FLORIDA CHRISTIAN
FFB0308304

PROPERTY OF
J. EDWIN SMITH

88-Ce-Ev
D-3

THE

DIVINE DEMONSTRATION.

A TEXT-BOOK

OF

CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE.

BY

HARVEY W. EVEREST, A. M., LL. D.,
President of Butler University and Professor of Biblical Literature and Moral Science.

"* * these things are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name."—JOHN 20 : 31.

FLORIDA
CHRISTIAN
COLLEGE
LIBRARY

PUBLISHED BY
CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY.
ST. LOUIS, MO.

COPYRIGHT BY
CHRISTIAN PUBLISHING COMPANY,
1884.

Published
by
THE OLD PATHS BOOK CLUB
600 North Rossmore
Hollywood 4, California

TO

THOSE YOUNG MEN,

FORMER MEMBERS OF MY CLASSES,

WHO ARE ENGAGED IN THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY,

IN RETURN FOR THEIR

UNWAVERING CONFIDENCE AND FRIENDSHIP.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/bwb_T2-EBV-972

PREFACE.

The modern teacher who has sought a suitable text-book on the Evidences of Christianity has discovered how difficult it is to find one suited to his wants. There are none that occupy the whole ground, since most writers have been content to follow out a single line of argument; while the time allotted to this subject in the usual college course is too brief for the reading of several works. Like all other text-books of the same age, the older books on this subject are unsuited to modern phases of unbelief and methods of investigation. The present volume is an effort to meet this want. It has been the aim to gather into one body all the great arguments for our religion, and to combine them into one concise and logical demonstration.

An explanation of the title of this book—*The Divine Demonstration*—will indicate the point of view from which the whole subject has been studied. It is assumed that if Heaven has announced a proposition which must be believed in order to salvation, and if it has given the proof of this proposition that men may believe it, then it is the part of wisdom to accept this proposition and the proof given. Now, the proposition announced by the Father and the Holy Spirit, which is to be believed and confessed by man, and upon which the Church is founded, is the following: *Jesus is the Christ the Son of God.* The proof of this grand proposition is given, or men could not be held accountable for their unbelief. This proof consists of the testimony of the Apostles, the character of Christ and of his religion, and the evidence from prophecy. The providence of God also determined the order in which these arguments should be applied for the demonstration of the proposition. It is a *divine* demonstration, because the *proposition*, the *proof*, and the *order* of proof, were divinely given; it is called a *demonstration* because in moral or probable reasoning a proposition may be as certainly established as in mathematics. We may

know in whom we have believed. As the discussion goes on among men it is more and more evident that the whole question turns on the authority and nature of Jesus. Was he but a man? then all is lost; was he divine? then all else will follow. Men may quibble about various things in the Old Testament and in the New, but the main question, and the one that carries every thing else, is this: *Who was Jesus?* The army of the Lord must rally around the cross if it would be united and victorious.

In following out this plan of the argument room has been found for every class of evidence bearing on the subject. The proof of the genuineness and credibility of the New Testament has been condensed and presented in one view. The relations of Christianity and science, and the several questions which arise out of this relation, are fully discussed. The adaptation of Christianity to man—to his mental, moral, and social natures,—is assigned ample space in the argument. Objections are classified and answered. The reliability and inspiration of the writers of the Old Testament are established, and the testimony of these reliable and inspired writers is brought to sustain the claims of Christ. The Messianic prophecies occupy, in this discussion, as prominent a place as they do in the Holy Scriptures.

An effort has been made to adapt the work to the class-room as well as to the private study. For the sake of clearness of demonstration and conciseness, modifications and details of statement have been omitted, as well as nearly all references to authorities. Comprehensiveness and cogency of argument by bringing, as far as possible, premises and conclusions into close relations, have been preferred to exhaustive discussions of particular subjects.

The author expresses his indebtedness to the writers on Christian evidences who have preceded him, but especially to the *divine word*, whence he has endeavored mainly to derive the material and the method of this demonstration.

H. W. B

BUTLER UNIVERSITY,
Irvington, Ind., January 26, 1884.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

PREFACE - - - - - - - - - - - - 5

INTRODUCTION.

POSTULATES - - - - - - - - - - - - 9
THE PROPOSITION—STATEMENT AND DEFINITION - - - 17
THE PROPOSITION NOT ABSURD OR IMPOSSIBLE - - - 22
THE PROPOSITION NOT IMPROBABLE - - - - - - 28

PART I.

ARGUMENT FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT.

GENUINENESS AND INTEGRITY OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT - - - - - - - - - - - 37
CREDIBILITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT EVIDENCE FOR CHRIST 64
CONCLUSIVENESS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT PROOF - - - 98

PART II.

ARGUMENT FROM SCIENCE AND REASON.

INTRODUCTION TO THIS ARGUMENT - - - - - - - 107
AGREEMENT OF NATURE AND THE BIBLE IN METHOD - - 111
AGREEMENT OF NATURE AND CHRISTIANITY IN TEACHING - 124
CHRISTIANITY ADAPTED TO MAN AS AN INTELLIGENT AND MORAL BEING - - - - - - - - - - - 172
CHRISTIANITY AS A REMEDIAL SYSTEM ADAPTED TO MAN - 179
CHRISTIANITY SUPERNATURAL AND SUPERHUMAN - - - 199

PART III.

ARGUMENT FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION TO THIS ARGUMENT - - - - - - 257
THE OLD TESTAMENT RELIABLE - - - - - - - 262
THE WRITERS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT INSPIRED - - - 282
THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES - - - - - - - - 305
CONCLUSIVENESS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT ARGUMENT - - 345

GENERAL SUMMARY - - - - - - - - 356

COROLLARIES - - - - - - - - - -
THE CANON - - - - - - - - - - - - 360
INSPIRATION - - - - - - - - - - - 369

INDEX - - - - - - - - - - - - 393

INTRODUCTION.

In every demonstration, the argument proceeds from admitted premises to the full establishment of the proposition. An argument built for the defence of Christianity should rest on the bed-rock of admitted and axiomatic truth. In a mathematical treatise, it is usual to state, at the first, the underlying definitions, postulates and axioms; this example is followed here that no position may be assumed without sufficient warrant.

POSTULATES.

I. *There are certain fundamental facts.*

1. The first of these are the three facts given in consciousness. (1) Consciousness is that power by which the mind knows its own activities and states. It is the eye which surveys the mental world. It deals not with the past nor with the distant, but with what is now passing in the mind. (2) It is a witness that cannot be questioned. If possible, it is consciousness that must impeach consciousness. If one says he is doubtful whether he is thinking or feeling now, it is consciousness that makes known to him the doubt; but if consciousness is not a truthful witness in regard to thinking, neither is it in regard to doubting. Hence to question consciousness is absurd. We are *compelled* to accept its testimony. (3) This witness testifies to the existence of three things: *mind*, *force* and *matter*. If one says, "I think," he affirms that he is, that he puts forth

energy, and that there is an object of thought. "I see the tree," affirms, as existing, the agent seeing, the act of seeing, and the object seen. No man can say that he believes nothing, without unwittingly affirming his belief in these three forms of existence. These are three grand facts: I exist, the external world exists, and force exists.

2. Our fellow-men exist. (1) This is not known through consciousness, nor is it a matter of sense-perception. We see the bodily form and the phenomena attending it, but not the real self, the mind. (2) The steps which bring to us this knowledge of our fellow-men are the following: (a) Consciousness reveals ourselves as putting forth energy, as causing events. (b) From this fact we derive the idea of causation and the intuition that every finite event is a caused event. (c) From ourselves we learn the characteristics of effects which have been produced by intelligent causation—order, plan, design, and mathematical exactness. (d) When, therefore, we recognize about us effects other than our own, which bear these characteristics, we affirm the existence of beings similar to ourselves. No sane man questions the existence of his fellow-men. (3) Still further, it is an admitted fact that these fellow-beings are like ourselves—sentient, intelligent and moral beings.

3. God exists. (1) No one can prove that there is no God. Before he can prove there is no God, he must himself become one. He must be omnipresent, or where he is not God may be; and omniscient, or the one thing which he does not know, may be that there is a God. Over every atheist there hangs this dark cloud from which may flash the lightning-truth that God is. (2) The belief in the existence of God, has characterized man in all countries, times, and stages of civilization. This is a remarkable fact, showing that the evidence is patent and convincing to the common mind.

(3) We know the existence of God just as we know the existence of our fellow-men, and with the same certainty. "Every house is builded by some man, but He that built all things is God." Nature, in ten thousand ways, gives evidence of intelligent causation; but this causation is not of man, and we are, therefore, led to believe in a higher being. All modern sciences are employed in revealing the far-reaching plans, the exact working, and the infinite power, of this being. All the high-ways of science centre upon his throne, and demonstrate his unity. (4) We also assume the infinite wisdom, justice, and power of God.

There are here five postulates of existence: self; force; matter; fellow-beings, intelligent and moral like ourselves; and God, infinitely wise, just, and powerful.

II. *There are solid grounds of belief.* Universal skepticism is irrational and impossible. That mind is unhealthy and verging toward insanity, which questions and doubts everything. Science recognizes grounds of certainty; even unbelief must have grounds of certainty whereon to build. The admitted grounds of certainty are the following:

1. Consciousness. We have the utmost certainty that our acts and states of mind are such as we know them to be. To deny is absurd.

2. The senses. Seeing is believing. The senses may be diseased and may mislead us. We may suppose that what we *infer* is what we *see*. The different senses may give differing testimony. Still, they give us certainty. We guard against disease and deception. We know that the sun is shining.

3. Intuition. The mind is so constituted that it at once recognizes the reality of certain ideas, and the validity of certain propositions. Space and time are such ideas; the axioms are such propositions. The shortest path between two points is a straight line; things equal to the same thing are equal to

each other; everything that began to be had a cause for so beginning; we ought to do right. The mind that does not accept these truths as certain, is undeveloped or abnormal.

4. Memory. It may give hesitating and doubtful testimony, but when it is clear and decided, the fact is certain. If mendacious, no scientist could report his observations, no testimony could be received in a court of justice, no mathematical demonstrations would be possible.

5. Reasoning. The premises being true and properly related, the conclusion is certain. Reasoning is the unerring architect of the mathematics. It has constructed the sciences. It is the vaunted Goliath who defies the armies of the living God, and if it cannot lead to certainty, then the opposition is disarmed.

6. Testimony. This is the knowledge of facts brought to us through the mind of another. If that mind is honest, the rays of truth come to us neither refracted, condensed nor dispersed, and we see the fact in its true position and color; if that mind is dishonest, then the image of the fact is distorted or wholly fictitious. Yet, there are kinds of testimony never known to be false, and therefore it is a ground of certainty. Indeed, nearly all our scientific knowledge comes through this source. Individual observation and experiment are narrow, while the fields of science are exceedingly broad. Geography, history, astronomy, geology, chemistry,—all are little known to us except through testimony.

The human mind may arrive at *certain knowledge*. There are *certain* things in science, history, and philosophy. It is not impossible that the great facts of Christianity should lie among these certainties; for upon all these solid grounds of belief, though with varying pressure, rests the temple of Christian faith.

III. *It must also be admitted that human belief has its limitations.*

1. We cannot believe a contradiction or absurdity, as that a part is greater than the whole; or that a thing may be and not be, in the same sense.

2. We cannot believe unless belief is more rational than unbelief. We cannot believe at will, arbitrarily, or against reason. Reason, meaning thereby the whole mental power for the ascertainment of truth, must be our guide. No one insists upon this more earnestly than the defender of Christianity. Reason and faith are not antagonistic, but rather coadjutors. No faith is worthy unless it is justified by the severest use of reason.

3. We cannot believe what we do not understand; that is, the part that we do believe about anything is a part that we understand. We may understand and believe that gravitation varies inversely as the square of the distance, but as to what gravitation is, we neither know nor believe.

4. It is rational to believe, on evidence, facts, the causes and mode of which we do not understand. We believe the facts of electricity, but do not understand its essence and mode of existence. We know the mind is connected with the body, but cannot tell how. Indeed, we generally accept facts before we understand their explanation.

5. We may be compelled to believe two propositions which we cannot reconcile. Of course, all truth is harmonious, but we may not yet have discovered the harmony.

6. Proposition and proof must be homogeneous. They must be such that the former may be deduced from the latter, and this requires that they shall be of the same kind. Scientific facts must be verified by observation and experiment; first truths are revealed in consciousness; mathematical propositions must be demonstrated; while historical

statements are supported by adequate testimony. None but a novice in reasoning would demand other than historical proof for historical propositions.

7. Moral or probable reasoning may lead to the utmost certainty. (1) Mathematical reasoning starts with premises whose denial would be absurd. In moral or probable reasoning, the premises are not of this nature. In the former there are no degrees of cogency; one demonstration is as conclusive as another, as conclusive as a thousand. In the latter, the premises may vary from the slightest probability to the firmest certainty. (2) Mathematical demonstration has drawbacks not usually recognized. The conclusion of a single demonstration is no more certain than memory; for if memory does not hold all the steps in correct nature and relation, the conclusion is invalid. This kind of reasoning cannot establish a fact. Its objects are ideal and hypothetical. *If* a given figure is a triangle, the sum of its three angles is equal to two right angles; *if* two given straight lines are parallel they will never meet; but it cannot prove that any figure is a triangle, any line straight, nor any two lines parallel. (3) All facts, not revealed in consciousness, are established by moral reasoning. Though not having seen London, we are as sure of its existence as of any proposition in Euclid. Though so long ago, we are as certain that Julius Cæsar lived in the century just preceding the Christian era, as that we now live.

8. In all human affairs it is rational to be guided by the preponderance of evidence. In most things, we cannot attain to certainty and are *compelled* to walk by faith. In faith we sow, we trade, we cross the sea, we venture into the future, we walk in the dark passage-ways of the grave. If in regard to Christ we might not reach absolute certainty, yet it might be reasonable to follow him.

9. In moral or probable reasoning we are liable to be influenced by prejudice and passion. (1) In mathematical reasoning there are no degrees of truth and cogency. Premise and conclusion stand out with the distinctness of a mountain in the sunlight. In moral reasoning, we may view the premises with reversed telescope, and refuse to combine the arguments. (2) It is difficult to produce good arguments when belief would *cost much.* If the loss of the eyes was the penalty for believing in the existence of Jupiter's moons, there would be a great deal of skepticism on this subject. Belief in Christianity requires that we shall deny ourselves, take up the cross, and follow Christ to Gethsemane and to Calvary. Though Christianity is sustained by the strongest possible evidence, it is not strange nor unexpected that there should be much skepticism. The one who investigates should strenuously guard against this irreligious bias.

POSTULATES.

I. Facts of Existence.

1. *Facts of consciousness.*
   (1) The existence of self.
   (2) The existence of not-self.
   (3) The existence of force.
2. *The existence of our fellow-men.*
3. *The existence of God.*

II. Grounds of Belief.

1. *Consciousness.*
2. *The senses.*
3. *Intuition.*
4. *Memory.*
5. *Reasoning.*
6. *Testimony.*

III. The Limitations of Belief.

1. *Not an absurdity.*
2. *Not unless it is more rational to believe.*
3. *Not what we do not understand.*
4. *Facts not accounted for.*
5. *Facts as yet unreconciled.*
6. *Proof and proposition homogeneous.*
7. *Force of moral reasoning.*
8. *Preponderance of evidence.*
9. *The irreligious bias.*

THE PROPOSITION.

JESUS IS THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD.

I. *This form of the general proposition is adopted for the following reasons:*

1. It is specific. One author of a work on Christian Evidences discusses this question: "Is the religion of Jesus Christ as exhibited in the New Testament a revelation from God?" Another proposes to show "the supernatural origin of Christianity." The "religion of Christ" and "Christianity," are too variously interpreted and too general, for a close demonstration. The statement chosen is a declaration of *facts* concerning *Jesus of Nazareth.*

2. It is the proposition announced as such in the Scriptures. From the Bible itself, as being the source of all Christian teaching, the fundamental proposition should be derived. If God has expressed his power, wisdom and love, man-ward, in a single proposition, and presented this proposition for our belief, to accept this as the question in discussion is but the part of Christian faith and humility. This proposition was announced: (1) By the Angels. "He shall be great and shall be called the Son of the Highest." Luke 1: 32. "For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Savior, which is Christ the Lord." Luke 2: 11. (2) By the Father. At the Jordan and on the mount of Transfiguration, the oracle that came from the excellent glory was, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." (3) By the Holy Spirit. On the day of Pentecost, the Spirit testified that God had made that same Jesus both Lord

and Christ. Acts 2 : 36. (4) By the Apostles. It was the proposition of Peter's Pentecostal sermon, and also of the one delivered soon after, under Solomon's Porch. Philip preached Christ to the people of Samaria, and Paul alleged at Thessalonica that the Jesus whom he preached to them was the Christ.

3. This is the proposition declared to be proved in the Scriptures. "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." Rev. 19 : 10. "These things are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you might have life through his name." John 20 : 31.

4. If this is proved, the truth of the whole system will follow. If Christ is received, himself the miracle of miracles, there will be little doubt concerning the rest. He endorsed the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms. He declared that his apostles should be endued with power from on high, and should be led into all truth.

5. On account of its relation to the world. It contains the moral power of the gospel. It is the truth to be confessed. One who accepts it, has received power to become a son of God.

6. On account of its relation to the church. It is the foundation of the church. Matt. 16 : 16–18. Eph. 2 : 20. It is the divine creed, and the only creed authorized of Heaven. It is the source of victory. "Who is he that overcometh the world but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?"

7. This is the battle-ground of the religious world. All other questions are unimportant compared with this, "What think ye of Christ?" Upon this one question are concentrated to-day the hope and fear, the feeling and the thought, of the civilized world.

8. This is the grandest truth known to man. It so far surpasses every mere human event that to institute a comparison would be an offence to cultivated intellect. The glories of creation are lost amid the splendors of Redemption. This divine proposition has in it the only hope of our race, the highest civilization, the true light shining on the mysteries of life and death, and the strongest assurance of immortality and eternal blessedness.

II. *The proposition defined.* Only the predicate of the proposition needs definition. This contains two terms: the one presenting the official relations of Jesus; the other, his divine nature.

1. The Christ. (1) The words *Christ* and *Messiah,* the one Greek and the other Hebrew, both mean *anointed.* Among the Jews, prophets, priests and kings, were anointed as a consecration to their offices. Interpreted in the light of this custom, the Christ is the one anointed as prophet, priest and king, for the human race. (2) When it is affirmed that Jesus is the Christ, it is affirmed that he is the Messiah of Jewish promise, prophecy and longing expectation.

2. The Son of God. (1) This phrase is not used in the Scriptures, nor in this demonstration, as meaning that Jesus is the Son of God just as men or angels are. There is no need of proof that the *man,* Jesus, lived and died; it is admitted. Nor would it do any good to prove that he was divine in this sense; for then he would have no divine authority and power; his blood could not atone for human sin; and he would be proved to have been an impostor. Nor could this degradation of Jesus be prevented by assuming that man is also divine, that man's spirit is a sparklet of divinity. This assumption is mere rhetoric, and neither fact nor logic. (2) This phrase is used to denote that Jesus was truly divine as well as human. This is the sense in which it

is used in this treatise, and the following testimonies show that this is the Scriptural sense. (a) The prophets. "But thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler of Israel: whose goings forth have been *from of old, from everlasting.*" Micah 5 : 2. "And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, *The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father*, The Prince of Peace." Is. 9: 6. (b) John's statement. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the *Word was God.*" John 1 : 1. (c) Gabriel's statement, given not to prove, but to define, the divinity of Jesus. "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Luke 1 : 35. (d) The declaration of the Father. If Jesus was the Son of God only as men are, why should God announce from the heavens a proposition so apparent and so useless? (e) The confession of Jesus. When on trial and under oath, he confessed that he was the Son of God. His judges understood this confession in such a sense as made it blasphemy; and rather than explain that he meant to claim that he was only a man, he suffered himself to be condemned and crucified. The only explanation of his silence is the fact that he was the Son of God in the highest sense. (f) The whole scheme of Redemption demands that it be understood in this sense. It is absurd that all the ages should be made to revolve about the death of a man, and that upon such a death should depend the destiny of an entire race.

THE PROPOSITION.

I. WHY THIS FORM OF THE PROPOSITION IS CHOSEN.

1. *It is specific.*
2. *It is the proposition announced as such.*
3. *The one proved in the Bible.*
4. *If this is proved, all else will follow.*
5. *Its relation to the world.*
6. *Its relation to the church.*
7. *This is the battle-ground.*
8. *This, if true, is the greatest fact known to man.*

II. THE PROPOSITION DEFINED.

1. *The Christ.*
2. *The Son of God.*
   (1) Not as man is the son of God.
   (2) But in a higher sense.

PRELIMINARY VIEW OF THE PROPOSITION.

I. *The proposition is not absurd and impossible.* If it is absurd, if it declares that to be a fact which is clearly impossible, argument would be as absurd as the proposition, and it would be wise to proceed no further. Those scientists who oppose law to miracle, and claim that "since the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning," adopt this view. This method suits the temper of modern unbelief; it is a short cut and saves investigation.

