant, "Give me to drink."

No one ever solved, no one ever will, the mystery of the union of the human and the divine in Him whose name is Immanuel. He was not only miraculously conceived; He not only wrought miracles; His whole being from Bethlehem to Olivet, was a miracle in perpetuity. It is sacrilegious profanation for finite beings like ourselves, to attempt by psychological analysis, and the application of evolutionary theories to explain the mystery: "which things the angels desire to look into."

Facts -- these concern us -- are plain enough, the analysis of them is beyond us.

* * * * *

APPENDIX D -- THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

We are exhorted to hold fast the form of sound words. Does the New Testament justify the idea very frequently expressed by speakers and writers, that, in point of spiritual relationship, God is the father of all men? To the writer it seems clearly otherwise. None are natural children of an

earthly father, except those who are born to Him. The new birth -- spiritual birth, alone can constitute one a child of God. The apostle declares that "by nature we are the children of wrath," therefore our Lord makes the unqualified declaration: "Except a man be born again he cannot enter the Kingdom of God."

While, therefore, emphasizing the universality of God's love for an alien and rebel race, His all inclusive provision for salvation, let us not quiet the guilty conscience by any ill-founded assurances of a fancied relationship to God. "Ye must be born again," admits of no exception and until born of God we are children of the wicked one.

* * * * *

APPENDIX E -- "THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE" -- John 8:32

There are many well-authenticated instances of the transforming power of the Scriptures of truth under the Spirit, over the hearts and lives of men. I subjoin an account of one that came under my own observation. It was that of a man highly gifted by nature and of some literary turn of mind. His early training and his books had been largely of the Unitarian School, represented by such men as Theodore Parker. When I first met him he was the father of a young family and had an excellent Christian wife. He invited me to be his guest after an evening meeting where he had heard me preach on the Deity of Christ and the Atonement. He spent much of the evening in urging objections to my doctrines. Without much reply, I finally said: My brother, I have just two things to say: Thou wilt never reason thyself into faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; and in the second place, if that ever comes to be thy experience, it will be in answer to thy own prayers for light. He was serious and silent for a moment, and then replied: "I guess that is so."

The next morning he read the Scriptures for the family. The selection was Rom. v. On reading the first and second verses, he was broken into tears, being so affected that it was with difficulty that he resumed reading. After reading he offered a brief, heart-broken prayer. It was to the effect that he might see the truth. At a meeting which followed he made this confession: "If anyone had told me a very short time ago, that I should see and believe as I now do, I would as soon have believed him if he had told me I should see the sun stand still in the heavens. I prayed that I might see, not as you or any one else sees but that I might see and believe the truth. My prayer is answered." He then gave testimony that showed he believed in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, and in the vicarious atonement. He said it burst on his spiritual vision while reading on the occasion referred to, the first two verses of Rom. v. He continues to the present, now about thirty years, a firm and exemplary Christian.

Another illustrative case was told me by a man who knew the individual and the particular circumstances. It was that of a young man who was at one time converted and used to testify of his love of his Savior, and engage in public prayer. He went through his Bible and marked many of the texts bearing on the subject of salvation through faith in the blood of Christ. But as the result of reading some publications that threw discredit on the authority and inspiration of the Scriptures, his faith was overthrown, he lost his experience and denied the very truths in which he had found comfort. His health failed. When he saw death was inevitable, he asked for his Bible and searched out all those texts on the atonement which he had marked. As a result of this, the Holy Spirit

brought him to see once more his lost and undone condition, and at the same time showed him that the precious atoning blood of Christ was his only ground of hope. He once more found joy and peace in believing, and died in the triumphs of faith.

* * * * *

APPENDIX F -- THE DIVINE IMMANENCE

The above phrase is often employed by what is known as the new school of theology, with a new meaning, which is little short of pantheistic.

That God is omnipresent, is an evident Scripture doctrine, but this is by no means equivalent to the claim that He is a kind of resident force operating in every thing and every where.

Nor is it Scriptural to teach that His Spirit is resident in all men. The Holy Spirit is bestowed upon and abides in those only who believe on Jesus Christ. See John 7:37-39.

* * * * *

ENDNOTES

1 See Appendix A

2 See Appendix B

3 Compare this prophecy of the apostle Peter with that of John in the Book of Revelation, 20:11-15 and 21:1-4.

4 Warfare of Science with Theology by A. D. White, vol. 2, p.337

5 See Appendix C

Warfare of Science with Theology by A. D. White, vol. 2, p.331

7 See Appendix D

8 There are two ways of satisfying governmental requirements. First, by obedience; or where that has not been rendered, by the payment of that which the law attaches as a penalty for its violation. Suppose in some given case the law demands a fine. This, whether paid by the transgressor himself, or by another who, commiserating his condition, voluntarily befriends him, satisfies the law. If the guilty one pays the penalty, we call it suffering retributive justice; if another, in no way involved in the transgression, pays it, we call it suffering in the place of another, to satisfy the ends of public justice.

* * * * *

THE END