1. The proposition is not impossible so far as God is concerned. (1) It is an admitted proposition that God exists, all-powerful, wise and just. It is certain, then, that he could manifest himself to man, could manifest himself in this way, and could give adequate proof of this manifestation. To deny this, would be to deny God powers possessed in large measure by man, and to limit his infinite wisdom. He who created the worlds, from whom proceeded all the forces of the universe, and all the science embodied in matter and mind, surely could reveal himself as a divine teacher and savior. (2) It is said that Jesus was a *miracle*, and that his claim to be divine depends upon *miracles;* but that a *miracle* is impossible. (a) A miracle is such an event as indicates the presence and sanction of Deity. It is an event clearly not produced solely by the ordinary forces of nature, by man, nor by demons. (b) It is not antagonistic to the laws of nature, but may be produced through natural law. A law of nature as an established order, and a miracle, are both results of the divine volition, and hence cannot be opposed to each other. (c) It can never be known that

a miracle is impossible. Those who know that a miracle is impossible, possess miraculous knowledge. They can accomplish the impossible logical feat of proving a negative. No miracle now; then they know all that is going on, at this instant, in all the universe of matter and spirit. No miracle in the eternity past; then they must know all that has been in all the universe. No miracle yet to be; then they know all the future. Such knowledge is wonderful! But it is higher yet and nothing short of infinite, when they affirm the abstract proposition that a miracle is impossible; not only that it *is* not, never *was*, and never *will be*, but that it never *can* be! (d) It is said that a miracle is impossible because it implies a disturbance and reconstruction of all material relations. That a pebble might have been thrown by the waves fifty feet farther inland, would have required larger waves, a higher wind, a greater difference of temperature, a different relation to the sun, a change in all planetary bodies, and hence, a different adjustment in all their past history. It is impossible that the pebble should have been thrown fifty feet farther inland. But along comes a boy, chasing his butterfly, or whistling his tune; he picks up the pebble and hurls it at a squirrel. Behold! the impossible is accomplished, and the universe is reconstructed! (e) Through all nature, the higher law dominates the lower. Human volition throws the stone in opposition to gravitation. Vegetable life builds the tree in opposition to gravity, and to those chemical forces, which, when life departs, fulfil the old decree, "earth to earth, and dust to dust." Man's higher power continually directs and modifies natural forces. The law of miracles, the power of God, is higher than all else, and may dominate all else; and this would be but one of a great class of facts. (f) The greater includes the less. The creation of the universe includes all miracles.

The transforming of the egg into the bird, all a-flutter with life and song, is as wonderful as any miracle recorded in the Bible. That we live at all, is more wonderful than that we shall continue to live beyond death and the grave. The changing of water to wine, at Cana, is no greater miracle than when done by natural processes. The miracle of creation implies the miracles of providence and of revelation. (g) As respects the laws of nature, God's interference with nature is the same *in kind* with man's. A house is a *supernatural* result; for nature, left to itself, would never produce it. It is an evidence of man's presence, thought and labor. In building the house, man does not suspend and thwart natural law; he rather works through law. So to speak, man's interference acts at right angles with natural forces, and so neither accelerates nor retards them. May not a miracle be of the same kind? Has God less power over nature than has man? (h) Miracles are not impossible, for they have been wrought. (1°) Creation is a miracle. If evolved from a germ, however small, this germ could not have been evolved. *That* was more wonderful than all developed from it. It began to be, and that by miracle. Though we go back through an almost infinite regression, we come to this at last. (2°) It is a well established law that life only springs from antecedent life. Then life came on the globe by miracle, since no life could have survived the reign of fire. (3°) Man is the result of miracle. If developed from an ape, yet the ape, at the beginning of the evolution, is the result of intelligent causation, of miracle. But it is in the last degree improbable that a being, who, when fully developed, can build a steamship, and navigate the ocean, descended from an animal. Man was made, rather, "but a little lower than the angels."

2. The proposition is not impossible so far as man is con-

cerned; that is, it is not impossible for man to know that it is true. On the admission that Christ himself was a miracle and that his claims are sustained, in part, by miraculous evidence, it is said that to prove a miracle is impossible. Though Jesus were the Christ, the Son of God, yet if a miracle cannot be proved, it is folly to enter upon the argument. Those who assert that a miracle cannot be proved, rely on Hume's celebrated position: "Testimony is more likely to be false than miracles to be true." "Miracles are contrary to experience, but that testimony should be unreliable is in harmony with experience." (1) This position of Hume is fallacious: (a) It bears with equal force against any new and wonderful fact of nature and history, since such a fact would stand in equal contrast with testimony, and would be equally opposed to experience. There must be something wrong in Hume's position. It proves too much, and hence proves nothing. (b) When it is said, "Whatever is contrary to experience never occurred," the "experience" may be that of *all* men or of *some* men. It is the experience of all men in the major premise, but that of some men in the minor, —a common fallacy. (c) It is not true that all testimony, of whatever kind, is more likely to be false than a miracle true. That some examples of testimony should be false, would be a greater miracle than the raising of the dead. (d) Hume himself saw this and refuted his own statement: "I own," says Hume, "there may possibly be miracles of such a kind as to admit of proof from human testimony. Suppose all authors, in all languages, should agree that, from the first of January, 1600, there was a total darkness over all the earth for eight days; suppose the tradition of this event is still strong and lively among the people; that all travelers bring us accounts of the same tradition; it is evident that our philosophers *ought to receive it for certain.*"

It is not surprising, however, that Hume should distrust testimony, when it is remembered that he questioned the reliability of his senses when they declared to him the reality of an external world. (2) There are scientific facts more difficult of belief than miracles, and yet we do not hesitate to receive them. We are required to believe that we live on a globe of fire, with only a thin crust between us and the fire; that the stratified rocks have been deposited, in some places, to the depth of eighty thousand feet; that the great Colorado cañon has worn for itself a channel, through the hard rock, three hundred miles long, and six thousand feet deep; that the sun is equal to 1,400,000 worlds like ours; and that all the fixed stars are similar suns; and all this, and a thousand-fold more, on testimony and reasonings, often conflicting and changing every decade. We are required to believe in the existence of chemical atoms, though an atom is what no man has seen nor can see. Some easily believe that man has been evolved from a monad, or from a lifeless protoplasmic cell; others, that all the power, thought, beauty, mathematical exactness, and far-reaching plan, of the universe are the results of blind chance, or remorseless fate, though even the existence of such "chimeras dire" as chance and fate is more than doubtful. (3) There are historic facts of the utmost certainty. The following are criteria by which historic statements are tested: (a) When the witnesses are honest, competent, and had opportunity to know. (b) When the witnesses agree in the general statement, though they may differ on minor points. (c) When there is no known motive for imposture. (d) When the facts recorded are strongly against the faith or interest of the narrator. (e) When such witnesses are numerous. (f) When the facts recorded and existing facts are related as cause and effect. (g) When the facts recorded are sus-

tained by existing monuments, coins, games, or other public institutions. The facts of history thus established beyond question, are too numerous to mention. They lie in the *far past;* a thousand and two thousand years before our era; they are *wonderful in the extreme;* as the glory of ancient Babylon, the Persian invasion of Greece, the careers of Cyrus and Alexander, the Roman siege of Jerusalem, and the military exploits of the first Napoleon. (4) It is not impossible that the great facts of Christianity should be among the certain things of history. (a) Early Christian history does not lie far in the past. Three or four steps bring us back to that age. The discovery of America is in the recent past, not four hundred years ago. A little more than doubling this backward journey, and we are in the days of Alfred the Great, a comparatively modern period, A. D. 900. Doubling this, we are in the first Christian century. (b) Christianity originated many centuries subsequent to the time when history becomes authentic, and as many centuries this side of those cloudy dawnings, in whose dense fogs of superstition, a military hero was seen as a god, and the ancient mythologies were originated and received. (c) These facts did not transpire in a darkened corner of the earth, where they could not be certainly known and transmitted. (1°) They occurred in the centre of the Old World, in the ancient home of man, and with that portion of the race which has always taken the lead in civilization. (2°) Christianity has been brought into contact with every form of civilization; Egyptian, Assyrian, Phœnecian, Hebrew, Greek, and Roman. (3°) In the land and time of early Christianity, three great streams of literature were in brilliant confluence; the Hebrew, the Greek and the Latin. It was common for Jewish youths to be trained in these three languages, and in them all, was written the superscription on

the cross of Jesus, "This is the King of the Jews." (4°) Christianity began in the age of great literary and intellectual activity. Athens had for a hundred and fifty years been the university city of the Roman world, whither flocked the youth of Italy and Asia Minor. Grecian philosophy and learning had spread over the East and the West. The century, in the middle of which stands the cross of Jesus, numbers among its historians and poets, the following conspicuous names: Catulus, Cæsar, Nepos, Cicero, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Sallust and Josephus. (d) The introduction and early progress of Christianity were not so quiet as to be unnoticed. From the first, it has made a stir in the world. It was aggressive, abolishing the Jewish law and attacking heathenism on every side. It had virulent literary, as well as political, enemies. The soldiers sought the life of Jesus when a babe in his mother's arms; he was put to the cross; his disciples were beheaded; and bloody waves of persecution rolled again and again over the Roman Empire. From the birth of Jesus to the present, Christianity has been a powerful factor in human affairs.

Clearly, the proposition is not impossible; neither as a fact, nor as a certainty in human knowledge.

II. *The proposition is not improbable.* If the proposition was, in a high degree, improbable, still it might be susceptible of proof; but it would require evidence to overcome this improbability as well as to establish its truth. If the proposition is *thought* to be improbable, this prepossession will be in the way of belief. If, on the other hand, there is a strong probability that the proposition is true, and this probability can be fully shown, it will not only overcome the supposed improbability, but will also add much to the positive argument. That God should give to man a divine revelation, a divine teacher and savior—would it be unnecessary, unlike

God, and hard to believe? Belief in the probability of such an event will depend upon a knowledge of the causes which tend to produce it. These causes are found in man's need, God's nature, and the relation of God to man.

1. Man needs a divine teacher and savior. This great need is found in man's nature. (1) Man is an *intelligent* being. (a) He does not work by blind impulse. He desires to know the whence and the whither of his existence. He desires to make the voyage of life intelligently. If he thinks at all, he can find no rest till the problem of life is solved. (b) Nature does not give him light, while the speculations of the wisest philosophers are unreliable and without authority. (2) He is a *religious* being. (a) He sees himself to be, in his dependence and subjection to law, the correlate of God, independent, and having all authority. He has the faculty of veneration. He everywhere worships. (b) These religious faculties are the crowning endowments of his nature. They subordinate every other influence,—social ties, patriotism, and life itself. The soldier defending the altar of his God, the mother putting her babe into the burning arms of Moloch, the martyr dying amid the flames, attest the power of this religious nature. That man is most wretched who is "without God and without hope in the world." (c) He becomes like the God whom he worships. His worship is a source of degradation, unless his god is pure and perfect. (d) Nature does not fully reveal to us the character of God. In nature are clearly seen God's existence, wisdom, and power, but not his moral attributes. A knowledge of the true God has ever been the most pressing need of our race. (3) Man is a *moral* being. (a) He has a conscience, or the intuition that there is a right and a wrong, and that he ought to do right. (b) He needs, as a moral being, to know the true object of his existence, and the true ultimate pur-

pose. The character of this ultimate, all-comprehending purpose will determine his moral condition. (c) And yet, nature, which holds him to the law of right, gives little light as to what is right, and what are its eternal sanctions. (4) Man is a *sinful* being. (a) The evidence is everywhere, within and without. The witnesses are consciousness, the wreck of his moral powers, civil law and its penalties, the blood-written pages of history, and the constant suffering and death. (b) Nature does not tell us whether God *can* forgive, whether he *will* forgive, nor on what *conditions* he will forgive. (5) Man is a *suffering* being. (a) The sources of suffering are abundant; his physical environment, his own sins, the sins of his fellow-men, the inroads of disease, and the end of all in the grave. (b) He needs a hope that reaches beyond the vail. He who says this hope is not a deep and universal need, mocks the mother bending over her dead child, the strong man weeping at the grave of buried love, and the aged husband and wife doomed to part in the dark valley of death. (c) Nature does not meet this need. She rolls a great stone to the door of the sepulchre. The clay lips of the grave do not open to disclose what lies beyond.

2. It is highly probable that God would meet this need. (1) He is wise, powerful, and good, enough to do so. (2) He has supplied all man's lower wants. He has given food for the body, science for the reasoning powers, light for the eye, music for the ear, beauty for the æsthetic faculties, with friendship and love for the social nature. The higher, religious faculties he would not neglect. (3) This is the more probable when the relation of God to man is taken into account. God created man, gave to man his faculties, and implanted in him all his moral and religious necessities. His giving man lungs, made it certain that he would also give the air; his giving the eye implied the light, without

which the eye would be useless. So these God-created needs are sure prophecies that God would answer their demands. Moreover, man is the noblest creation of God in this world. All excellencies culminate in man, and all other created things are subordinate to him. Noble as man is, what he is now is nothing compared with the possibilities that slumber in his nature. It is not wonderful, then, that God should set his love upon man. It would be inexplicable if God should leave him to perish. (4) This probability is almost a certainty. If an only and beloved son were dying in a distant land; if he could say, "Father, mother, brother and sister, know of my sickness and danger; the means of communication are open, the cars running daily between my old home and this place of suffering; they have the health and means to come; they love me as in by-gone days; they will certainly come," would the dying boy be disappointed! But the case in hand is even stronger. God knows all our need; his love is divine, and no unforeseen circumstance could stand in his way.

3. There is the same probability that Jesus of Nazareth is this divine Teacher and Savior. Jesus and his religion are without a rival. (1) All other religions, ancient and modern, go down before the march of science and civilization. Heathen religions vanish with the night-shadows. Mohammedanism, Mormonism, Spiritualism, and every other modern *ism*, are transparent frauds. (2) Natural science does not furnish a system of morals and religion; on the contrary, just now it seems to be drifting into a sunless, godless region. As interpreted by many, it is atheistic; it asserts the eternity of matter and its laws; declares that it has no use for the theistic hypothesis; that matter holds all the potencies of life; that the soul is material or the result of material organization; that it is one of the cor-

related forces; that man is not free, and hence is not a moral being; that conscience is the result of arbitrary customs, and might have been reversed in its decisions. It teaches the eternity of material laws, the impossibility of miracles, the folly of worship, the uselessness of prayer, the annihilation of the soul at death, and hence the impossibility and mockery of any religion whatever. (3) To the civilized man, the question lies between the Christian religion and no religion. If he will not accept Christianity, then he is *compelled* by every principle of reason to live without God and to die without hope.

PRELIMINARY VIEW OF THE PROPOSITION.

I. THE PROPOSITION IS NOT ABSURD.

1. *It is not impossible with God.*
   - (1) God has the power and the wisdom.
   - (2) Miracles are possible and actual.
2. *Not impossible for man to know the truth.*
   - (1) Hume's fallacy.
   - (2) Scientific facts more difficult of belief.
   - (3) There are unquestioned historical facts.
   - (4) Bible facts may be equally certain.

II. THE PROPOSITION IS NOT IMPROBABLE.

1. *Man has great need of a divine teacher.*
2. *God would meet this need.*
3. *Christianity is the only religion possible to civilized man.*

THE DEMONSTRATION.

Having clearly stated our postulates, defined our proposition, and found that it is not impossible, but, on the other hand, that there is a strong probability in its favor, we are now prepared for the demonstration.

The demonstration that JESUS IS THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD, will consist of three great and independent lines of argument, derived from three sources:

I. From the New Testament.
II. From Reason and Science.
III. From the Old Testament.

It is desirable to adopt not only the divine proposition, but also the divine order of demonstration. The order of revelation and of divine providence in the development of these great arguments is conceived to be that above given; for although the Old Testament was first written, still its proofs could not be applied before the proposition itself was announced. The character, teachings, miracles, crucifixion and resurrection, of Jesus must first be given as a foundation of fact and doctrine whereon to build. Then, and not till then, the religion of Jesus could be subjected to the tests of science and reason. Still further, since the argument from prophecy consists of two parts, prediction and fulfilment, this argument could not be used till after the events predicted had become a part of established history.

PART I.

ARGUMENT

FROM THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

The argument from the New Testament requires the establishment of three subordinate propositions. These three propositions affirm, concerning the various books of the New Testament, three things:

I. Their Genuineness and Integrity.

II. Their Credibility.

III. Their Conclusiveness as to the Proposition.

PROPOSITION FIRST.

The New Testament contains the testimony concerning Jesus of Nazareth as the primary witnesses gave it to the world.

This proposition affirms the genuineness and integrity of the New Testament: the former has to do with the authorship of a book; the latter with the question of transmission —the question whether it has come to us from the hands of the author without material change. If the New Testament contains the testimony concerning Jesus which the original witnesses gave to the world, and if this testimony has come down to us without material corruption, then we can judge of its credibility and conclusiveness as correctly as those could to whom it was first delivered.

Argument 1. *This proposition is maintained by the talent, the learning, and the piety of the Christian world, and is admitted by many competent and candid unbelievers.*

1. Questions of anatomy, chemistry or astronomy are settled to the satisfaction of the world by the authority of competent scientists; so the authority of learned men on the subject before us ought to have much weight.

2. If there is a conflict of authority, still Christian testimony is quite as weighty as that of infidels. There may be a bias on either side; but Christian scholarship can scarcely be matched on the other side in patience, thoroughness, and prayerful desire to know the truth. Every infidel critic can be offset with a score of equally learned Christian writers.

3. Rénan says: "The composition of the Gospels was one of the most important events to the future of Christianity which occurred during the *second half of the first century*." "All, in my judgment, date back to the first century, and they are substantially by the authors to whom they are attributed."

Argument 2. *They present no marks of spuriousness.*

1. The following are the marks of spuriousness (Michaelis), but none of them are alleged against the New Testament: (1) When doubts have been entertained from the first appearance of a given book whether it was the work of the reputed author. (2) When his immediate friends, who were able to judge, have denied it to be his. (3) When a long series of years elapsed after his death in which the work was unknown, and in which it would have been quoted had it been his. (4) When the style is different from that of his other writings, or, in case no others remain, different from what might reasonably have been expected. (5) When events are recorded which happened later than the time of

the reputed author. (6) When opinions are advanced contrary to those which he is known to have maintained in his other writings.

2. The New Testament found in possession of the Church, exhibiting no marks of spuriousness, and in the absence of any proof to the contrary, if a legal document, would be received as genuine in any court of justice. *Simon Greenleaf*, a noted jurist and the author of a well-known work on evidence, says: "The first enquiry, when an ancient document is offered in evidence in our courts, is, whether it comes from the proper repository; that is, whether it is found in the place where, and under the care of persons with whom, such writings might naturally and reasonably be expected to be found; for it is this custody which gives authenticity to documents found within it. If they come from such a place, and bear no evident marks of forgery, the law presumes that they are genuine, and they are admitted to be read in evidence, unless the opposing party is able successfully to impeach them. * * * Now this is precisely the case with the sacred writings. They have been used by the Church from time immemorial, and thus are found in the place where alone they ought to be looked for. * * * If it were the case of a claim to a franchise, and a copy of an ancient deed or charter were produced in support of the title, under parallel circumstances on which to presume its genuineness, no lawyer, it is believed, would venture to deny its admissibility in evidence, nor the satisfactory character of the proof."—*Testimony of the Evangelists, pp.* 9, 10. The case would be a strong one, even if the proof of genuineness should end here.

Argument 3. *The books of the New Testament are quoted by an unbroken series of writers reaching back to the days of the Apostles, proving their existence when quoted, and attributing them to their reputed authors.*

1°. From the present *back to the fourth century* there is no need of proof. (1) There are three great manuscripts of the New Testament which have come down to us from the fourth and fifth centuries, the Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Alexandrinus, and the Codex Vaticanus. (2) Since the fourth century the New Testament has taken such a part in civil and religious controversies, and is so interwoven with the world's literature, that its existence and wide distribution are beyond question.

2°. Evidence for the *fourth century.* (1) Innumerable quotations from all the books in the New Testament, made in the course of this century, can be produced. (2) No fewer than eleven formal and distinct catalogues of its books, made in this century, are now extant. Two of them were made by large and solemn councils; that of Carthage in 397 and that of Laodicea in 350. The remaining nine catalogues were made by distinguished scholars and writers—Augustine, Rufinius, Jerome, Philastrius, Gregory Nazianzen, Epiphanius, Athanasius, Cyril, and Eusebius. (3) Augustine and Eusebius, the one at the last of this century and the other at the first, (315), are fair examples of scores of writers from whose works the New Testament, if lost, could be wholly recovered. Augustine was a voluminous and conscientious writer, who left his impress upon his times. The titles of his works alone would form a long catalogue. His book of sermons contained 700 discourses and shorter articles. Eusebius was born in Palestine, A. D. 260. He became Bishop of Cæsarea, and was noted as a great student, a busy gatherer of books, an industrious writer, and as the Father of Church History. His Ecclesiastical History, in ten books, was completed in 325. His testimony establishes three propositions: (a) That when he wrote there were four and only four Gospels. (b) That these Gospels bore the names of Matthew,

Mark, Luke, and John. (c) That these Gospels and the other books of the New Testament were received by the churches everywhere as genuine and authentic. (4) The existence of the New Testament during this century is not questioned by either class of writers, Christian or infidel; hence, this *kind* of evidence is conclusive.

3°. Evidence for the *third century*. (1) The testimony of *Origen*, of Alexandria, is decisive for this century. He was born in Egypt A. D. 186, and died about the year 253. He was held in high esteem by heathen philosophers as well as by Christians. He wrote a three-fold exposition of all the books of Scripture, and gave the following testimony concerning the Gospels: "As I have understood from tradition respecting the four Gospels, which are the only undisputed ones in the whole Church of God throughout the world, the first is written according to Matthew, * * * the second is according to Mark, * * * the third is according to Luke, * * * and, last of all, the Gospel according to John." This passage is preserved by Eusebius. "If we had all his works remaining we should have before us almost the whole text of the Bible."—(Dr. Mill.) As given by Dr. Keith, we have the following enumeration of quotations from but four volumes of Origen: Matthew, 1,352 quotations; Mark, 195; Luke, 649; John, 775; Acts, 147; Romans, 731; I. Corinthians, 620; II. Corinthians, 239; Galatians, 130; Ephesians, 135; Philippians, 68; Colossians, 94; I. Thessalonians, 48; II. Thessalonians, 36; I. Timothy, 92; II. Timothy, 55; Titus, 19; Philemon, 3; Hebrews, 154; James, 18; I. Peter, 48; II. Peter, 5; I. John, 77; Jude, 5; Revelation, 60. Origen alone being witness, who can question the existence of the New Testament when he wrote, and its general acceptance as genuine and credible? (2) Yet there are many writers of this century who furnish testimony

equally convincing. Among them may be named Julius Africanus, Ammonius, Caius Romanus, Cyprian, Firmilian, Apollonius, Dionysius of Alexandria, and Malchion. (3) This *kind* of evidence is accepted by all parties as decisive for the third century. On this ground the existence of the books of the New Testament during this century *is not questioned.*

4°. Evidence for the *last half* of the *second century.* (1) The first evidence for this earlier period is the fact, just established, that all the books of the New Testament were in existence at the close of the second century. Origen made more than four thousand quotations from them, they were widely known, and there were many thousands of churches whose very existence depended upon the teachings of the New Testament. Now these books and churches did not burst upon the world, in full reputation and power, at the beginning of the third century. To have gained such place and influence they must have been written and distributed many decades before. (2) Testimony of Clement of Alexandria. This writer was born about 160 and died in 220. He turned away from the profound study of Plato to become a Christian. He was a man of great ability and learning, and though his interpretations of the Scriptures are often fanciful, yet, as to matters of fact, his testimony stands unimpeached. He calls the Scriptures divinely inspired, divine and holy books. That there is but one God and Almighty Lord, he says, is proved by the Law, the Prophets and the "blessed Gospels." In arguing against a spurious book called "The Gospel According to the Egyptians," he alleges that it contains passages not found in the true Gospels. "In the first place," he says, "we have not that saying in the four Gospels which have been handed down to us." In a fragment preserved by Eusebius he ascribes the books to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and names them in this order. In

those portions of his writings which have been preserved there are found not fewer than 389 quotations from twenty-one New Testament books. (3) Testimony of Tertullian. This man lived and worked in Carthage between 160 and 220. He was a Roman lawyer and a Pagan, and then a Christian and a distinguished defender of the faith. His greatest extant work is entitled "Against Marcion." He uniformly recognizes the four Gospels as written by the evangelists, and distinguishes Matthew and John, as apostles, from Mark and Luke, who were "apostolic men." He gives evidence of a Latin version of the New Testament circulated in his country of North Africa. His quotations from twenty-four books of the New Testament are very numerous—1,802. These quotations are long and formal. Not only for himself, but also for all the churches of his time, does he give evidence for the existence, genuineness and credibility of these books. (4) Testimony of Irenæus, born at Smyrna, living between 120 and 202, and becoming Bishop of Lyons in 178. He gives testimony for the West as Clement and Tertullian do for the East. His martyrdom is the seal of his honesty as a witness. He wrote many books, but his five books "Against Heresies" are all that remain. These volumes contain an elaborate refutation of gnosticism. One quotation will exemplify his testimony: "So firm is the ground upon which these Gospels rest that the very heretics themselves bear witness to them, and, starting from these [documents], each one endeavors to establish his own peculiar doctrines. For the Ebionites, who use Matthew's Gospel only, are confuted out of this very same, making false suppositions in regard to our Lord. But Marcion, mutilating that according to Luke, is proved to be a blasphemer of the only existing God from [passages] which he still retains. Those, again, who separate Jesus from Christ, alleging that Christ remained impassible, but that it was Jesus

who suffered, preferring the Gospel by Mark, if they read it with the love of truth, may have their errors rectified. Those, moreover, who follow Valentinus, making copious use of that according to John to illustrate their conjunctions, shall be proved to be totally in error by means of this very Gospel, as I have shown in the first book. Since, then, our opponents do bear testimony to us, and make use of these [documents]. our proof derived from them is firm and true." His quotations from all the New Testament books, except one, John's third epistle, number 767. The testimony of these three witnesses, Clement, Tertullian, and Irenæus, giving nearly 3,000 quotations, speaking for all the churches, East and West, alleging the Apostolic origin and sacredness of, the whole New Testament, is of great weight. (5) Testimony of Athenagoras, writing about 177, in two works, "A Mission About Christians," and a treatise on the "Resurrection." He quotes Luke 6 : 27, 28, and Matthew 5 : 44, 45; he also quotes John's Gospel twice. (6) Testimony of Claudius Apollinaris, Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, and writing between 161 and 180. He refers to John 19 : 34, and also wrote the following: "Some say that the Lord ate the lamb with his disciples on the 14th of Nisan, and suffered himself on the great day of unleavened bread; and they state that Matthew's narrative is in accordance with this view; while it follows that this view is at variance with the law, and, according to them, the Gospels seem to disagree." (7) The testimony of Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, and of Melito, Bishop of Sardis, is equally clear and decisive. (8) The Muratori Canon. This is an ancient document discovered by an Italian, Muratori, in 1740, in the Ambrosian Library at Milan. It is a translation into the Latin from the Greek, and scholars agree that it was made as early as 160 or 170. It contains a catalogue of the canonical New Testament books,

and bears special testimony to the Gospels. The first lines of this document, which undoubtedly referred to Matthew and Mark, have perished, but immediately after the blank the name of Luke appears as the *third* and that of John as the *fourth*, so that the order then was the same as now. (9) Ancient Versions. Two are adduced as evidence in this case, the *Peshito* and the *Itala;* the former in Syriac and the latter in Latin. The *Peshito* was made certainly as early as A. D. 150; some put it earlier. It contains all the New Testament except Second Peter, Second and Third John, Jude and Revelation. The *Itala* existed as early as the time of Tertullian, who testifies of its existence A. D. 160 to 220. Davidson places it at A. D. 150. This version was re-edited by Jerome and became the Vulgate or Common Version. (10) Ancient Harmonies of the Gospels. Two writers, Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, and Tatian, of Syria, left works of this kind. Theophilus died A. D. 181. He says the Gospels were inspired as well as the Prophets, quotes Matt. 5 : 28–32, Matt. 5 : 44, Luke 18 : 27, John 1 : 1, and wrote a Harmony of which Jerome says: "Theophilus * * * , who, writing into one work the words of the four evangelists, left for us monuments of his own mind, said the following things concerning this parable in his commentaries [the parable of the Unjust Steward.]" Tatian wrote a work entitled an "Address to the Greeks," which is referred to 170. He refers to the parable of the "Hidden Treasure," Matt. 13 : 44; also to John 1 : 1, 3, 5 and 4 : 24. Eusebius speaks of his Harmony as follows: "Tatian, having formed a certain body and collection of Gospels, I know not how, has given this the title Diatessaron, that is, the Gospel of the Four, or the Gospel Formed of the Four; which is in the possession of some even now." On the evidence for this period two remarks are in place: (a) It is exceedingly strong. It comes

from the whole Roman world: Antioch in Syria, Alexandria in Egypt, Carthage, Athens, Corinth, and Rome. It is of great variety for such a case—harmonies, versions, a catalogue, thousands of quotations, and direct testimony to genuineness and credibility. (b) The existence of the New Testament during this period, the last half of the second century, *is admitted* by unbelieving critics. Indeed, this is the *very time* to which they assign the origin of these books. Thus far, Christian and Infidel travel together in the clear light of demonstration; but farther than this, some unbelievers refuse to go.

5°. Evidence for the *first half* of the *second century.* (1) The first proof is the established, admitted and incontrovertible *fact* that the New Testament, in its several books, existed and was held in high esteem during the last fifty years of the second century. During this period there were not fewer than three millions of Christians in the Roman Empire, nor fewer than sixty thousand copies of the Gospels in circulation—(*Norton*). They were quoted and appealed to from one end of the Empire to the other. Many versions were made, and they were the subject of elaborate harmonies and commentaries. These facts imply for the books of the New Testament a long previous history. Though there were no earlier historic references to Thebes, yet when Homer calls it "hundred-gated" Thebes, and says it could pour forth an army from every gate, we are not to conclude that Thebes was unknown till the days of Homer, but rather that a hundred years had been required to gain this power. So, even if the books of the New Testament were not known in literature earlier than A. D. 150, we could not put their origin then, but rather fifty or a hundred years before.

2. Testimony of Justin Martyr. He was born at Neapolis, or ancient Sichem, about the close of the first century,

and died a martyr at Rome in 167. He was a scholar in Greek literature and philosophy before he became a Christian writer, and is the best known of the early defenders of the faith. Of his numerous works three of great value have been preserved; two Apologies and a Dialogue. The longer Apology was presented to the Emperor Antonius about 139; the other to Marcus Aurelius in 163. His dialogue with Trypho, a Jew, was also a defence of Christianity. He bears testimony to the Gospels in the following passages:

(1) "And the messenger then sent to that virgin announced to her the glad news, saying, 'Behold, thou shalt conceive through the Holy Spirit, and bring forth a son, and he shall be the Son of the Most High; and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall deliver his people from their sins; *as those who have written memoirs concerning every thing relating to our Savior, Jesus Christ, have taught, whom we believe.*" In giving an account of the Last Supper of our Lord he says: "*The Apostles, in the Memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels*, have thus informed us." "On the day which is called Sunday we all, whether dwelling in cities or in the country, assemble together; when the *Memoirs by the Apostles*, or the writings of the Prophets, are read, as long as time permits."

(2) It is said that these passages cannot refer to our Gospels for three reasons: (a) Justin does not designate them by our titles. (b) He does not quote them with verbal accuracy. (c) He has passages apparently from the written history of Christ used by him, which are not found in our Gospels.

First objection answered. In his Apologies he was not giving a list of books or authors. He calls the Gospels "Memoirs" as being more intelligible to Greeks and Romans. It is not certain that the naming of the writers of the Gospels

specifically—for he does call them *Apostles* — would have added to his argument.

Second objection answered. (a) Ancient writers were not generally accurate according to a modern standard. (b) Justin quotes as accurately as others did. (c) He is inaccurate in his quotations from other books. (d) He did not always give the same passage in the same words. All things considered, his quotations are such as one would expect to find in this author.

Third objection answered. (a) When he professedly quoted from the Apostolic Memoirs he never produced anything not found in them. (b) His works contain but few passages not found in the canonical Gospels, and those few he does not attribute to the "Memoirs." (c) He quoted often from memory and not accurately. (d) He sometimes quoted traditional sayings similar to those in the Gospels.

(3) Therefore, notwithstanding these objections, it is evident that the "Memoirs" of Justin were the same as our Gospels. (a) The number and substantial accuracy of the quotations. (b) They were the origins of Christianity, in his opinion, and were so regarded by the Church of his day. (c) If the "Memoirs" were not our Gospels, they must have perished in the next decade or two; for Clement, Tertullian and Origen knew and said nothing of them. (d) They related the same facts as our Gospels. They contained nothing not found in the Gospels; the style and language were the same. (e) There were, at least, four such "Memoirs;" for he speaks of "Memoirs" written by *Apostles* and their *companions*. (f) Our Gospels *were in existence* in the days of Justin and *were quoted* copiously by contemporaneous writers; it is certain that he quoted these "Memoirs" just as others did. The position that the "Memoirs" were not the

Gospels is a suppositional theory invented to account for suppositious facts.

(4) The sum of Justin's testimony is this: (a) He had in his possession written histories of the ministry of Jesus, called by him "Memoirs," which cannot be accounted for except on the supposition that they were the Gospels of the next age. (b) His professed citations can all be found in the canonical books. (c) His writings contain forty quotations, all substantially, and many verbally, from Matthew. (d) They contain twenty passages from Mark and Luke. (e) There are several passages substantially from John. (f) He quotes 125 passages of the New Testament books.

3. Testimony of Papias. He lived about the beginning of the second century and was a contemporary of the disciples of the Apostles. He was Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia. Eusebius says of him as follows:

"But Papias himself, in the preface of his discourses, by no means asserts that he was a hearer and an eye-witness of the holy Apostles, but informs us that he received the doctrines of faith from their intimate friends." He wrote a work in five books, entitled "Interpretations of Our Lord's Declarations," in which he indicated his acquaintance with two Gospels, Matthew and Mark. Of Matthew he says:

"Matthew composed his history in the Hebrew dialect, and every one translated it as he was able."

Of Mark: "And John, the presbyter, also said this: 'Mark being an interpreter of Peter, whatever he recorded he wrote with great accuracy, but not, however, in the order in which it was spoken or done by our Lord, but, as before said, he was in company with Peter, who gave him such instruction as was necessary, but not to give a history of our Lord's discourses; wherefore Mark has not erred in anything by

writing some things as he has recorded them; for he was carefully attentive to one thing—not to pass by anything that he heard, or to state anything falsely in these accounts.' "

4. Testimony of Basilides. He lived not long after the Apostles, and about A. D. 130. He wrote a commentary on the Gospels in twenty-four books. What we know of this work has been handed down by Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. He testifies (1) that, in the opinion of some, the New Testament writings deserved the title, and had attained the rank, of "inspired" books; (2) he quotes Romans 8 : 22, and II. Corinthians 12 : 4, under the formula "it is written;" (3) he cites the first Epistle to the Corinthians as "Scripture;" (4) he shows his acquaintance with three of the Gospels, Romans, Ephesians, Colossians, I. Timothy and I. Peter.

5. Testimony of the Letter to Diognetus. This is assigned by the best scholars to the year 117. Though the writer is unknown, the letter itself is still extant in its original Greek form. The writer shows great familiarity with John's Gospel, and with the Pauline writings. There are manifest references to Romans, I. Corinthians, Galatians, Acts, Ephesians, Philippians, I. Timothy, Titus and I. Peter.

6. The fact that the books of the New Testament were in existence and were held in high esteem during the *last half of the first century* is also strong proof for the first half of the second century. If the stream of Christian literature was in full tide in the year 100, and is found still flowing on in the year 150—fifty miles down the valley—it is good proof that it traversed the portions lying between. It remains to make this point good and to take the last step in this regressive investigation.

6°. *Evidence for the Apostolic Age, the last half of the first century.*

The Apostolic Fathers are Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp. The first three are supposed to be named in the New Testament. They lived between the years 70 and 120.

1. Testimony of Clement. His first letter to the Corinthians is admitted to be genuine. It was written between 70 and 80, according to Tischendorf, Westcott, and others. (1) He shows great familiarity with the writings of Peter and Paul; he imitates their style and uses their words. (2) He was familiar with John's Gospel. (3) His allusions to the Hebrew Letter are numerous. (4) Lardner cites thirty-one quotations from seventeen of the New Testament books.

2. Testimony of Barnabas. The genuineness of the "Epistle of Barnabas" was questioned until Tischendorf found, in 1859, at the Convent of St. Catherine, the Greek text. It was written a little after the destruction of Jerusalem. (1) He says, in a celebrated passage, found in the Greek as well as in the Latin, "Let us be on our guard that we be not found to be, *as it is written*, many called and few chosen." This is found in Matthew, and is explicit as to the existence of this Gospel. (2) He alludes to Matt. 9 : 13 and Matt. 20 : 16. (3) His references to the Judaizing tendency of his time, to the observance of the Lord's day, and to the Gospel facts, attest his acquaintance with the New Testament literature. (4) Lardner cites twenty-four quotations from twelve books of the New Testament.

3. Testimony of Hermas. His work entitled the "Shepherd of Hermas," was a very ancient document, as early as the reign of Hadrian. It is quoted by Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, and Eusebius. Lardner cites twenty-three quotations from fourteen books.

4. Testimony of Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, born in 37; martyred at Rome in 108. His seven shorter Epistles, in

their Greek form, are believed to be genuine. Lardner cites nineteen quotations from as many books of the New Testament.

5. Testimony of Polycarp. He was a disciple of the Apostle John, and his letter to the Philippians is genuine beyond all question. He makes forty quotations from the New Testament books.

6. To sum up this evidence for the Apostolic Age: (1) We have more than 200 quotations from all the New Testament books. (2) We have all and more than could be expected of the writers of this age. They had little need to write when the Apostles and their immediate disciples were still living. There was no demand, as yet, for Apologetic literature. There were no great heresies to be controverted. The time of scientific theology had not arrived. (3) This evidence is such in *kind* as we should expect. Some of the Gospels were earlier than others and would be best known. The Epistles were scattered among the churches; copies had not yet greatly multiplied. The kind and number of quotations show this state of things. This harmony of evidence, in quantity and kind, is strong proof of the genuineness and authenticity of the Apostolic Fathers. (4) Without the testimony of these Fathers the genuineness of the New Testament would have been established; since the reception of these books by the Church everywhere as genuine and authentic, and by those who had the means of knowing, is abundant proof; but with this additional evidence the proof of genuineness is unanswerable.

Argument 4. *All the Heretical Sects of the Ancient Church accepted the New Testament books as genuine.* This evidence comes from the second century, but it looks backward from that century as well as forward.

1. Testimony of the Ebionites. These heretics were the descendants of the Judaizing teachers of Paul's day. They believed that Christianity was but a further development of Judaism, adhered to the law of Moses, and rejected the divinity of Christ. They used only the Gospel of Matthew in Hebrew, and regarded it as genuine and credible. *Irenæus* says of them: "So well established are our Gospels that even teachers of error themselves bear testimony to them; even *they* rest their objections on the foundation of the Gospels."

2. Testimony of the Gnostics. The Greek word, *Gnostic*, means an enlightened man. These heretics were, therefore, called Gnostics, because they endeavored to interpret the facts of Christianity in the light of Greek wisdom and philosophy. These facts they found in our canonical Gospels. "The fathers were eager to urge against the Gnostics the charge of corrupting and contemning the Scriptures and of fabricating Apocryphal writings. * * * What, then, is the state of the case? I answer, in the first place, that Irenæus and Tertullian were the two principal writers against the Gnostics, and from their works it does not appear that the Valentinians, the Marcionites, or any other Gnostic sect, adduced in support of their opinions a single narrative relating to the public ministry of Christ besides what is found in the Gospels. It does not appear that they ascribed to him a single sentence of any imaginable importance which the evangelists have not transmitted. It does not appear that any sect appealed to the authority of any history of his public ministry besides the Gospels, except so far as the Marcionites, in their use of an imperfect copy of Luke's Gospel, may be regarded as forming a verbal exception to this remark. The question, then, which we have proposed for consideration would seem to be settled. The Gnostics did not oppose any other history of Christ to

the catholic Gospels. Had they done so, it is altogether incredible that the fact should not have been conspicuous throughout the controversial writings of Irenæus and Tertullian."—(*Norton.*)

3. *The testimony of prominent heretical writers* is to the same effect. *Valentinus* is worthy of the first mention. Irenæus gives copious quotations from his works. Hippolitus, in a work discovered about thirty-five years ago, also quotes and refutes his writings. (a) He shows his familiarity with John's Gospel by the use of such words as the Word, Only-begotten, Life, Light, Fulness, Truth, Grace, Redeemer, Comforter. (b) He gives several sayings of Christ as found in John, particularly John 10 : 8. He refers to Matthew 8 : 9 and Luke 7 : 8; also Matthew 9 : 20. (2) *Ptolemy*, a disciple of Valentinus, gives several quotations from Matthew and one from John in these words: "The Apostle says that all things were made by it, and that without it was not anything made that was made." (3) *Heracleon* wrote an entire commentary on the Gospel of John, deeming it important to show that this Gospel sustained Gnosticism.

Argument 5. *All the early adversaries of Christianity granted the genuineness of the New Testament books.* These adversaries were men of talent and learning. By worldly interests and intense hatred of Christianity they were urged to use against it every possible weapon. The fact that they did not show its sacred books to be spurious is proof that they were not able to do so. Four representative opponents will be noticed, and it will be seen that these also lead us back to the Apostolic Age.

1. *Testimony of Julian.* The Emperor Julian composed his work against Christianity in 361. He united talent, learning, power, and persecuting zeal. If anything could

have been said against the genuineness of the New Testament he would have been eager to make his attack from this side, but he did not. He bore witness to the genuineness of the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. He concedes their early date and quotes them as the genuine works of their reputed authors. He quotes Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians. His whole attack assumes the genuineness and credibility of the New Testament.

2. Testimony of Hierocles. In 303 he was president of Bithynia; a cruel persecutor, and a sarcastic writer. He concedes the genuineness, and confines his efforts to the hunting up of internal flaws and contradictions. He refers to six of the eight authors of the New Testament.

3. Testimony of Porphyry. He was the most severe and formidable adversary of the primitive church. He wrote about 270. He was well acquainted with the New Testament. He has plain references to Matthew, Mark, John, Acts, and Galatians. There is no trace of a suspicion that the sacred books were spurious. That he would have made this point, if possible, is evident from the fact that he did attack the book of Daniel in this manner.

4. Testimony of Celsus. He flourished about 176, and but 76 years after the death of the Apostle John. What we know about his work entitled "The True Word" has been preserved by Origen. More than eighty quotations, made by him from the New Testament, have been thus preserved. His whole argument proceeds upon the concessions that the books he quoted were in existence, were held in high esteem by the churches, and were genuine.

Thus by a plain and independent path we can trace the New Testament back to the Apostolic Age. It is also a remarkable fact that these bitter enemies are made to bear this unwilling, but decisive, testimony.

Argument 6. *The internal character of the New Testament books is such as to show that they were written by their reputed authors.*

1. The language and style are in perfect harmony with local and other circumstances of the reputed authors. (1) The language is that of Palestine during the last half of the first century. It is not pure Greek, but what is called *Hebraic Greek*, and such as was not written in any other age or country. The New Testament could not have been written at any other time or place. (2) The New Testament was written by Jews, and such were its reputed authors.

2. The style and language harmonize with the rank and training of the reputed authors. They are plain and simple, destitute of philosophy and rhetorical art, and such, with one exception, as Galilean fishermen would have adopted. They are suited to the peculiarities of each writer; Peter is ardent and ever mindful of his fall; John is always in calm communion with Him on whose bosom he leaned at supper; and Paul exhibits his higher culture and his constant remembrance that he was once a persecutor and the chief of sinners.

3. The absence of any reference to the destruction of Jerusalem is proof that these books were written before that event, A. D. 70; or, at least, by authors whose methods of thinking, feeling, and writing were formed before the fall of the Jewish temple and city. If written after, there would have been copious references to an event so powerfully affecting the Jewish nation and the rising church.

4. They were evidently written by eye-witnesses and participants. The minuteness of detail and accuracy of historic statement show this.

Argument 7. *The books of the New Testament are not forgeries, and are therefore genuine.*

1. None *would* have forged such books if they could.

(1) They are opposed to the evil passions and purposes of human nature, and would not have been written by deceivers and liars. (2) They were offensive to every sect among the Jews, and yet retained enough of the Jewish religion to secure a rejection by the Gentiles, if false. The love of gain, notoriety or power, could not have been a sufficient motive. (3) They would all have been attributed to the Apostles. (4) The writers would have avoided all superficial oppositions and difficulties. (5) They would not so often have appealed to history and risked fatal antagonisms with it.

2. None *could* have forged such books if they would. (1) They could not so wisely have drawn the line between the Old Covenant and the New, saving a part and rejecting the rest. (2) They could not so perfectly have dovetailed their forged narratives with profane history that there is not a single discrepancy. (3) They could not have invented the many undesigned coincidences between the historic portions and the Epistles. (4) They could not have invented the character and life of Christ, a perfect manhood and a divine nature, so far as we can see, perfectly joined and manifested for the admiration of all the ages. (5) They could not have invented so profound a system of morals and religion, and have explained and defended it so variously and consistently.

3. If any could or would have forged them, yet it would have been quite impossible to secure for them acceptance and circulation among the churches. (1) It should not be forgotten that the Church existed before the books of the New Testament were written. The Apostles and early evangelists were the first depositaries of the Gospel. The oral Gospel was first preached, received, and treasured up in the memories of individual Christians. It was not till after some years that the sacred teachings were committed to writ-

ing. The churches, therefore, first of all, became well acquainted with the facts and requirements of the Gospel, and with the Apostolic method and style. They were well qualified to judge of the genuineness and credibility of what might be presented. (2) It would have been impossible for base men to palm off on the churches forged and spurious books. It would have been impossible to replace the true account with the forged, so suddenly, so quietly, and so perfectly, that the change never excited a suspicion nor left on record a single word of protest.

Argument 8. *The books of the New Testament have come down to us essentially as their authors wrote them.*

1. That the sacred text presents many changes should not be a matter of surprise. These changes would be of two classes: the *unintentional* and the *intentional.* (1) The unintentional variations would of necessity be very numerous. These books, for sixteen hundred years, were multiplied by penmen who transcribed them, a volume at a time, from copies that had been transcribed many times, and which exhibited the accumulated errors of centuries. The scribe did not always *see* the words and letters as they were; if he wrote from dictation, the reader might have been at fault, or he might have failed to *hear* correctly; hearing a sentence read, his *memory* might have failed to hold it firmly till it was fixed again on the parchment; or his *judgment* might not have been sound. It is not in human nature, in such work, to be perfectly exact. (2) Intentional changes would also be of two kinds: those *honestly* made and those *dishonestly* made; (a) the former would be such changes as the choice of a synonymous word, the supposed improvement of the order or euphony of the sentence, and the introduction of a modern name for an old one no longer understood; (b) the

latter would be such modifications as changed the facts recorded or the doctrines taught; and would be made in the interest of heretical and contending parties.

2. All books of great age have suffered in this way. (1) The utmost care of the printer and proof-reader cannot produce the printed page that is just like the manuscript. When once stereotyped the changes would cease for a time; but the next edition would show a new instalment of variations. (2) In Edwards' work on the Will, and in editions made only a hundred years from the first publication, there is a larger proportion of changes than in the New Testament. (3) The six comedies of Terrence, written 150 B. C., present 30,000 various readings.

3. The New Testament books have suffered less from such changes than any other books of the same age. Among the reasons for this fact we may enumerate the following: (1) They were classed with the Old Testament as sacred books, and it is well known with what care and reverence such books were copied and guarded. (2) Their wide distribution and the fact that they were constantly appealed to as the source of doctrine and as decisive of all controversies, rendered it, at all times, exceedingly difficult to corrupt them. (3) The time when they could or would have been *dishonestly* corrupted was very brief. Before the second century there was little temptation to do so, since the age of controversy had not yet come; and after this century the copies were too numerous. It is impossible to corrupt them now, and this impossibility runs as far back as the beginning of the third century. (4) That they retain the characteristics of the Aramaic Greek, that they bear the complexion of the historic period when produced, that they have preserved the traits of Jewish authorship and the peculiarities of their respective writers, is proof that they have come down without material change.

4. That the so-called "various readings" do not involve any essential change of these books is evident from their character. (1) They have been gathered from nearly two thousand manuscripts, ancient and comparatively modern, perfect and fragmentary, designed for public use or private reading. These manuscripts have been studied with microscopic eyes, and have been closely compared as no others ever were. All their differences with one another, as well as with the older and standard copies, have been noted and counted among the "various readings." What wonder that these variations, from the slightest to the most important, should number one hundred and twenty thousand! (2) Concerning the character of these variations the following may be said: (a) Nineteen-twentieths of them are not worthy of notice, because they are found in so few and fragmentary manuscripts; this will leave but 6,000 that need any explanation whatever. (b) Nearly all these 6,000 are such as differences in spelling, in tense, in case, in number, in the presence or absence of particles, in the presence or omission of the article, in the use of the proper name instead of the pronoun, in supplying words understood, in the name of Jesus, in using equivalent words, in exchanging simple and compound forms, and in supplying words and phrases from the other Evangelists. For the most part, these changes would not alter, in the slightest degree, any single sentence. The statement that Edwards on the Will has come down to us without material change, it would be preposterous to deny; but it would be far more preposterous if this denial were applied to the New Testament.

5. The intentional modifications are exceedingly rare, while it would be impossible to make out a clear case of dishonest corruption.

6. The result of these investigations may be summed up

in the following particulars: (1) These "readings" do not affect a single material fact or doctrine. (2) These investigations *prove* that these books have not been essentially corrupted. (3) Well-read unbelievers have abandoned this field as one that gives little hope of affording valid objections to the Christian faith. "They have ceased henceforth to look for anything from those critical researches which they at first so warmly recommended, because they expected discoveries from them that have never been made."—(*Michaelis.*) (4) The following statement of the learned *Samuel Davidson* is the unanimous verdict of competent critics: "Having thus given a history of the text, printed as well as unprinted, and having shown the various attempts made to restore it to its pristine purity, we may add a few words on the general results obtained. The effect of it has been to establish the genuineness of the New Testament text in all important particulars. No new doctrine has been elicited by its aid, nor have any historical facts been summoned by it from their obscurity. All the doctrines and duties of Christianity remain unaffected."

Here the argument is closed in regard to the genuineness of the New Testament. What other proof would the logician have? What other *kind* of proof is possible; and how, in the providence of God, could these proofs have been stronger ones of their kind? Therefore, the *New Testament contains the testimony concerning Jesus of Nazareth as the primary witnesses gave it to the world.*

THE GENUINENESS AND INTEGRITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

ARG. 1. THE WEIGHT OF AUTHORITY IS ON THIS SIDE.

1. *Authority of learned men is of great weight.*
2. *Christian authority is weightier than Infidel.*
3. *Renan's testimony.*

ARG. 2. THE NEW TESTAMENT PRESENTS NO MARKS OF SPURIOUSNESS.

1. *The six marks of spuriousness.*
2. *Greenleaf's testimony.*

ARG. 3. THERE IS A LINE OF QUOTATIONS REACHING BACK TO THE APOSTLES.

1. *Evidence back to the fourth century.*
2. *Evidence for the fourth century.*
3. *Evidence for the third century.*
4. *Evidence for the last half of the second century.*
5. *Evidence for the first half of the second century.*
6. *Evidence for the apostolic age.*

ARG. 4. TESTIMONY OF HERETICAL SECTS.

1. *Ebionites.*
2. *Gnostics.*
3. *Prominent heretical writers.*

ARG. 5. TESTIMONY OF EARLY ADVERSARIES OF CHRISTIANITY.

1. *Julian.*
2. *Hierocles.*
3. *Porphyry.*
4. *Celsus.*

ARG. 6. THE INTERNAL CHARACTER OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

1. *The language and style agree with the circumstances of the reputed authors.*
2. *The language and style agree with the rank and training of the reputed authors.*
3. *Absence of reference to the destruction of Jerusalem.*

ARG. 7. THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT ARE NOT FORGERIES.

1. *None would have forged such books.*
2. *None could have forged such books.*
3. *If forged, their acceptance by the early church impossible.*

ARG. 8. THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT HAVE NOT BEEN MATERIALLY CHANGED.

1. *Changes to be expected.*
2. *All ancient books have suffered in this respect.*
3. *The New Testament has suffered far less than others.*
4. *"Various readings" numerous, but unimportant.*
5. *No intentional changes.*
6. *No material fact or doctrine affected.*

PROPOSITION SECOND.

The books of the New Testament are credible.

Argument 1. *If these books are genuine they are credible.* A book may be credible and not genuine. It may have been published anonymously, and the world not have discovered the writer; and yet the facts related may be beyond question. If a book, however, asserts itself to have been written by the reputed authors, then the genuineness and credibility stand or fall together; and either, when established, would help to prove the other. This is the case with most of the books of the New Testament. When, in geometry, a proposition has once been demonstrated, it may be used in establishing succeeding propositions. Having proved that the books of the New Testament are genuine, it is legitimate to argue from this that they are credible.

1. They were published in the *country* and *time* in which the events recorded took place. The writer of a false account under such circumstances would be in great danger of exposure and punishment; so great is the danger that few would attempt it. In such cases, also, counter statements would be written, and these would certainly be as long-lived as the forged account. But in regard to Christianity we have no such counter statement. So strong is the improbability that such accounts are forged, that in any other case their credibility is not questioned.

2. In the quotations to prove the genuineness, quotations from councils, churches, and individuals; from Christians, heretics and enemies, we have evidence of credibility. These quotations record the belief of the church and of the heathen

world in the authenticity of these books; and this discriminating, religious belief is traced back to the apostolic age.

Argument 2. This testimony is credible because the witnesses had the means of knowing.

1. They were eye-witnesses of what they relate, and were companions of Jesus and participants in the early spread of the gospel. It is a rare thing that the eye-witness and the historian are the same person. Most writers of authentic history are compelled to collect their facts from former documents, from tradition, and from participants removed from them by several generations. A history is of the first-class and receives universal credence, if, like Xenophon's Anabasis and Cæsar's Commentaries, it was written by an actor in the scenes described. Hence, the New Testament books must be placed in the highest class of reliable histories.

2. These witnesses give *facts*, what they *saw* and *heard*, not inferences and theories. Their inferences, like those of other witnesses, might have been incorrect; but in regard to what they saw and heard they could not have been mistaken. Of this strict adherence to facts there are abundant examples. (1) The first miracle is a good one. Jesus and his disciples were at the marriage in Cana, the wine was exhausted, the vessels were filled with water, it was presented as wine to the guests, and they said it was the best used at the feast. These are the *facts* given by the witnesses, and from these facts, and not from the assertion of the witnesses, we learn that a miracle was wrought. (2) Again, in the resurrection of Christ, we have the *facts*—the arrest, trial, crucifixion, death and burial; all these were ordinary events; also, the visit to the tomb, the empty sepulchre, the meeting with the Savior, exhibition of his wounds, and the many infallible signs,—all ordinary events. Human testimony is adequate to establish the latter

facts as well as the former. They give us these facts, and *we* see the miracle. This is characteristic of the Gospels. Stronger and more specific evidence could not be asked in any court of justice.

3. These witnesses had the means of knowing, because theirs is not a complicated history like that of a war or of a nation, but only some events in the daily life of Jesus, during three and a half years. The history of a war might be difficult, so many are the causes, so many the campaigns, so many the battles, so contradictory the reports. The history of a nation, including many wars, and matters of early and general progress, would be more difficult. How much easier this—a single line of events, in a single life, and for a brief time! Besides, these writers do not profess to give all the events, nor to give what they do give, in exact chronological order. Varying in their selections, in the order of narration, and in the degree of fulness, each gives what would justify the Messianic claims of Jesus and prove his divine nature and mission. Surely, these witnesses *knew* whereof they wrote.

Argument 3. This testimony is credible from the number of the witnesses.

1. We have Matthew, Mark, Luke, John the Acts, and the Epistles—in all, eight independent witnesses. Some of these give full and direct testimony; the others, indirect and incidental evidence; so that the whole field of evidence is included. We lose the force of this number of witnesses by their being all bound in one volume. Suppose we should find in addition to Xenophon's account of the Anabasis, three other, similar and reliable, personal narratives, and that all should agree in giving, substantially, the same facts; suppose a Greek history should be found, one chapter of which gives the same facts; and still further, that a score of letters should

be discovered written by individuals in the expedition of Cyrus to their friends in Athens, Sparta, and Corinth, incidentally referring to the events recorded in the Anabasis; would not this historic evidence be exceedingly strong? Indeed, could it, in any way, be made more convincing? But this is exactly the case with the New Testament narrative. We have Matthew, and then Mark, Luke, and John. We have the history in the Acts, and the twenty-one Epistles, all woven together and strongly supporting one another; moreover, the writers, the places, and the surroundings, are so various as to preclude the possibility of a combination to deceive.

2. All who believed, in the early ages and in the country where the events transpired, are also witnesses; the three thousand Pentecostians, the two thousand converted soon after, the great company of the priests who were obedient to the faith; Samaritans, Jews, and Gentiles, and influential persons like Cornelius and Saul. That from the first there were multitudes of converts in Jerusalem itself, is evident from profane history. These all are witnesses to the truth of Christianity, since they believed when and where the facts were well known, and since, against all worldly interests, they cast in their fortunes and lives with those of the persecuted church.

3. If the New Testament is not credible, then there was a conspiracy to deceive; a conspiracy early formed, wide-spread, lasting at least seventy years, inveterate, and unaccountable. The hypothesis of such a conspiracy is *absurd*. What motive can be supplied? How were so many made to entertain this fell purpose? How did it continue so long after the originators of the scheme were gone? Why did not some one turn state's-evidence and expose the plot? Why did not some one in prison or at the block yield to the compulsion of conscience and the terrors of death, and reveal the whole dark history?

Argument 4. *This testimony is credible from the character of the witnesses.*

1. Their writings and lives give evidence of great moral worth. Their writings speak for themselves, and the argument from their lives is founded upon the admission that the lives of these men were spent in propagating Christianity. So long as a tree is known by its fruits, so long will these men be known by their writings and deeds. Where will you find a purer morality, an intenser hatred of wrong, or a diviner self-sacrifice and moral heroism? It cannot be that the fountain was impure whence these living waters flowed.

2. These witnesses were men of great candor. (1) Their testimony has all the appearance of honesty. If the testimony is not true, the writers were miracles of skill in telling a falsehood so as to make it seem the truth. They do not stop to eulogize, to express wonder, nor to make asseverations of truthfulness. They seem to be unconscious that their statements will be hard to believe, and that they should be on their guard against detection. (2) They fall into just such discrepancies as true witnesses are liable to. There are no contradictions, but one relates more than another, and sees the same fact from a different angle. Perfect agreement indicates false testimony as surely as bald oppositions. These witnesses show just that agreement and that kind of difference which are impossible of imitation and which prove their honesty. (3) Sometimes their testimony seems to be against themselves and their cause. They record that Jesus, after his resurrection, appeared only to his disciples; that John the Baptist, in prison, was tormented with doubts, although he had witnessed the descent of the Spirit and heard the voice, at the baptism; that at one time some went back from following Christ; that all forsook their Master, and Peter denied him.

3. Their extreme sufferings on account of their testimony is proof of their honesty. Martyrdom may not prove that a man is talented and learned, and therefore that his conclusions are correct; but it does prove that he is honest in that for which he dies. A bad man may be killed; but even a bad man will not suffer death, when he could save his life by giving up unprofitable deceit and falsehood. (1) That these witnesses suffered on account of this evidence, is seen from the *nature of the case.* They left home and country to preach Christ. They brought upon themselves the enmity of Jews and Romans. They taught that the Temple service was abolished and that heathen altars and idols must be cast down. They incited against themselves a multitude of artisans who ministered to heathen religions; they angered powerful priesthoods whose living depended upon the superstitions which Christianity was overthrowing; they armed against themselves the civil power of every land, for the civil ruler was bound to maintain the state-religion. Nothing could have kept them from persecution and martyrdom, but the power of God. We are therefore prepared to believe the blood-stained record of suffering. (2) It would not be logical to mention here the stoning of Stephen, the killing of James, the imprisonment of Peter, and the beheading of Paul at Rome; for these are found in the record whose credibility we are proving. But we have abundant outside evidence. Let him who doubts, open our church histories; let him read the testimony of the Christian Fathers; let him study Tacitus' account of the Neronian persecution which took place not later than thirty-four years after the death of Christ; let him ponder the letter of Pliny to the Emperor Trajan, written about A. D. 90, in which we have the account of a persecution which nearly depopulated town and country; let him visit the catacombs of Rome and, as he passes along these subterranean streets in the

city of the dead, let him mark the frequent inscriptions and bloody symbols which testify that many myriads of martyrs there found repose.

4. The character of these witnesses is further evident from the following view: These writers were either *deceived*, *deceivers*, or *true* witnesses. (1) They were not deceived. The things testified of were so plain, and many of them so often repeated, that the supposition is absurd. (2) They were not deceivers. Their writings, their lives, and their sufferings, put this hypothesis out of the question. (3) They were, then, reliable witnesses. As this is the only tenable position, so it is the most natural, and one that accounts for all the facts in the case.

If the argument should end here, the credibility of the New Testament would be fully established. That such testimony should prove false, would be a greater miracle than the resurrection of the dead. On the one hand, a miracle is *possible*, since there is a God; and *probable*, since man's whole nature cries out after light; besides, Christ, to say the least, was a *remarkable personage*. On the other hand, when twelve men like the Apostles, men of integrity, of clear moral insight, of great benevolence and moral heroism, without any conceivable motive or reward, but in the face of certain persecution and death, shall combine to deceive and to publish such a tissue of falsehoods—falsehoods if the New Testament is not credible,— then will the dead stir in their shrouds and come out of their graves.

Moreover, it should be remembered that the main facts in the life of Jesus—all except the miracles, however absurd this exception may be—are admitted; and admitted *on the ground that this testimony is credible*. Baur, Strauss, and Renan build on this foundation as well as Christians.

Argument 5. *The New Testament contains in full the one and only account of the origin of Christianity.*

Fragments of this account are found in the Fathers and in profane authors, but nowhere is there a different one. It is not probable that the true account was lost. It is not probable that a false one, so elaborate, so perfect, and so cunningly devised, was put in its place; nor that this false account could have been put in place of the true one so quietly and with such general consent as to leave no trace of the transition in the literature of the time.

Argument 6. *The failure of hypotheses devised to account for the miraculous facts of the New Testament without admitting their reality is a strong argument for the credibility.*

Human ingenuity has been severely taxed to invent some way of accounting for the supernatural in the New Testament without admitting its reality. The result is the production of four theories, wholly inadequate and at war with one another.

1. *The Theory of Imposture.* This theory affirms that the writers of the New Testament were *base impostors;* impostors, because they wrote what they knew was false; and base, because they did this with a wicked purpose to deceive. This theory is now abandoned by the most acute and learned critics of the opposition. It is untenable for the following reasons: (1) The moral and religious tone of their writings forbids it. (2) Their philanthropic lives forbid it. (3) Impostors could not have produced such a moral renovation in society. (4) They would not have done this without an adequate motive, nor without hope of reward. (5) They would not have suffered martyrdom in such a cause.

2. *The Theory of Honest Deception.* This hypothesis implies that the Apostles were deceived and were innocent in writing their false accounts. This theory, if established, is

destructive of the first. (1) This supposition makes Christ a base deceiver and the Apostles simpletons. It is not possible that Jesus was a deceiver. (2) If the account is not true the writers knew that they were lying. They could not have been deceived in regard to what they saw and heard. They had ample opportunity to investigate and to know the truth. They state that they themselves took part in the events which they relate. Could they have been mistaken about this? Could they have been deceived in regard to the risen Christ? Could they have misinterpreted the "infallible signs" of their Master's presence? (3) If the New Testament is not true, its writers were no ordinary men, and were not easily duped. They produced the best system of morals known to the world. They elaborated the most profound and philosophical religion. They were masters in the imitation of truth and simplicity. They invented Christ, the highest ideal of moral excellence possible to man. It is not to be believed that *such* men, so many of them, and for so long a time, were deceived.

3. *The Mythical Theory of Strauss.* The German critic, *David Frederick Strauss*, was born at Wurtemburg in 1808. His "Life of Jesus" was published in 1836; this was for the learned. In 1864 he published a revision, adapting it to the masses, and changing his position in important respects.

(1) The following are the essential points of his theory: (a) The books of the New Testament were not written by the Apostles and their companions, but by unknown writers and in the last half of the second century. (b) The account of natural events is, in the main, true; but that of supernatural events is false. (c) That the narrative of supernatural events found a place in the New Testament. is accounted for in the following way: The young church believed that Jesus was the Messiah, and if so, that he must have wrought such miracles as are attributed to the Old Testament prophets; hence, they

freely ascribed these miracles to him. (d) The writers of these myths were unconscious of fraud or guilt.

A few instances will illustrate his method. He thinks Jesus was said to be the son of a virgin, because of the misinterpretation of a passage in Isaiah. He is represented as feeding the multitude, because Moses fed the Israelites with manna. It is said that when a lad he was found in the Temple disputing with the doctors, because a similar fact is related of Augustus Cæsar. He raised to life the widow's son, because the prophet Elijah performed such a miracle.

(2) Objections to this theory. (a) It is opposed to the established proposition that the New Testament is genuine. It would have been too bald and incredible to suppose that the *Apostles* could have innocently written such falsehoods about their Master, and hence the origin of the New Testament books is assigned to the church and to the last half of the second century. But this cannot be allowed, since we have proved that these books existed a hundred years before the time when this theory supposes they were written. Besides, if these books were written so long after the days of the Apostles, how does Strauss, or any one, know that the ordinary events related are credible, and what basis could he have for a "Life of Christ?" (b) Whenever these supernatural accounts were written, if false, the writers must have been conscious of fraud. (c) This theory asserts that miracles were attributed to Christ because he was believed to be the Messiah. But how did they come to believe that he was the Messiah? How were they made so firm in this faith? How were the first converts made and the church so wonderfully enlarged? If the Apostles, without the preaching of miracles, were able to found the church and nearly to conquer the Roman Empire by the end of the second century, why did the church turn away from the simple truth to these cumbrous

fables concerning the supernatural? (d) It is true that the Jews had definite ideas about the character and work of the Messiah; but the life, teachings, and ignominious death of Jesus were contrary to all these expectations. Again, if these writers of fictitious miracles recorded these miracles to fill out Jewish expectations in some respects, why did they not invent more and meet these expectations in all respects? For example, why did they not represent Christ as a king, like David; for that the Messiah would come in kingly splendor, was one of the strongest hopes of the Jews? Moreover, why did they place Jesus in strong opposition to Jewish hopes; representing their Christ as one crucified and raised from the dead? Why did they make him "to the Jews a stumbling block and to the Greeks foolishness?" (e) These suppositions of Strauss are only a *theory* at most, and yet as a theory it does not touch as many facts as it omits; and it would account for those it does touch in a very feeble way. He thinks the healing of Naaman suggested the healing of the nobleman's son of Capernaum. Here there is only one point of resemblance and that not a prominent one, while there are half a dozen points of strong contrast. In a poetic allusion to the *drying up* of the sea, (in one of the Psalms,) he finds a suggestion for Christ's stilling the sea and the storm. He finds no parallel to the Transfiguration, but the shining of Moses' face when he came down from the mount, and can adduce none whatever for the finding of the piece of money in the mouth of the fish. There is no parallel in the Old Testament to the healing of the ten lepers; hence, he thinks a parable was mistaken for a miracle. (f) He gives abundant evidence of dishonest criticism. In his opinion, Christ's refusal to give the Pharisees a sign, is a denial that he wrought any miracles whatever! He says that in forgiving the paralytic, Jesus endorsed the Jewish notion that sins were fully punished

in this life, wholly ignoring the Savior's frequent denial of this doctrine. He says that Jesus is represented as entering Jerusalem in triumph, riding on *both* the ass and its colt. If it is written that a certain one was High-Priest "that year," this is construed to mean that the writer supposed the Jewish High-Priest was appointed annually. Peter's confession in the sixteenth chapter of Matthew, is construed to mean that before that time the disciples had not believed in the Messiahship of Jesus. Other evidences of unsound criticism are abundant. The relation of more circumstances of a given event is a contradiction of the briefer account, as though the Evangelists profess to state every circumstance. He reasons in a circle, disproving John by the Synoptics, and the Synoptics by John. (g) Finally, this theory is only an effort to invent a plausible statement of how it might have been, but does not come within a thousand miles of proving *anything;* much less, *how it was.* One might invent many ways in which President Lincoln might have been killed, but the *conception* of a plan is not to be put in the place of veritable history.

4. *Theory of Renan.* The French writer, *Joseph Ernest Renan*, was born in 1823. He was educated for the Romish priesthood. He turned away from the church to become a student of oriental literature, and in 1860 was at the head of a scientific expedition that visited the Holy Land. His "Life of Jesus" was published in 1863.

(1) His theory presents the following points: (a) He admits the genuineness of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and, with some hesitancy, of John also. They were written in the Apostolic age, and by the Apostles and their companions. In this he opposes and neutralizes Strauss. (b) He accepts all the ordinary history of the New Testament and on the same grounds which Christians urge, but rejects the extraordinary portions on the assumption of fraud on the part of Jesus and

the Apostles. He is not, like Strauss, desirous of clearing Jesus from the suspicion of deception by laying it all on the church of the second century. (c) He regards Jesus as the highest type of man intellectually and morally, and grants that the Apostles were disciples worthy of their Master.

(2) Objections to this theory. (a) Renan is an unsafe critic. He maintains that monotheism is characteristic of Semitic peoples, whereas they are polytheistic with but few exceptions. He gives no definite principles according to which he separates the true from the false in the New Testament narrative. He retains or rejects passages as fancy, or his theory, may require. He grossly misinterprets the Scriptures, affirming that Christ condemned property and marriage; that he required of his followers the rupture of all social and family ties; that the Eucharist was observed before the Last Supper was celebated; that Judas was jealous of the other disciples, and for this reason betrayed Christ; that Peter and John were rivals; and that Christ had no idea of the soul separated from the body. (b) His accounting for the supernatural in these writings on the ground of fraud in Christ and his Apostles is inconsistent with his ascription to them of great moral purity and intelligence. His theory is self-destructive. (c) The "Life of Jesus" is made up in the most arbitrary way. His selections of material from the Gospels is in disregard of all the laws of evidence. Of 971 verses in Matthew, he uses 791, disallows 73, and leaves the rest unnoticed. Of Mark's 678 verses, he uses 384, rejects 82, and ignores 212. There are 1,151 verses in Luke, of which he appropriates 606, finds 136 untrue, and 409 worthless. He supplies elements in the character and life of Christ to help out his theory, and on his own sheer authority. Christ was of magnificent physical presence and of great magnetic influence, although the New Testament is silent on the sub-

ject. He had an excessive admiration for natural scenery. He intended at once to found a temporal kingdom, without property and without a civil ruler. He will have Jesus to be an enthusiast, though his mission, his humble life, his profound teachings, and his frequent discouragement of disciples, render this assumption absurd. Though he would please believers in Jesus by ascribing to him every excellence, yet, when it suits his purpose, he makes Jesus to be a trickster and deceiver; as when, according to Renan's interpretations, he connived at the *supposed* death and resurrection of Lazarus. (d) He is exceedingly illogical in this, that he impeaches his witnesses—the Gospels—and then proceeds to build his Life of Jesus on their testimony. (e) His admissions are fatal to his theory: the genuineness of the Gospels, the great facts in the life of Christ, the genius and moral worth of Jesus, and the sublimity of his religion. (f) Of Renan it must be said as of Strauss—his theory is only a *conception* of how it might have been, and not a historical and logical statement of how it was.

Argument 7. The peculiar relation of the Gospels to one another is a proof of their credibility.

1. The facts of difference and concordance that call for an explanation are the following:

(1) *Between John and the Synoptics.* The points of *difference* here are the following: (a) The *duration* of the Savior's public ministry; some would gather from the Synoptics that it was only one year, but from John that it was more than three years. (b) The *place* of his public labors; in the Synoptics it is principally Galilee, but in John it is Judea. (c) The *discourses* of Jesus; in the Synoptics they are brief and simple; in John longer and more elevated. (d) The *person* of Christ; the former make more prominent his

humanity, the latter his divinity. (e) The *incidents* related. "If the total contents of the combined Gospels be represented by 100, the following table is obtained:

Mark,	peculiarities	7,	concordances	93.
Matthew,	"	42,	"	58.
Luke,	"	59,	"	41.
John,	"	92,	"	8.

Points of *concordance:* (a) The age when Christ lived; in general, the country where his life was passed and the persons associated with him are the same. (b) In both Christ is the same divine Savior. (c) The great events in Christ's life are the same. (d) The doctrines taught are the same. (e) Still further, they are in accord in this, that their differences are not inconsistent with one another.

(2) *Between the Synoptics*, Matthew, Mark, and Luke. *Differences*: (a) In the events related. If there are about 150 sections in the four Gospels, Luke has 37 peculiarities, Matthew 14, Mark 2. Mark does not give the events of the infancy of Jesus. There is a series of events in the Galilean ministry related by Matthew and Mark, but not by Luke. Another long series in the trans-Jordanic journeyings is given by Luke, but not given by the other two. (b) Each has peculiarities of style, and these peculiarities are greatest in the narrative portions. *Concordances:* (a) In general plan: this presents in order the birth, the baptism, the temptation, the ministry in Galilee, the journey toward Jerusalem, the triumphant entrance into the city, the discussion in the Temple, the passion, the crucifixion, the resurrection, and the ascension. (b) In the facts recorded. If the sections of the whole Gospel are 150, the concordances between the three Synoptics are 65; between Luke and Matthew, 12; Matthew and Mark, 15; Luke and Mark, 5. (c) In the reports of

the Savior's discourses the language and style are quite similar.

2. These differences and concordances are accounted for in one of three ways: the writers copied from one another; they used common documents, which have perished; or, these Gospels were written by independent disciples of Christ, who possessed a common knowledge of the facts and a common inspiration.

(1) *The first hypothesis is untenable.* (a) There is no agreement as to which Gospel was the original one, and which were copied. Each one has been made the basis and every possible combination has been advocated. This shows that this hypothesis has no foundation to stand upon. (b) This supposition might account for some of the concordances, but not for the differences. Westcott says: "Every attempt to show on this hypothesis why a later Evangelist has omitted details which are noted by an earlier one; why he adopted his language up to a certain point and then suddenly abandoned it; why he retained in some sentences nothing more than a remarkable word, and in others the fulness of an entire answer, has always failed." (c) The superficial incongruities and apparent contradictions which are fonnd in the different Gospels are inconsistent with the close connection which this theory supposes. (d) This theory is now generally abandoned as inadequate and not even plausible.

(2) *The second is also unsatisfactory.* (a) No two critics can agree upon the number and kind of original documents needed to account for all the facts. *Eichorn* required *five;* an original document, an alteration of this used by Matthew, another alteration used by Luke, a third document made by a combination of these two alterations which was used by Mark, and a fourth alteration used by Matthew and Luke in common. *Bishop Marsh*, another advocate of this theory,

needs *eight* original documents and several differing translations of these. This hypothesis does not account for the facts, and, therefore, it falls to the ground. (b) There is no evidence whatever that any such documents ever existed; nor is there any probability that, if once in existence, they would have utterly perished. Why were they not as long-lived as the Gospels themselves?

(3) The third disjunction, therefore, presents the true solution. The Gospels were written by independent disciples of Christ who possessed a common knowledge of the facts and a common inspiration. The *accordances* are explained by (a) their common experience, (b) their common oral Gospel, (c) their common purpose to give sufficient to prove the Messiahship of Jesus, (d) and their common country and nationality. The *differences* are also perfectly accounted for by this theory. (a) No one of them professes to give all the facts in the life of Jesus, nor all the circumstances of any one event. (b) No one professes to follow the exact order of time, but they adopt, rather, other principles of grouping. (c) They supplement one another as witnesses and historians. (d) Their independence in writing accounts for differences in minor points and in style. (e) They wrote for different classes of readers; some for Jews, some for Gentiles; some for individuals and some for churches. (f) Jesus often repeated his discourses, giving rise to different narratives of what he said. (g) The different presentations of Jesus in the Synoptics and in John are such as might have been made by two disciples writing at a great distance apart in time and place; nor are they more diverse than the two lives of Socrates given by Plato and Xenophon.

It is evident from the foregoing that the more deeply we study the Gospel records, collating their agreements and peculiarities, the more certain are we that they must have

been written by independent and honest witnesses; and that they are therefore credible.

Argument 8. *The credibility of the New Testament is fully sustained by profane history.*

1. *The Talmuds*, Jewish traditions, the compilation of which began as early as the second century. (1) They speak of Christ and name several of his disciples. (2) They admit that Christ performed many and great miracles, but impute his power to his having learned the right pronunciation of the ineffable name of God, which, they say, he stole out of the Temple; or to the magic arts which, they say, he learned in Egypt. (3) They refer to the destruction of Jerusalem; and (4) agree with the New Testament account of the manners and customs of the Jews.

2. *Josephus.* This writer was born at Jerusalem four years after the ascension of Jesus, wrote his history of the Jewish war soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, A. D. 70, and completed his history of the Jews about the close of the first Christian century. He wrote in Greek. He lived near the time when these events are said to have happened, and was present at the destruction of Jerusalem. It is agreed, on all hands, that, so far as this writer goes, he confirms in every thing the accuracy and credibility of our books.

(1) He gives the same account of Jewish sects—Pharisees, Sadducees, and Herodians; (2) gives the same account of the political condition of Judea—of the Herods, Pilate, Felix, Drusilla, and Bernice; (3) there are several references to John the Baptist; (4) his account of the death of Herod is strikingly similar to that given by Luke in the twelfth chapter of Acts; (5) that the Jews had not, under the Romans, power to take life; (6) that there was an Egyptian who led

into the desert four thousand men that were murderers; (7) that Antipas was living with Herodias, his brother Philip's wife, and that Salome was her daughter; (8) that there was stationed at Cæsarea a band of soldiers called the Augustan Band,—these facts are all confirmed. (9) If the following passage *is genuine*, he is not silent concerning Christ: "Now there was, about this time, Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man; for he performed many wonderful works. He was a teacher of such men as received the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him many of the Jews and also of the Gentiles. This was the Christ. And when Pilate, at the instigation of the principal men among us, had condemned him to the cross, those who had loved him from the first did not cease to adhere to him. For he appeared to them alive again on the third day, the divine prophets having foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him. And the tribe of Christians, so named from him, subsists to this time." If, on the other hand, this passage *is not genuine*, then Josephus is silent concerning Jesus, but this silence is exceedingly significant. He could not have been ignorant of the facts, he does not contradict the New Testament statements, nor expose Christianity as a system of imposture. His silence is, therefore if such be the case, a strong corroboration of our history.

3. *Tacitus.* This Roman historian was born about A. D. 59, twenty-five years after the Crucifixion. In his account of the burning of Rome in the tenth year of Nero, and of Nero's imputing this crime to the Christians, we have the following points: (1) There was such a person as Jesus. (2) He was put to death by Pilate. (3) He was executed as a malefactor. (4) The Christians derived their name from him. (5) Christianity arose in Judea and spread to Rome. (6) In Rome the Christians were a great multitude, *ingens*

multitudo. (7) At Rome they were made to endure terrible sufferings; they were torn to pieces by dogs, were crucified, were burned to death. This testimony is not questioned. Even Gibbon admits that it must be received.

This account is confirmed by *Suetonius*, *Martial*, *Seneca* and *Juvenal.* The latter, in his first satire, has the following allusion:

> "Now dare
> To glance at Tigellinus, and you glare
> In that pitched shirt in which such crowds expire,
> Chained to the bloody stake, and wrapped in fire."

4. *Pliny* was governor of Pontus and Bithynia, and a cotemporary of Tacitus. From his celebrated letter to the Emperor Trajan, concerning the persecution of Christians, two quotations are here given:

(1) "They affirmed that the whole of their fault, or error, lay in this, that they were wont to meet together on a stated day before it was light and sing among themselves, alternately, a hymn to Christ, as God, and bind themselves by an oath, not to the commission of any wickedness, but not to be guilty of theft, or robbery, or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor to deny a pledge committed to them when called upon to return it. When these things were performed it was their custom to separate, and then to come together again to a meal, which they ate in common without any disorder."

Again: "Suspending, therefore, all judicial proceedings, I have recourse to you for advice; for it has appeared to me a matter highly deserving consideration, especially on account of the great number of persons who are in danger of suffering; for many of all ages and every rank, of both sexes likewise, are accused, and will be accused. Nor has the contagion of this superstition seized cities only, but the lesser towns also, and the open country."

(2) This testimony sustains the following positions: (a) Christ was a real historic personage and the founder of Christianity. (b) He was worshiped as one divine. (c) Their observance of a stated day of worship. (d) Their pure morals and the source of their influence. (e) The wide spread of Christianity and the great number of its adherents. (f) That the Church was terribly persecuted by the Roman authorities. (g) That to withstand this persecution they must have had good reasons for the hope that was in them.

5. *Suetonius.* This Roman historian was born about 70 A. D. In his Life of the Emperor Claudius, who reigned from A. D. 41 to 54, he states that Claudius "banished the Jews from Rome, who were continually making disturbances, *Christus*—a well-known heathen name for Christ—being their leader." This fact is referred to in Acts 18: 2, the Roman Emperor not making a clear distinction between Jews and Christians.

6. *Hegesippus*, writing of Domitian, who reigned between 81 and 96 A. D., says, "There were at that time yet remaining of the kindred of Christ the grandsons of Jude, who was called his brother according to the flesh. These some accused as being of the race of David, and Evocatus brought them before Domitianus Cæsar; for he, too, was afraid of the coming of Christ, as well as Herod." Gibbon accepts this testimony and incorporates it into his history.

7. *Celsus*, *Lucian*, *Epictetus*, *Galen*, and *Porphyry*, all bear testimony similar to the above, and all throw light on the early history of Christianity, confirming, so far as they go, the facts of the New Testament.

8. *The edicts of the Roman Emperors*, from Nero to Constantine, commanding the persecution of Christians and the extermination of their religion, are governmental recognitions of Christianity as existing and causing commotion in the

Empire. These edicts mark the rise and progress of Christianity. They bear testimony to its rapid and victorious advance, to the purity of its morals and its consequent hostility to paganism, to the sufferings of the followers of Christ on account of their faith, and to their heroic endurance.

In concluding this argument, it should be remembered that this evidence has been thoroughly sifted by modern criticism, and that it is *in addition* to the direct testimony of the New Testament and all the Christian Fathers. Had the New Testament never been written, and had the fathers maintained an unbroken silence, we should be able to gather from these outside sources, and be compelled to receive, all the great facts of Christianity.

Argument 9. *The New Testament facts and existing or admitted facts are related as cause and effect.*

The church and its institutions, and our Christian civilization, are effects from which we logically infer the reality of New Testament facts as their only adequate cause. Standing in the full light of day, we do not believe on mere testimony that the sun is risen. Beholding its results and enjoying its light, we know that the Sun of Righteousness has arisen with healing in its wings. The testimony is good, but we have more. If one should testify that many years ago a tremendous cyclone swept over the country, mowing down the forests, leveling the villages in its path, and destroying hundreds of the inhabitants, such a cyclone as finds no equal in human experience, we might believe the account on the sheer evidence of this competent witness. But if this witness, in addition, should point out the wide path cut by the cyclone through the forest, where are still to be seen the upturned roots and the prostrate trunks of giant trees, his word would be placed beyond all question. Seeing the effects of the storm

would convince almost like seeing the storm itself. The fact of the cyclone and existing facts would be related as cause and effect.

If one should doubt that Washington ever existed, we would not only adduce the unquestioned testimony of history, but we would point the doubter to the effects of Washington's life and to the monuments erected in his memory. We would ask him to join the pilgrims who annually visit the sacred shrine at Mt. Vernon; to walk the streets of our capital city named in his honor; to handle the relics reverently preserved by grateful generations; to mark the institutions of freedom secured by his patient heroism; and to behold the ensign of the Republic, on whose field of blue, star after star has quietly taken its place.

1. The church is an existing fact fully accounted for, and not otherwise, by the recorded facts of the Christian Scriptures. It has existed for more than eighteen hundred years. It is a grand spiritual kingdom ruling over many millions of the most enlightened portions of the human race. It has been a great power in all the advance movements of the nations. It is everywhere and always the champion of truth, liberty, and philanthropy. It is the missionary force of modern times. Now, whence came the power of Jesus' name, the story of his resurrection, the deep philosophy which underlies the gospel, the preaching of the cross, the faith and the courage of martyrdom? Admit the facts recorded in the New Testament, and all is plain; the church and its wonderful conquests are homogeneous with these facts, and worthy of them. Deny these facts, and all is inexplicable. Christ was not the author of Christianity? Which one of the disciples then was this more than wonderful genius? How were his fellow-disciples deceived or induced to enter into this scheme of deception? and how were they all held firmly to the accomplishment of

so nefarious a purpose? Whence the first converts at Jerusalem, whence the faith of martyrdom, and whence the philanthropy which has worked so powerfully for the salvation of man during all these Christian centuries?

2. Another fact is the conquest of the Roman Empire by the religion of Christ,—an admitted fact, also related to the New Testament statements as effect and cause. This new religion, in opposition to Jewish hate and pagan superstition, in opposition to the inherent wickedness of human nature and the fierce and persistent persecutions of the civil powers, without the influence of learning or the coercion of the sword, *did* conquer the then civilized world, and render it impossible for an unchristian emperor to rule the Roman people. Grant the facts of the Gospels, and we have a sufficient cause for the devotion of the disciples of Jesus and the faith of their converts. Deny the credibility of the Scripture testimony, and we have an effect without an adequate cause.

3. Again, the institutions of the church, baptism, the Lord's-Supper, and the Lord's-Day, are monumental of the great facts recorded in the Gospels; to these institutions the New Testament facts are related as cause and effect. A monument is a living witness to the truth. This republic is a proof that there was a Declaration of Independence, but the Fourth of July, observed from the first as the anniversary of that Declaration, gives, in this regard, the utmost certainty.

Leslie, in his "Method with the Deist," shows that we can not doubt a statement of history when corroborated by monumental observances having the four following characteristics: (1) If the event transpired publicly; (2) if it was such as could be judged of by the senses; (3) if it has been commemorated down to the present time by a stated observance; (4) and if such stated observance began at the time of the event. The first two characteristics guard against imposture

at the time, since no people would begin such a commemoration, if they knew the event never occurred; the two last prevent imposture at any *subsequent time*, for the beginning of such an anniversary at any after time must be coupled, in the case supposed, with the assertion that it had been observed from the first, which all the people would know to be false. Such are the institutions of the church under consideration. They began with the events. Every Lord's-Day the death and the resurrection of the Savior have been solemnly commemorated. Constantly believers have been baptized in the likeness of his burial. Every week the glorious sun reminds our dying race that life and immortality have been brought to light.

4. The civilization of to-day is an effect. The human race feels a new life; science is doing wonders; education is opening her college doors to all the people; in comparison with former ages, kings are ruling in righteousness; all nations are confederated for the general good; and the enlightened portions of mankind are eager to illumine all the dark places of the earth. Whence this tendency, this rising in opposition to the gravity of nearly all the dead past? It originated in *ideas*, great ideas, which stirred single minds, then nations, then the world. But what ideas? Those of the Orient, forbidding progress, and conservative as the pyramids? Was it Greek literature and Roman law, which perished in the night of barbarian invasion? The vital ideas of our civilization are the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; that man was made in the image of God and gifted with immortality; equality, justice, and philanthropy; conscience and consecration to the good of man. These ideas are essentially Christian, and are made vital by the sense of divine authority and power which impress them.

How easily we believe historic events which rest on testi-

mony alone; for example, the existence of the city of ancient Rome, or the astronomical facts revealed by the telescope. How much more, then, these facts whose effects are all about us and whose monuments we ourselves are perpetuating.

Argument 10. *The undesigned coincidences between the books of the New Testament is an unanswerable proof of their credibility.*

The grosser forms of coincidence may be imitated in fictitious works, but these coincidences, if so minute, so hidden and so slight as to indicate the absence of all design, would negative the supposition of forgery, and prove the works in which they occur to be a transcript of facts. Paley, in his Horæ Paulinæ, has fully developed this argument.

1. For example, in I. Corinthians 4:11, 12, Paul says, "*Even unto this present hour* we both hunger and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling-place; and *labor, working with our own hands.*" This Corinthian epistle was written at Ephesus. Now, not in the 19th chapter of Acts, which gives an account of Paul's life at Ephesus, do we find any indication that he performed manual labor there, as intimated in the passage just cited; but here is where one fabricating the account would have placed the coincident statement. We find it not here, but in Paul's address at Miletus, (Acts 20:34), in the presence of the elders of the Ephesian church. This is too refined a coincidence to have been invented.

2. Again, in the Second Thessalonian letter, 3:8, we have: "Neither did we eat any man's bread for naught, but wrought with labor, night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you; *not because we have not power, but to make ourselves an ensample unto you to follow us.*" Compare this with a passage in the address at Miletus: "Yea, ye

yourselves know that these hands have ministered unto my necessities and to them that were with me. I have showed you all things, how that *so laboring ye ought to support the weak.*" The reason why he labored is the same in both, but the language is so different as to obscure the coincidence, and render it useless as a mark of agreement in a fictitious work.

3. Other examples: Paul writes to Timothy, "Let not a widow be taken into the number under threescore years;" in the sixth of Acts we learn that the church made provision for widows. He writes to Timothy that from a child he had known the Holy Scriptures; in the Acts we are told that Timothy's mother was a Jewess. He exhorts the Corinthians not to despise Timothy on account of his youth; to Timothy he writes, "Let no man despise thy youth," and "Flee also youthful lusts." In his letters to Timothy, Paul refers to his own sufferings at Antioch, Iconium and Lystra; from the Acts we learn in a most indirect way that Timothy must have lived in one of those cities. In the Epistle to the Romans Paul asks their prayers that he may be delivered from those who did not believe in Judea; in reference to the same journey, he says, as recorded in Acts, "And behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there, save that the Holy Spirit witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me." In the Roman letter he commends to them Phœbe, a servant of the church at Cenchrea; we learn from the history that he had been at Cenchrea, but only from the following passage: "Having shorn his head in Cenchrea, for he had a vow."

4. Of such coincidences Paley has pointed out *a hundred*, and still the subject is not exhausted. The sum of the argument is this: In the Acts we have a history of Paul's journeyings, and the Pauline Epistles are letters written at

different points in these journeyings. In these letters are references to the facts recorded in the history. These references are incidental, natural, obscure; and more than a hundred of them have been pointed out. If the history and the Epistles are according to the facts, these coincidences were natural and unavoidable. On the supposition of forgery and mendacity, these coincidences *can not be accounted for*. No literary forger *would* have fabricated *such* trivial and concealed agreements; and no one *could* have done it if he would.

Argument 11. *The perfect dovetailing of the New Testament account with the geography, with the customs, religious and social, and with the political history of the times, is so extensive and so exact as to render the supposition of fabrication, as opposed to credibility, wholly untenable and absurd.*

1. The references to countries and places are in the highest degree exact. The keenest and most hostile criticism has not been able to find the smallest crevice for the insertion of its lever. (1) The references to Jerusalem and its environs are exact; the Temple, Solomon's Porch, the Beautiful Gate, Gethsemane, the Mount of Olives, Bethany, Bethesda, the Pool of Siloam, and so on to the end of a long list. Such accuracy a hundred years after the destruction of Jerusalem was impossible. (2) The allusions to the localities of Palestine are equally correct; not a single village, or natural object, is out of place. (3) All references to the Roman world are faultless. Antioch, in Syria, is the great city where the nationalities commingle; Ephesus is the emporium of Asia Minor, while Antioch in Psidia, Iconium, Derbe, Lystra, Colosse, Perga, Troas, and a score of other places, all have their true locations. (4) The voyage between Troas and Neapolis in *two* days, and the same voyage years afterward,

but in the contrary direction, in *five* days, perfectly agree with the time of the year and the direction of the periodical winds. He who will repeat Paul's voyage from Cæsarea to Rome, at the same time of the year and in a similar vessel, will find on the way a hundred proofs that the writer of the Acts was an eye-witness, that the account of the voyage could not have been forged, and is, therefore, entirely credible. The touching at Sidon; the sailing under Cyprus; the crossing of the Sea of Cilicia and Pamphylia; the transfer to a ship of Alexandria, laden with wheat and bound for Italy; the sailing slowly many days till they came over against Cnidus; seeking protection from the northwest wind under the southern shore of the island of Crete; Fair Haven and Phenice; the tempestuous wind, Euroclydon, and the refuge behind the island of Clauda; the fear of the quick-sands on the shores of Africa; the tossing up and down in the Adriatic; and the roar of the breakers on the shores of Melita; the ship whose sign was Castor and Pollux; Syracuse and Rhegium; Pateoli, Appii Forum and the Three Taverns; the captain of the Prætorian Guard; and the indefatigable Apostle, still preaching Christ, though chained to a Roman guard,—all are true to nature and to Roman civil and commercial life.

2. The references to Jewish and Gentile sects, opinions and customs are without a fault. The Pharisees sitting in Moses' seat, sounding the trumpet before giving alms, loving to make long prayers at the corners of the streets, tithing mint, annis and cumin, but neglecting the weightier matters of the law; the Sadducees, hating the doctrine of the resurrection; Herodians, zealous for the Roman authorities; Sanhedrim and High Priest; Publicans, gathering taxes for Rome and hated by the Jews; the Temple-guard and soldiers of the Roman band; the council of the Areopagites and the

loiterers of Athens, who spent their time in hearing or telling some new thing; Stoic and Epicurean; soldiers at Rome and members of Cæsar's household, all stand out in the clear light of truth. The worship at Jerusalem, priests, sacrifices, and houses of prayer; the Temple of Diana at Ephesus, the zeal of the city for this heathen goddess, and her silver shrines; the offering of sacrifices to Jupiter and Mercury at Lystra; the city of Athens wholly given to idolatry; Roman citizenship, how it was obtained, and the rights it conferred; Roman colonies and Roman deputies; the condition of the Jews scattered throughout the Empire, and everywhere accused and persecuted,—all these and hundreds of other references are given without a single variation from the exactness of fact. It is impossible that the artist stood at the close of the second century, and, reaching back over more than a hundred years, painted with such accuracy these scenes from Jewish and Roman life. He must have lived then and there, and have produced these photographs with the sunbeams of truth.

3. The New Testament references to facts recorded in profane history are also perfectly correct. Specific statements are needed to show the strength of this position. (1) The reference to Archelaus and his character, Matt. 2 : 22. (2) The reference to the Roman rulers, Tiberius and the Herods, Luke 3 : 1. (3) Herod's casting John the Baptist into prison, Mark 6 : 17. (4) Herod's marrying Herodias and about their daughter, Salome, Mark 6 : 22. (5) That Herod Agrippa was a king in Judea, Acts 12 : 1. (6) Herod's death at Cæsarea, Acts 12 : 19. (7) Felix, the Governor, and his Jewish wife, Drusilla, Acts 24 : 24. (8) The reference to Festus as the successor of Felix, and to Agrippa and Bernice, Acts 24 : 27. (9) That the churches had rest, Acts 9 : 31. Profane history gives the reason for this cessation of

persecution. (10) The reference to the band of soldiers stationed at Jerusalem, Acts 21 : 31. (11) The captain of the Temple, Acts 5 : 24. (12) The Jewish council, the Sanhedrim, Acts 23 : 1. (13) The place of prayer, by the river-side, Acts 16 : 13. (14) That the Pharisees were the *straitest sect* of the Jews, Acts 26 : 5. (15) Jewish washings, Mark 7 : 3, 4. (16) The tenets of the Sadducees, Acts 23 : 8. (17) That the high priest was a Sadducee, as in Acts 5 : 17. (18) Relations of Jews and Samaritans, Luke 9 : 51. (19) The worship at Samaria, John 4 : 20. (20) The high-priesthood of Caiaphas, Matt. 26 : 3. (21) Paul's denial that Ananias was High Priest, Acts 23 : 5 (22) The customs of a crucifixion, John 19 : 19; Matt. 27 : 26; John 19 : 16; John 19 : 32. (23) That the ninth hour was an hour of prayer, Acts 3 : 1. (24) That Moses was read in the synagogues on the Sabbath day, Acts 15 : 21. (25) The shaving of the head on the fulfilment of a vow, Acts 21 : 23. (26) The Jews scourging, forty stripes save one, II. Cor. 11 : 24. (27) References to Publicans, Luke 5 : 30; Luke 19 : 2. (28) Not lawful to scourge a Roman citizen uncondemned, Acts 22 : 25. (29) That a Jew could become a Roman citizen, Acts 22 : 27. (30) That a Roman prisoner was often chained to a soldier, Acts 28 : 16. (31) Common to send prisoners to Rome to be tried, Acts 27 : 1. (32) Famine in the days of the Emperor Claudius, Acts 11 : 28. (33) Banishment of Jews from Rome by Claudius, Acts 18 : 1. (34) Judas of Galilee in the days of the taxing, Acts 5 : 37. (35) Reference to a certain Egyptian, Acts 21 : 38. (36) That there were altars in Athens to "unknown gods," Acts 17 : 23. (37) The reference to the taxing when Cyrenius was governor of Syria, Luke 2 : 2. It was long maintained by unbelievers that there is here a discrepancy between Josephus and Luke; but Prof. Zumpt has shown that there were two taxings when Cyrenius was

governor of Syria, and that Luke refers to both. (38) That *Sergius Paulus*, the governor of Cyprus, was a *proconsul*, one appointed by the Roman Senate, Acts 13 : 7. This was also said to be contrary to Roman history; that this officer was a *proprætor*, or one appointed by the Emperor. The discovery of a coin, some years since, in the island of Cyprus, fully confirmed Luke's statement. All these references to facts also given in profane history, are verified by citations from Josephus and other historians. Lardner, Horne, Paley and others give the double quotations from the New Testament and profane history at great length. The above are only important examples. These confirmations are explicit, full, undenied, and undeniable.

Now, what should be said of this wonderful agreement of the New Testament account with the geography, the social customs, and the political history of the first century? If one should pick up a fragment of rock at the base of a ledge and should find a place on the edge of the ledge where the fragment perfectly fitted, would he not *know* that the fragment was taken off at that place, and that its composition and origin were the same as of the ledge itself? Is there not the same proof of truthfulness in this case? The jointure is perfect, and if there *is* a rock of true history the New Testament is a part of it. Any competent judge, any one having a general knowledge of books and authors, and a specific knowledge of profane history and the New Testament, must see that no man or men *could have invented* this Christian history; that no one could have put in so many hundred points of agreement and not have blundered in scores of cases.

CREDIBILITY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

ARG. 1. IF GENUINE THEN CREDIBLE.

(1) Published in the country and time of the events.
(2) Quoted as not only genuine but credible.

ARG. 2. THE WITNESSES HAD THE MEANS OF KNOWING.

(1) They were eye-witnesses and participants.
(2) They give facts and not inferences.
(3) The history is not long and complicated.

ARG. 3. CREDIBLE FROM THE NUMBER OF WITNESSES.

(1) There are eight independent witnesses.
(2) All who in that age believed are witnesses.
(3) The great number, without a traitor, forbids conspiracy.

ARG. 4. CREDIBLE FROM THE CHARACTER OF THE WITNESSES.

(1) Their writings and lives.
(2) They give many evidences of candor.
(3) Their sufferings on account of their testimony.
(4) They were neither deceived nor deceivers.

ARG. 5. THE NEW TESTAMENT ACCOUNT IS THE ONLY ONE.

ARG. 6. THE FAILURE OF COUNTER HYPOTHESES.

(1) The Theory of Imposture.
(2) The Theory of Honest Deception.
(3) The Mythical Theory of Strauss.
(4) The Legendary Theory of Renan.

ARG. 7. THE PECULIAR RELATION OF THE GOSPELS TO ONE ANOTHER.

(1) The facts of difference and concordance.
(2) These accounted for in one of three ways.

ARG. 8. THE CREDIBILITY IS SUSTAINED BY PROFANE HISTORY.

(1) The Talmuds.
(2) Josephus.
(3) Tacitus, Martial, Seneca, and Juvenal.
(4) Pliny's Letters to Trajan.
(5) Suetonius in his life of Claudius.
(6) Hegesippus.
(7) Celsus, Lucian, Epictetus, Galen, and Porphyry.
(8) Edicts of Roman Emperors against Christians.

ARG. 9. NEW TESTAMENT FACTS AND EXISTING FACTS ARE RELATED AS CAUSE AND EFFECT.

(1) The church is an effect of Bible facts.
(2) The conquest of the Roman Empire.
(3) Christian institutions—baptism, Lord's-day, Lord's Supper.
(4) Christian civilization is an effect.

ARG. 10. THE UNDESIGNED COINCIDENCES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

(1) I. Corinthians 4:11, 12, and Acts 20: 34.
(2) II. Thessalonians 3:8, and the address at Miletus.
(3) Several other examples.
(4) Paley's array of examples.

ARG. 11. THE NEW TESTAMENT AGREEMENT WITH GEOGRAPHY, CUSTOMS, AND HISTORY.

(1) Geographical references.
(2) References to sects, opinions, and customs.
(3) References to the facts of history.

PROPOSITION THIRD.

The books of the New Testament having been proved to be genuine and credible, it follows that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God."

That this is the undoubted teaching of the New Testament is evident from the following considerations:

1. He was either a base impostor; or, he was the Messiah, the Son of God; or, we must assign him a place somewhere between the two extremes. These three positions cover the whole ground. (1) We can not assign him any middle rank. *First*, consider how wonderful were his claims; (a) That he came forth from God and would return to him; (b) that he alone knew the Father; (c) that he existed before Abraham was; (d) that he had power to forgive sins; (e) that he could give rest to human souls; (f) that the prophecies were fulfilled in him; (g) that he wrought miracles; (h) that he did then, and would again on the last day, raise the dead; (i) that he would sit on the throne of judgment, and that all nations would be arraigned before him. *Second*, he must have known what these claims meant; and that if they were not true they were in the highest degree deceptive and blasphemous. Every fact which evinces his transcendent intellectual power proves that he understood the character of these claims. Among these facts may be named his knowledge of human nature; his profound insight into the Mosaic law; his far-reaching moral teachings; his conception of a grand moral kingdom over which he would reign; the forces which he set in motion to realize this conception; and the sway he

has held, for eighteen hundred years, over the most thoughtful of the human race. If he was not what he claimed to be, it is impossible to free him from the deepest guilt. It is evident, therefore, that we cannot assign him a middle rank. He was either a base deceiver or the Son of God. (2) It is equally certain that he was not a base deceiver. The most lasting impression made upon the reader of the Gospels is that of the superlative goodness and moral purity of Jesus. This moral purity shines upon us from every page like the sun in heaven, and is the chief means which gives to the common reader, the child, or the uncultured man, the unwavering belief that Jesus was divine. If the source of this impression is analyzed his moral uprightness is still more apparent. The benevolent and pure teachings of Christ could not have flowed from an impure heart and a guilty conscience. If corrupt at heart, some exigency of suffering, of studied affront, or of cold neglect, would have revealed, by word or deed, his true character. Whether in public or private, entering Jerusalem in triumph, or bending beneath the imprecations of the Jews, he is the same patient, perfect one. To the same purport is his life of benevolence. "He went about doing good." He loved all men. He believed that he was dying for the world. From his life and death what ever-widening streams of purity and philanthropy have continued to flow to the nations of the earth? The godly sorrow which leads to a renunciation of sin, the self-denial which goes forth bearing the cross, the patient endurance of persecution, every sentiment of Christian liberty, every impulse of world-wide charity, and all the heroism of Christian missionary life, may be traced back to his pure life and heart. It cannot be that that heart was corrupt and dark with guilt. (3) The third disjunction alone remains. The Jesus of the New Testament was neither deceived nor a

deceiver; he was what he claimed to be—*the Christ the Son of God.*

2. The New Testament being credible, Jesus was a supernatural being, and is not to be classed with the sons of men. (1) He had not the least taint of selfishness. For the world's hatred and persecution he gave back tears of compassion and prayers for mercy. He labored for others, he died for others, and for others he ever lives to intercede. (2) He was free from all Jewish prejudice and narrowness. He belonged to no sect among them. He saw that Jewish institutions were temporary and soon to be lost in the brightness of the Christian Church. He believed that God, who is a spirit, is to be worshipped everywhere, and not alone at Jerusalem. His Gospel was for Gentiles as well as Jews, and was to be given to all nations. He contemplated the universal brotherhood and liberty of the human race. (3) He was wholly devoid of worldly ambitions. Wealth, fame, and power seemed to have no attractions for him. (4) He never expressed, so far as the New Testament goes, the least doubt on any subject. Whether he discoursed concerning the past or the future, concerning God or man, he always spoke as one having authority. (5) He was without sin. "Which one of you convinceth me of sin?" was the challenge which he sent to the men of his time, and the long silence of eighteen centuries shows that no one is willing to accept it. This one characteristic sets him far above all human beings and indicates his heavenly origin.

3. The stupendous facts recorded of him lead to the same conclusion; his divine nature and origin; his pre-existence; his miraculous birth; his fulfilment of all the Messianic prophecies; his varied and ever-successful miracles on nature, on man, and on the spirit-world; the earthquake and the darkness at his crucifixion; his resurrection from the dead;

his ascension to the right hand of the Majesty on high, and the descent of the Holy Spirit,—all these facts can not be received, on the credibility of the New Testament, without the conviction, also, on the same testimony, that Jesus was more than human.

4. The consciousness of Jesus, when it testified concerning his divine origin and mission, would seem to be decisive of New Testament teaching on this subject. In early life he felt the pressure of his mission, and that he must be about his Father's business. He often spoke of his oneness with God. When he uttered the "I say unto you," in contrast with the authority of Moses; when he said to the penitent sinner, "Thy sins are all forgiven thee;" when, standing before the open tomb, he gave the command, "Lazarus, come forth;" when he calmly foretold his own death and resurrection; when he taught that his death was for a world's salvation; and when he gave to his Apostles the great commission commanding them to publish the story of his ignominious death to all the nations, but not to begin this work till endued with power from on high—in all these instances there is not the least betrayal of a consciousness that he was acting a part. In every utterance of Jesus and in every miracle there is a sincerity, solemnity, and authority, which declare, unmistakably, his belief, his *consciousness*, that he was in himself, and was to the world, all that he professed to be.

5. The teachings of the Apostles, all of whom were familiar with the claims and the miracles of Jesus, are explicit and conclusive. John testifies: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God;" "the same was made flesh and dwelt among us." Peter made the "good confession," "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Paul wrote: "Let this mind be in you which was also in Jesus Christ; who being

in the form of God thought it not robbery to be *equal* with God." "God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." "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."

6. That Jesus should have been divine is in full harmony with the grandeur of the Christian religion. Surely, he who presided over the plan of human redemption in its development; whose death is a sufficient atonement for a world's sin; who reigns over a moral kingdom, universal and eternal; who is to raise the dead, sit on the throne of judgment, and lead the saved and glorified of our race to higher and still higher planes of heavenly blessedness, must needs have been divine, and none other than the Lord of Glory.

I. *The New Testament contains the testimony concerning Jesus of Nazareth as the primary witnesses gave it to the world.*

II. *The books of the New Testament are credible.*

III. *The New Testament being genuine and credible, it follows that Jesus is the Christ, the son of God, quod erat demonstrandum.*

CONCLUSIVENESS OF NEW TESTAMENT EVIDENCE.

1. ONE OF THREE SUPPOSITIONS IS TRUE.
   (1) Jesus was not an impostor.
   (2) We can not assign him a middle rank.
   (3) He was what he claims to be—the Son of God.
2. JESUS IS NOT TO BE CLASSED WITH THE SONS OF MEN.
   (1) He had no taint of selfishness.
   (2) Free from Jewish prejudice.
   (3) Devoid of worldly ambition.
   (4) Never expressed a doubt.
   (5) He was without sin.
3. THE GREAT FACTS RECORDED OF HIM.
4. THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF JESUS IS DECISIVE.
5. THE TESTIMONY OF THE APOSTLES IS EXPLICIT AND CONCLUSIVE.
6. THE DIVINITY OF JESUS IS IN HARMONY WITH THE GRANDEUR OF CHRISTIANITY.

PART II.

ARGUMENT

FROM

SCIENCE AND REASON.

METHOD AND DIVISION.

1. The historic facts of Christianity are now before us. There *was* a Jesus of Nazareth. He was the *author* of the Christian religion, and this religion, in its revelations, moral principles, commands and motives, is contained in the New Testament. This New Testament is widely distributed throughout the civilized world; it is in nearly every family, and is familiar to all well-educated persons. If the New Testament is credible,—and this must be admitted or all history be denied,—then our proposition is true, and Jesus was the Christ.

2. Leaving the question of *historic credibility* and its conclusiveness, a new argument is now to be developed. What Christianity is may be clearly gathered from the New Testament and the associated books of the Old Testament. This religion, wholly separated from an authoritative past, is to be examined in itself. As though these sacred books had been but recently found, we are to ask what of reality and value there may be in the religion they present. Just as though man had originated these books, we are to weigh their contents and determine their value. Is this religion absurd? Can it be proved false and pernicious? Has it been a curse wherever received? Is it opposed to liberty and progress? Is it unsuited to man and unworthy of God? Or, on the other hand, can we see that its great principles are true, its requirements just, its effects beneficent, and the whole such as may have originated in infinite love and wisdom?

3. It may be said that reason has no right to sit in judgment on such matters; that a revelation in its very nature is above and beyond reason; that the commands of the Infinite One are not to be judged of by a finite being. This is, in part, true; and yet human reason is the *only* instrument of investigation. If the test of reason is not absolute and infallible, still it must be used. Of certain matters and to a certain extent it is reliable, and to this extent we may employ it. Reason and revelation are not opposed; nor reason and faith. We accept a professed revelation, if at all, because it is reasonable to do so; we put faith in another and follow him because reason so directs. Reason, or man's intellectual faculties, stands behind everything else.

4. All men are *free-thinkers*, if they think at all. In another sense, none are free-thinkers, since no one is at liberty to disregard fact and logic; for, to disregard the laws of correct thought, is not to *think* at all, in its highest sense, but to imagine or invent. We are, therefore, free to bring Christianity to the test of our reason, and it is our duty to do this to the best of our ability.

5. We must reason from what we know, and by a right use of the known we must test, and receive or reject, the hitherto unknown. We *know* certain fundamental and self-evident truths. (1) Among these we enumerate all matters of consciousness, mathematical axioms, and all the moral intuitions. Founded upon these, there is a large body of principles, which all fully-developed minds unhesitatingly receive; for example, the duty of gratitude, the supremacy of conscience, the moral equality of all men, and the ultimate nature of true happiness. (2) Again, we *know* much concerning nature. The objects and phenomena of nature embody the scientific thoughts and plans of the Infinite Mind. Man is capable of discovering and thinking these

thoughts. The growth of science is but the progress of this process of discovery. We may, it is true, *think* we know many things in nature of which we are totally ignorant, and we may have much false science to throw away; and yet there is a large system of principles in every science concerning whose reality and truth we have no doubt. (3) Still further, we *know* much concerning human nature, the faculties and laws of mind, the fears and hopes which agitate us, and the tendencies of different systems of philosophy. We know something of the limitations of man, both physically and mentally.

6. Now we may bring this religion to the test of this knowledge in its various forms. (1) We may lay it alongside of the human reason and see whether its requirements are in harmony with reason or opposed to it. (2) We may compare this revelation with the book of nature, God's "elder scriptures," and see whether they agree in the methods pursued and the matter presented. (3) Or, we may consider whether Christianity originated in nature or whether it is both supernatural and superhuman.

7. This argument, for the sake of logical clearness, may be briefly stated as follows: *If Christianity agrees with nature in its methods of development and in its teachings; if it agrees with man, receiving the sanction of his reason and being perfectly adapted to the renovation of his moral nature; and if it is both supernatural and superhuman: then Jesus of Nazareth, who is the author and finisher of this faith, must have been the Messiah, the Son of God.*"

If this proposition as a whole is admitted, and if the several antecedents in the proposition are established, then the consequent must also be admitted. The following propositions are, therefore, to be fully proved:

I. Christianity Agrees with Nature in its Methods and Teachings.

II. Christianity Agrees with Human Nature, Receiving the Sanction of Reason, and Being Adapted to the Mental Faculties.

III. Christianity is Supernatural and Superhuman.

IV. Discussion of Objections.

PROPOSITION FIRST.

CHRISTIANITY AGREES WITH NATURE IN ITS METHODS AND TEACHINGS.

CHRISTIANITY AGREES WITH NATURE IN ITS METHODS.

I. *They both began in miracle and are continued by general law.* (1) Something always was or nothing could have been. God inhabiteth eternity; matter is the subordinate, the finite, the created. (2) Whatever be conceived to have been the process of creation, there was a time when this process began. If evolution was the process, then there was a time when this evolution began. However slight this beginning, though it was but the mutual attraction of two contiguous atoms, still there was a cause for it; and this cause was not a part of the development, but an outside and antecedent force. There was an involution before any and every evolution. There was a plan and a purpose before the laws of evolution could embody them. (3) There was, then, a stupendous miracle which originated law and started evolution, if this was the method. But now we have the reign of established law. Matter is controlled by inherent forces; cause and effect are in stable relations; we may forecast the future and conform to the conditions of life and safety.

(1) So Christianity was originated and established by miracle. God revealed himself. Angels came on errands of mercy or retribution. Jesus, by miracles, as the only possible

way, declared himself divine; and the gospel was confirmed by miracles. (2) But now, in the kingdom of grace, as in the kingdom of nature, we have the reign of law. As force is inherent in matter, so is God's moral power in the gospel. Moral cause and effect are equally stable; and we, by conforming to established law, may, with equal certainty, prepare against the eternal future.

II. *Nature and revelation are alike in the slowness of their development.* (1) If the Nebular Hypothesis be correct, it takes many ages to convert a fiery mass, "without form and void," into a perfectly organized and habitable world. How slowly accumulated the material for the coal-beds, and the soil which covers the infertile rocks. How slow is the progress of civilized society. (2) So, Christianity during long historic eras made slow and uncertain growth. Nearly two thousand years were needed to show the downward tendency of idolatry and man's inability to save himself from it. Centuries more were needed to develop the fundamental ideas of God, sin, and sacrifice. Many ages must intervene between prophecy and fulfilment. The last eighteen centuries have but tested this religion, and prepared it for the world's conquest, and for its long reign of peace. (3) Neither reminds us of man and his works whose longest plans must lie within the limits of his "three score years and ten," and whose proudest works give signs of haste and sure decay; but rather of God, to whom "one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day," and who has an eternity in which to carry out his plans.

III. *Again, they are alike in that their blessings are not universal to the human race.* (1) The benefits of nature are limited in place and time; in place, for some countries are favored with fruits of every kind, and climates healthy and congenial, while others are cold and sterile; in time, since

nature has yielded her products (in richest abundance) only to the latest and most enlightened portions of the race. Time is required for the diffusion among the nations of the knowledge which makes nature a rich source of physical and intellectual good. (2) Christianity has similar limitations, confined as it was at first to one nation, and undeveloped till the beginning of this modern era. Time is required for its diffusion among the nations. The same considerations which will justify the partiality of nature, will also justify the progressive development and diffusion of Christianity.

IV. *They are alike in their methods of moral government.*

1. Pleasurable deeds are often followed by the severest penalties. The pleasures of wine lead rapidly to the drunkard's untimely end; the enticements of licentiousness are followed by the most loathsome diseases; and often the pain is far more intense than the pleasure. The few moments of exhilaration are no measure of the shame, remorse, and suffering often produced by a single transgression of nature's laws.

2. The delay of punishment affords no ground for the presumption of final impunity. (1) Sooner or later, nature remembers an infringment upon her rights. A score of years after the wound, the virus may show its presence and its power to destroy. The crimes of one generation may visit their results on many succeeding ones. It is also the teaching of this religion that though hand join hand, sin shall not go unpunished. The longsuffering of God affords no presumption that the sin is forgotten.

(2) Moreover, nature's punishments often come suddenly, as when the lightning stroke falls with death in its startling flash, or as when the "Black Death" sweeps off many thousands in a day. In like manner, the Scriptures speak of "swift destructions," if repeated warnings are unheeded.

3. In both neglected opportunities may never return. (1) As ordered in nature, man goes on from youth to age, through a series of stages, and each one has its returnless opportunities. The morning of childhood dawns but once. The period of growth is brief, and without a successor. When the tree of humanity has once blossomed and borne fruit, it is ready to die. (2) So Christianity teaches. Its blessings are offered only in this world. "Now is the accepted time." If the summer passes and the harvest ends, leaving the soul ungarnered for Heaven, the year will not turn back to repeat its seasons.

4. In both the consequences of wrong-doing are often irretrievable. (1) A disease once contracted may prove fatal. A child wrongly trained, may not be reprieved from ruin. The step of misplaced confidence and its direful results may never be recalled. The poison once taken, may prove irresistible and fatal. (2) The same is true in Christianity. The final rejection of Christ has no remedy.

5. In both, neglect is often as fatal as wicked disobedience. (1) The neglect of health insures disease. If the sailor neglects his course, if the railroad conductor neglects the precautions of safety, he may be as guilty and as dangerous as he who plans the wholesale slaughter of his passengers. The surgeon's neglect of his studies and opportunities may cost the life of many a victim, and, possibly his own. (2) In harmony with this, the Scriptures ask: "How we shall escape if we neglect so great a salvation."

V. *Both are systems of means.* (1) In Christianity, the conversion, sanctification, and final salvation of men, is accomplished through the means of grace; the gospel, the Holy Spirit, the institutions of the church, and the sympathies of good men. (2) The same law prevails in nature. God could make a tree, or produce a bountiful harvest, in a

moment and with a word. But this is not his method. The seed must be cast into the soil, heat and moisture must be given, and the seasons must bring their grateful changes, and time must intervene—all, means through which the forces of vegetable life build the tree and mature the harvest.

VI. *Both are remedial systems.* (1) Nature often has remedies for the consequences of violated law. The fractured bone is repaired. If one set of organs fails, another set may partially perform the duties of the former. If one sense is lost, the others become more acute. Nature has in her laboratory antidotes for the deadly poison, defences against contagion, and a remedy, complete or partial, for nearly every malady. (2) The New Testament presents a remedy for sin, — its guilt, its power, and its consequences. It would bring the individual and society into harmony with right and benevolence.

(3) In both, help is extended to the suffering and the lost. In both, the remedy may be accompanied with intense pain, the amputation of a limb, the bearing of the cross. In both, these remedies are offered to all on the same terms; the poor may enjoy them, and without them the rich and titled will perish. In both, the decree is, "He that believeth and is obedient shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be condemned."

VII. *Both are mediatorial systems.* (1) Christ is declared to be the one Mediator between God and man. Though innocent, his sufferings and death are set forth as the propitiation for our sins, for the sins of the whole world. (2) This mediation between man and man, this suffering of the innocent that blessings may come upon the undeserving and the guilty, is a prominent feature in human society. Parents are mediators in behalf of children. Thousands of patriots die that liberty may be the heritage of coming generations. The consequences

of crime fall most heavily on the innocent. The compassionate suffering of the innocent in behalf of the guilty is one of the most exalted manifestations of human nature. If this is an objection against Christianity, it lies with equal force against nature and its author.

VIII. *The kind and limit of knowledge are the same in both.* (1) Christianity professes to make men wise unto salvation. It makes plain the path of duty. It pauses at the boundary of utility and does not attempt to go beyond to satisfy mere curiosity, nor to attempt the explanation of the mysterious. This is remarkable, because no impostor in religion has been able to resist the temptation to excite wonder, to satisfy curiosity concerning the future world, and to explain the darkest mysteries. (2) So, nature gives us the plainest and most practical lessons, and pauses on the brink of deep mysteries. We know how to get bread, though we can not analyze the life which this bread helps to sustain.

IX. Both contain great mysteries. (1) However far we push investigation, mystery, though it may recede, still confronts us on every side. The larger the circumference of the known, the longer the walls of mystery which shut out the unknown. Every line of scientific thought runs out into infinite mystery. The law of gravitation we can demonstrate, but gravitation itself we know not. Chemical reactions we can discover and employ, but who shall explain the mystery of atoms? The biologist may have his classifications and his theories, but who can understand the very elements of his science, matter, protoplasm, the cell, the life? Everything partakes of the infinitude and mystery of the Creator himself. (2) So is it in Christianity. That God is to be obeyed and worshipped is plain, but the divine nature and methods are inscrutible. That Christ is to be loved and followed, and how we are to follow him, are plainly taught; but the incar-

nation, the atonement, and the resurrection, though plain as matters of fact, are full of mystery. Life and death, Heaven and Hell, are suggestive of problems not to be solved by the mathematics of reason.

(3) And here the works of God are widely separated from the works of man. What man has said and done man can understand. His inventions can be repeated and surpassed. His profoundest thoughts and plans can be completely analyzed and comprehended. We can arise from the reading of an uninspired book feeling that we have measured its shallows and its depths, and have explored its farthest shores. Not so with the works of God; and that it is not so with the Bible, is suggestive of its divine origin. A revelation without mystery, express or implied, would be impossible; if the Bible had no mysteries, their absence would prove that it is not from God.

X. *They are alike in the unsystematic way in which their facts are presented.* (1) In the museum of nature all sorts of minerals are thrown down in the same heap of seeming rubbish; all manner of shells are found in the same sea; all species of plants grow in the same garden. To study, classify, and arrange these objects is a source of human knowledge and development; and there is no other way in which this knowledge could be so thoroughly acquired. A more profound study shows that, under this seeming disorder, there are great forces and principles of superhuman order and harmony. Plants are arranged according to climatic zones, elevation on mountain sides, and the depth below the ocean surface. Animals are ranged grade above grade like the shelves of a cabinet. The stars, sown broadcast over the fields of the sky, are found to be arranged in mathematical order, and all their motions exactly co-ordinated in place and time.

(2) So is it in the Scriptures. Facts are not presented in the rigid order of a code of laws, or a scientific treatise. The

lessons of the New Testament are scattered over many pages of history. Prophesy, poetry, and moral teachings are mingled. Christ did not write out a systematic theology, but taught as circumstances suggested and required. The Apostles were disciples of their Master. The mode of entering into the kingdom of Christ, the rules of the Christian life, the form of church government, and the state of the dead, for example, must be learned by an induction of many cases and discourses. But it is also true, as in nature, that the Scriptures have a remarkable unity, are, in an important sense, one book, and have, underlying this apparent confusion, principles of undoubted progress and order. From the first word of Genesis to the last word of Revelation there is a steady progress in the orderly development of this religion. The Law, the Prophets and the Psalms; the Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles, and Revelation, have a perfect arrangement, and each fills a definite place in the scheme. This similarity of method argues oneness of authorship.

XI. *The same frame of mind is required in both in order to successful study.* (1) Christianity requires faith in the divine Teacher, a willingness to sit at his feet, a willingness to obey, a hungering after righteousness, and the humility of a child. To a proud and unrepentent spirit that would dictate terms of reconciliation to the Almighty, there is given no encouragement. (2) Even so it is in nature. The scientist, with the humility of a child, and with an intense desire for the truth, must sit at the feet of Nature, and listen to her story of fact and design. If he proudly dictates, and seeks to distort her history that she may seem to sustain his theory, he has no promise of success, but rather of strong delusion, that he may fail since he loves not the truth. Moreover, the greatest learners in both departments have conformed to this condition:

they have been great in their humility, and have been governed by a supreme desire to be right.

XII. *Both require profound and patient study, and both afford ample scope for this study.* (1) They are both complex, they have a long history of development, and they both teach by examples, requiring of the student a correct interpretation of these examples. No progress has ever been made in either without this hard study.

(2) Some have thought that the truths of revelation should have been written in unmistakable letters on the sky of every land. But why not the truths of science, as well? They have to do with life and progress. They, as well as revelation, supply food for the soul. It was undoubtedly best that, in both departments, truth and science should be obtained by hard study. Thus obtained it will impress and abide; it will have a high value; mental and moral growth will result from the hard struggle of attainment. The divine method is evidently the best. (3) Each gives ample scope. The fields of science are as various as the forms of universal and organic existence, and as limitless as duration and space. The provinces of religion which invite the explorer are as extensive as the manifestations of nature, human and divine, comprising all nations in all stages of progress, and, indirectly, all science; for nature reveals God and illustrates the principles of religion.

XIII. *The development of both science and Christianity is inwoven with history.* (1) The history of almost any science is the history of civilization; and the converse proposition is equally true. This is true of Christianity, and some of the reasons for it are quite obvious: (2) It renders the supposition of forgery absurd; it gave abundant opportunities to illustrate God's dealings with man; it made prophecy and its fulfilment possible, thus doubling the evidence; it demon-

strated man's need of a revelation and that Christianity is perfectly adapted to satisfy this need.

XIV. *The development in each has been carried on by the same means.* These have been human agencies. Great men have been raised up from time to time, who have signalized the centuries in which they lived, though long stretches of level desert lie between. Aristotle, Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, and Morse illustrate the one line; while Abraham and Moses, Daniel and Isaiah, Peter and Paul, are examples of the other.

XV. *Both have made progress through the literature by which the knowledge gained in either department has been conserved.* (1) The art of writing and printing has been the only means by which knowledge and experience have accumulated. No matter how important the knowledge, and though the life of individuals and nations depended on its preservation, pen and ink have been the only means of handing it down to succeeding generations. (2) So has it been in Revelation. Facts and commands were written down and sacredly guarded. (3) It may also be remarked that the methods of propagation are, in both, the same; the agency of men of science in the one, and that of men of God in the other. The pen and the press are equally busy in behalf of each. If it be said that language is too frail an instrument for the transmission of religious thought, the objection lies with even greater weight against every science.

XVI. *The true method of interpretation is the same in each, viz: the Inductive Method.* (1) First of all there must be, in each department, a patient and exhaustive gathering of facts. Nature must be observed and questioned. Experiments must be performed and natural phenomena scrutinized. (2) So in the Scriptures, passages and facts must be collated and classified. Then, the interpretation entertained must be

based on the proposition that all truth is harmonious; that nature is never inconsistent, and revelation never hostile to itself. The accepted theory or meaning must be the only one that reconciles all the facts in the case. (3) The Baconian method adopted in science has produced glorious results, and this method when generally adopted in the investigation of the Scriptures will be followed by results still more glorious. The inductive method brought certainty and harmony into science, and it will bring certainty and unity into Christian learning. There are so many parties in Christendom, not because the Bible is obscure or self-contradictory, nor because Christian men are unlearned or dishonest, but for the want of oneness in the method of study. Nature is not contradictory and absurd because men of science disagree, and no more is Revelation because creeds may differ.

XVII. *Finally, in both nature and Revelation, though the period of introduction is long, the period of full maturity is much longer.* Though nature may develop slowly, and science may require thousands of centuries to reach the greatest results, yet time is long, and the ages during which the blessings of science may be enjoyed will fully justify the long period of development; the former may be to the latter as a moment to a million of years. So, though Christianity was four thousand years in coming to its full development, still the long milleniums of Messiah's reign may fully justify these centuries of preparation. In comparison with the period of Christianity's triumph, those years of waiting for the Light from heaven may seem but a moment of time.

These specifications are sufficient to establish the statement that nature and Revelation are similar in their *methods*. The writer of an anonymous article may be detected by his style. The author of a scientific lecture may be known by his method of unfolding his theme. Another writer may be known by the grandeur and sublimity of his thoughts. The book of nature was written by the hand of God. This book presents the divine method of thought evolution. It is replete with beauty and sublimity. These characteristics of nature are found also in the book of Revelation, and they point to the same divine authorship.

AGREEMENT OF NATURE AND CHRISTIANITY IN METHOD.

1. *Both began in miracle, but are continued by law.*
2. *Slowness of development in both.*
3. *Their blessings alike not universal.*
4. *Alike in methods of moral government.*
   (1) Pleasurable deeds often followed by severe penalties.
   (2) Delay affords no immunity from punishment.
   (3) Neglected opportunities may never return.
   (4) Consequence of error often without remedy.
   (5) Neglect often fatal in both.
5. *Both are systems of means*
6. *Both are remedial systems.*
7. *Both are Mediatorial systems.*
8. *Kind and limit of knowledge the same.*
9. *Both contain great mysteries.*
10. *They are alike unsystematic.*
11. *The same frame of mind required in both.*
12. *Both require profound and patient study.*
13. *Development inwoven with history in both.*
14. *Development in each by the same means.*
15. *Progress in both has depended on literature.*
16. *The methods af interpretation the same in each.*
17. *In each the period of growth is long, but the period of maturity vastly longer.*

CHRISTIANITY AGREES WITH NATURE IN ITS TEACHINGS

PROPOSITION FIRST. SO FAR AS NATURE GOES THEIR TEACHINGS ARE THE SAME IN REGARD TO GOD.

I. *In regard to the Divine Existence.*

Nature indicates in many ways that there is a God. (1) The question is not what a savage or an undeveloped human being could learn from nature on this subject; it is not what one wholly destitute of Bible ideas could learn; nor what one could learn without study and thought; but rather what a fully-developed, studious, well-educated man, standing in the light of this age, can see in nature to suggest and prove to him the divine existence. It is the province of reason, as in regard to physical laws, to interpret nature's language, to combine her premises, and declare her conclusions. (2) The truth is with either Atheism or Theism. All theories come under one of these; Materialism and Pantheism are forms of the first, while Deism is included in the second. (3) It should be borne in mind that the discussion is not, at present, concerning the attributes of Deity, nor whether God is knowable, nor whether he is a person, but whether there is a God at all; and, specifically, what we may learn on this subject from non-bible sources.

Argument 1. *Atheism can not be proved.* Whatever reasons the atheist may bring, there will always hang over him the possibility that there is a God. (1) The supposition is not absurd. The atheist himself is the only being or object in nature that denies and repudiates its Maker. Surely the heavenly orbs are not continually "singing as they shine, the hand that made us is *not* divine." (2) He who says there is

no God ought to have made extensive explorations in earth and heaven, in worlds material and spiritual, in time and eternity. Indeed, before he could know there is no God he would himself become one; he must be *omnipresent*, or where he is not God may be; he must be *omniscient*, or the one thing he does not know may be that there is a God.

Argument 2. *The Theistic hypothesis is by far the most reasonable and scientific.*

(1) Something *is*, and, therefore, something *always was* Had there ever been a time when absolutely nothing was in existence, then nothing could ever have existed. There could have been no event, for there was no cause. This position is self-evident.

(2) So far as we know, there are but two things in existence—*matter* and *mind;* force is not an entity, but the energy manifested by the one or the other. Now the possible suppositions are these: *first*, Dualism, which affirms that matter and mind are co-eternal; *second*, Materialism, which affirms the eternity of matter, and that mind is only a result of certain combinations and properties of matter; *third*, Theism, which affirms the eternity of mind and that matter is a creation of mind.

(3) The hypothesis of *Dualism* is unscientific. The Law of Parsimony bids us provide the fewest agencies which solve a problem or explain a phenomenon. It is not necessary to suppose two eternal existences. Such a theory is too complex. It does not help in the explanation of any difficulty, and is loaded down with all the difficulties of both Atheism and Theism. The great majority of thinkers see no need of this double supposition; one class see in matter all the potencies of life and intellect; the other class believe that an Almighty God would be adequate to the production of the material universe.

(4) It is reasonable to believe that this eternal existence was mind rather than matter. (a) Mind is superior to matter. This general statement must be admitted. Mind is the knowing entity, while matter is the object known. Mind impresses, moves, and modifies matter. Matter is the servant and mind the master. Are the forms of matter which the chemist hammers on his anvil, melts in his crucible, and decomposes or combines, the equals of the chemist himself? The plant torn into shreds, the animal body dissected fiber by fiber, are surely inferior to the scientist who thus studies them. The tree is inferior to the man who cuts it down, and the body to the mind which guides and perhaps destroys it. (b) To that form of being which existed from eternity, and which caused all things else, belonged spontaneity and force. Without spontaneity it would have remained forever dormant; and without force it could not have caused a single event. Now, we know from consciousness that mind possesses these. It has power to move the body and is causative of such motions. On the other hand, so far as we can see and experiment, matter is destitute of both. It is laid down as a law of nature that matter remains in the condition in which it is, whether of rest or motion, until something from without itself shall change its condition. Matter could never have produced any change in its state of eternal rest or motion. If free to entertain a theory, why be so perverse as to cling to the one least likely to be true? (c) The one original form of existence must have had other attributes which, so far as we can see, matter does not possess, but which are characteristic of mind. There must have been in this original being all that is developed and manifested in the universe, including the human mind and all its productions. It possessed the power to think, plan, and feel. It had the capacity to love and hate, to make moral distinctions, and to choose between

right and wrong. Matter seems to be without thought and feeling; it is not supposed to be subject to moral law. At least, it has never been proved that matter possesses in any degree these attributes. We know that these powers inhere in mind. Mind, therefore, was eternal and not matter. (d) If it be said that the distinction between mind and matter is not well founded; that mind is a kind of matter, or that matter is a kind of mind, and therefore that the disjunction argued above is only a seeming one, the answer is threefold: *First*, to say that mind is matter, or matter mind, is nugatory, since we do not know what either one is in itself. *Second*, the phenomena of mind and matter are exceedingly diverse. Of course, they have some attributes in common, for there are no two things in the universe that wholly differ, since both would exist and both would stand in relation the one to the other. Differences in phenomena imply a difference in substance. Gold and silver have common qualities, but they differ in so many and so widely that no one supposes they are the same substance. So in this case, matter is known by its qualities, mind by its activities; consciousness reveals the one, the senses the other; one is dead, the other alive; one is senseless, the other full of thought and feeling; one is passive, the other gifted with spontaneity; the one is amenable to physical law, the other to intellectual and moral law. They appear to all men to be different things, and as such we must receive them, till some one shall prove that they are identical. *Third*, it is more reasonable to spiritualize matter than to materialize mind. This follows from the superiority of mind; from the certainty with which we know mind as compared with matter, since we are conscious of the former, but not of the latter; and from the tendency of mental philosophers to question even the existence of matter, except

as phenomena revealed in the mind alone; for example, Hume and some German writers.

So far the argument is clear; Atheism can not be proved, and Theism is the more reasonable supposition. The next step leads to the certainty of the divine existence.

Argument 3. *The universe exhibits marks of intelligent causation; it must, therefore, have had an intelligent cause.*

(1) There is such a thing as intelligent causation. The primary idea of force, causative force, and of this causative force under the direction of intelligences producing its characteristic effects, is derived from our own minds and their intelligent volitions. (a) Intelligent causation implies three things: the idea of the result desired, the perception of the means by which this result may be reached, and the exertion of energy under the direction of intelligence for the realization of this result. (b) Intelligent causation is strongly contrasted with what may be called fortuitous causation. The former implies a knowledge of material, a correct estimate of forces, and the employment of both with mathematical precision. It implies that the effect and the whole process of its production existed in thought before the realization. (c) All the works and achievements of man present examples of such causation. Every work-shop and factory, every article manufactured, every engine constructed, every steamship built furnishes uncounted examples. Instances of such causation are far more numerous than all the human beings that have ever lived. There is nothing with which men are more familiar than with this intelligent causation, and whose sure indications they more certainly recognize.

(2) Men are continually studying intelligent effects and referring them *with the utmost certainty* to their true cause. Not only so, but we are able to see the separate steps and

processes by which the causative intelligence reached its result. When we say that "every house is builded by some man" there is no guess-work and no uncertainty about it. We know that the sewing-machine did not grow, and that it was not produced by chance. We know that it existed in the mind of the inventor before he collected the material or lifted a tool. About this mode of reasoning there is nothing unusual or metaphysical. We employ it constantly, and we would question the intelligence or sanity of one who doubted the unavoidable conclusion, if it had to do with the works of man.

(3) Nature, in all her objects, processes, and plans, bears the marks of this intelligent causation. The microscope and the eye are made on the same plan; the parts and their arrangement are similar; and there is only this difference, that the eye is far more exquisite, scientific and perfect. If we trace one to an intelligent cause, why not the other with still more certainty. The engine with its valves and pipes, which convey water to all parts of the great city, is like the heart and blood vessels, only the latter is more perfect in its operation, more durable, able to repair itself, and needs no engineer to move its valves and gauge its force. It would require a volume to discuss the science involved in its structure and functions. The brain and spinal-cord with their efferent and afferent nerves remind one of an electric telegraphic system, only it far surpasses in delicacy, flexibility, and variety of functions everything of the kind that man has made. No rational person would say that one required intelligence, but that the other, and that the superior, was produced by unintelligent matter and force. We are compelled to recognize the intelligent and infinite Cause. There are as many proofs of the divine existence as there are leaves on all the trees, and drops in all the oceans. These marks of

intelligent causation are the characters in which the name of God is written on every flower and every insect-wing, impressed on every crystal, and blazoned on every star.

(4) The same reasoning may be presented in the following way: (a) There are *thoughts* presented in nature; then there must be a great *Thinker*. Nature manifests *design*; there is a *Designer*. She embodies, in her compounds and changes, chemical principles and laws; there must be a great Chemist. She builds her structures, her suns and systems, and measures off her eternal ages and spaces mathematically; there is a divine Mathematician. There are laws; there must be an all-authoritative Law-Giver. (b) Will any one deny, to take a single form of statement, that there is thought in nature? What are our scientific men about but translating the scientific thoughts of nature into the language of men? How do our inventors make progress except by the imitation of nature? How do we learn the transformation of matter, if not by studying in Nature's laboratory? Thought in nature! It seems an insult to common sense to argue such a question. It is equally certain that there was, prior to the production of the Universe, a divine Thinker.

Argument 4. *The moral government of the world implies the existence of a moral governor.*

(1) The nature of this argument may be presented in a few words. The existence of a king implies that there are subjects, for otherwise he could not be a king. The half of the horizon seen implies the half not seen. The portion of the arch resting on this side of the river implies that the portion on the other side is standing, though the mists may conceal it from our view. So if man is a moral being, subject to moral law, then there must be a moral authority by which this government is enforced.

(2) Man is such a subject of moral government. His conscience tells him there is a right and a wrong, and he has the power of choice between them. He believes that *justice* will be done; and, since nature knows nothing of justice, there is One above nature who will, at length, arise for its vindication.

(3) Hence, all guilty men fear the day of retribution. All martyrs to truth and human progress have committed their cause to Him who judgeth righteously. The oppressed in every age have cried unto a being supposed to hold in his hand the balance and the sword, and who would sooner or later make known his righteous judgments. To destroy this faith in a discriminating and righteous Moral Ruler would remove the foundation of all individual and social rectitude. If no such ruler exists, then a falsehood in respect to his existence is better than the truth—a consequence sufficiently absurd.

Argument 5. *The proofs of the divine existence are so patent and so convincing that the great mass of mankind and a vast majority of the philosophers and scientific men of the race have believed and maintained it.*

(1) The multitude of men in all ages have had this faith. The Atheist occupies a forced position. He professes to be smarter than his fellows. He has to convert himself to it, and there is much to justify the suspicion that the wish is father to the thought. "The fool hath said in his *heart*, There is no God." If this universal belief does not prove the divine existence, it *does prove* that nearly all men so interpret the testimony of nature.

(2) Philosophers, ancient and modern, with few exceptions, have believed in the divine existence, though they have spoken of it under different names and clothed it with

different attributes. These opinions are not cited to prove by sheer authority that there is a God, but to show how candid and profound minds have regarded the proofs furnished in nature. These proofs, in their opinion, have all the force of demonstration. *Socrates* held that the Supreme Being is the immaterial, infinite Governor of all; that the world bears the stamp of his intelligence; and that he is the author and vindicator of all moral law. *Aristotle* based his belief in a Deity on three arguments: (a) The Ontological, founded on our necessary idea of an eternal and immutable substance. (b) The Cosmological, based on our necessary idea of causality as the correlative of effect, and of intelligence as the correlative of harmony and contrivance. (c) The moral proof. *Sir Isaac Newton* was certainly qualified to judge in this case, and all the world knows how firm his faith was in Theism. *John Stuart Mill*, in the following passage, expresses his belief in the Supreme Intelligence and his reason for it: "The particular combination of organic elements called the eye had, in every instance, a beginning in time, and must therefore have been brought together by a cause or causes. The number of instances is immeasurably greater than is, by the principles of inductive logic, required for the exclusion of a random concurrence of independent causes, or, speaking technically, for the elimination of chance. We are therefore warranted by the canons of induction in concluding that what brought all these elements together was some cause common to them all; and inasmuch as the elements agree in the single circumstance of conspiring to produce sight, there must be some connection by way of causation between the cause which brought those elements together and the fact of sight. The natural sequel of the argument would be this: Sight, being a fact not precedent but subsequent to the putting together of the organic struc-

ture of the eye, can only be connected with the production of that structure in the character of a final, not an efficient cause; that is, it is not sight itself, but the antecedent idea of it, that must be the efficient cause. But this at once marks the origin as proceeding from an *intelligent will.*" *Herbert Spencer* reasons against Hamilton and Mansel to the conclusion that we can know *that* the Infinite exists, but we can not know *what* it is. He contends that we can know that it is, because "To say that we can not know the absolute is, by implication, to affirm that *there is an absolute.*" *Prof. John Tyndall*, and those who suppose matter to have been the original existence, and that it contains all the potencies of life and thought, are wont to impose on matter the attributes of mind, thus confessing that the primal being was intelligent. Such testimonies can be multiplied without limit. The multitudes of the common people in all ages, all Christian scholars, and all others, with only an exception here and there, believe in God. One who goes against all these should be able to show wherein he is superior to them.

(3) The elements of this problem are level to the comprehension of the common mind. The opinion of Socrates or Cicero is quite as authoritative as that of Mill or Agassiz. The progress of modern science has not changed the conditions except as it has greatly enlarged the evidence of design, plan, and thought, antecedent to nature's working. Evolution, if it is true, only enlarges our conception of the divine plans and of the laws which develop such wonderful variety and perfection. Every one will accept Whewell's remark: "We are, by the discovery of the general laws of nature, led into a scene of wider design, of deeper contrivance, of more comprehensive adjustments. Final causes, if they appear driven further from us by such extension of our views, embrace us only with a vaster and more majestic

circle. Instead of a few threads connecting some detached objects, they become a stupendous net-work which is wound round and round the universal frame of things."

Argument 6. *Theism must be accepted because the only alternative, Atheism, is beset with all the chief difficulties of Theism, and has besides insuperable difficulties of its own.*

1. *Atheism is beset with all the chief difficulties of Theism, and hence has no advantage over it.* If Theism is objected to, let us see what objections lie against the opposite hypothesis. If certain objections are fatal to Theism, let us see if they are not equally fatal to Atheism.

(1) It is said that in the Theistic argument we seek to rise from the finite to a comprehension of the infinite, and that from finite premises we draw an infinite conclusion. (a) In reply to this objection, when alleged against faith in God, it may be granted that we do of necessity pass from a conception of the finite to that of the infinite. These terms are correlative, the one suggesting the other. Finite space and time suggest infinite space and time. The limited suggests the unlimited as naturally as the pendulum swings from one extreme position to the other. Man and all his powers are finite. He rises from his finite self to the idea of the infinite intelligence, and no one should complain because he does this in the only way possible to him. (b) But the Atheist has to do the same. If there is no God, then matter is eternal, self-existent, and infinite. *Something* is infinite in its eternal existence. The Atheist must rise from the finite to this infinite something as well as the believer in God.

(2) It is said that the conception of an intelligent First Cause involves a logical contradiction, since the assumed first cause of the universe needs to be accounted for as much as the universe itself. (a) The Theist replies that to attempt

to account for the first cause is illogical, since it is the *first* cause; and that Infinite Intelligence is a suitable first cause, since mind has the power of thought and spontaneous activity, while matter, so far as we can see, has not. Since we can not go back of the first cause, it is more reasonable to stop at Mind than at Matter. (b) Atheism is in the same difficulty, if it be one. If Matter is the eternal existence, or force, or what not, then it would have to be accounted for; and the more the necessity, since matter gives no evidence of self-existence.

(3) If it be said that God is not perfectly known, is not, in this sense, knowable, and hence there is no God, (a) we reply that our knowledge of God may be adequate, though not perfect; that we cannot know *any thing* perfectly without knowing *everything* perfectly; and that such knowledge would make any being a God. (b) But, on the other hand, matter, in none of its forms, is perfectly known, nor in this sense is it knowable; hence matter does not exist, and hence, to make a practical application, we need not recognize matter nor regard its laws.

(4) It is said that if marks of intelligent causation in the universe indicate an intelligent cause, so do such marks, viz., thought and adaptation in God, indicate that He had an intelligent cause; and hence there would be an infinite regression of causes. (a) It is replied that we have no evidence of thought, plan or adaptation in the nature of God. Mind, so far as we can know, whether human or divine, is indivisible and without organs or parts. We do not know that it has any relation to space. We can not say, therefore, that it gives any evidence of contrivance, or of antecedent idea in its construction; it has no structure, so far as we are conscious of ourselves or can see in regard to another. (b) But if this objection does not lie against an

eternal mind, it does lie, in all its force, against matter as eternal; for matter, however simple and primordial its form, *does* exhibit these marks of intelligent causation. The chemical atoms,—and back of these none attempt to go even in theory,—are adapted to one another, and are under rigid chemical and mathematical law. If the objection is fatal to Theism, it is equally fatally to any original existence, matter, least of all, not excepted.

2. *Beyond these, Atheism has insuperable difficulties of its own.*

(1) Atheism, in opposition to the one simple hypothesis of Theism, builds on several complex and tremendous assumptions; assumptions, because it does not and cannot prove them: (a) That matter is eternal and self-existent; (b) that the forces of the material world are eternal and spontaneously self-active. (c) That the laws of the material universe are eternal. (d) That nature continually repeats the same cycle of changes; for otherwise, since matter, its forces, and its laws are eternal, it would have run its full course during the first part of its first eternity, and would now for many long eternities have been quiescent and dead. (e) That nature exhibits no thought, design, or plan. Of course this can not be proved; for though there might be no evidence of thought and plan in this world, yet who could show that in no corner of the millions of other worlds, and at no moment of their past eternity, was there the least evidence of thought or design? Not only is this a bold assumption, but it is in opposition to the science and common sense of mankind. We *do know* that thought, plan, and executive adjustment are exhibited in every part of nature's works.

(2) Atheism assigns a cause of the universe as we now find it which is not adequate. According to Atheism, nature's works include everything, the human mind, with its thoughts,

feelings, and volitions, not excepted. Nature then gives evidence of thought, design, plan, voluntary motion, love and hate, conscience, life—of all that is more than dead matter, as well as of matter itself. So far as man's experience and science can go, matter does not possess these qualities and potencies. The materialist confesses the inadequacy of the cause he assigns, when, that it may become a sufficient cause, he attributes to matter all the powers of life and intelligence.

(3) Atheism maintains the absurd position 'that the universe, as we now find it, is the product of sheer chance. If nature gives evidence of design, there is a designer, there is a God. The opposite of *design* is *chance*. No design, no plan, no action toward the realization of a plan, no intelligence, no God; then *chance* is the word and the conception, though the thing, *chance itself*, can not be proved to have even an existence. (a) A glance at some of nature's works would seem to make the absurdity of this supposition sufficiently evident. Is the eye, with all its nice and scientific adjustment, a work of chance? Is it a matter of chance that the human heart has its valves, arteries, veins and vital powers? Did chance create the human ear and its correlation with the vocal apparatus? Was it chance that gave the hand its powers and the brain its functions? Was it by chance that all these organs of the human body were brought together in the being called man? (b) How absurd this supposition of chance is may be shown by a mathematical demonstration. There are fifty-two cards in a pack. The number of hands of thirteen cards each which can be produced is 635,013,559,600, a number expressed with twelve figures. But in whist four hands are simultaneously held and the number of distinct deals possible becomes so vast that it would require *twenty-eight* figures to express it. Now, a

number consisting of twelve figures evidently would not express the improbability that chance would produce the *eye*, or the *ear*, or the *hand*, or the *brain*; and that chance should produce these *four* organs *simultaneously* and place them in the same body is so improbable that a number requiring twenty-eight figures would not express it. This improbability not expressed by even twenty-eight figures has reference to only *four* organs. If all the organs of the body and powers of the mind were taken into the account, no number *possible to our thought* could express the improbability that the organs and powers of man are a chance arrangement. This improbability is made infinitely greater when we suppose that chance made not *one* man only, but all the millions of the past and present, and made them all alike in respect to those organs and powers that are common to the human race. This improbability is multiplied by infinity again and again when we take into account the immense number of species of organized beings and the uncounted millions of individuals in each species.

It is, therefore, the teaching of nature and reason that there is a God. Now the Bible teaches the same great fact. It is assumed in the first verse, implied in every command and threatening, and declared in every act of worship. Here, then, we have perfect agreement in regard to the foundation fact of all morals and religion.

II. *In regard to the Divine Personality.* If the teachings of nature are not so definite and demonstrative as we could wish, yet so far as they go they are in favor of the personality of God.

1. There is nothing in nature to the contrary. Such a supposition does not clash with any known fact, principle, or law. Pantheism must forever remain a mere, dim, uncertain,

mental conception. No syllogism can be framed that will prove it, no experiment performed that will verify it. There are, therefore, no difficulties in the way of such a conclusion.

2. All that we know about intelligent causation is associated with a *person.* We have no knowledge of an intelligence existing in the abstract, or diffused, like ether, throughout the arctic winter of infinite space. In our conception and experience, intelligence and personality go together and can not be divorced. We do not know and cannot conceive how impersonal intelligence can exist at all. We, therefore, refer the intelligent causation exhibited in nature to a personal being.

3. Still further, we are justified in regarding God as a person because of the strong resemblance between the human intelligence and that manifested in nature. Man, as well as other works of nature, is the offspring of the Original Intelligence; hence every spiritual quality and mental power found in man must also belong to the nature of God, and we should expect that the created intelligence would resemble the uncreated mind. Accordingly, when we compare man's work with God's work in nature we find them strikingly alike. Man "thinks God's thoughts after Him." They work on the same mathematical and mechanical principles. Man, without a knowledge of nature's methods, has, in many instances, adopted the same means to secure the same results. Man makes his pyramids broad-based with the center of gravity low, just as God builds his mountains. Man makes his steamships with water-tight compartments, as nature does her chambered shells. Man reinvented the pulley of the eye and the valves of the heart. God and man are co-operants in developing and beautifying nature. They *are alike*, hence it is right to suppose that God, like man, is a person, and to

conceive of Him under the notions furnished by the human mind.

4. Nature teaches the *unity* of God, and this is an element of personality. All science is one. In the darkness of heathenism a god was assigned to every seemingly separate department of nature; sea and land, good and evil, life and death, had each its presiding deity. But in the light of science all this is absurd. There is a unity of matter, law, and force. Light, heat, and gravitation are the same throughout the universe. The Creator of chemical atoms framed also the worlds. The kingdoms of plant and animal life meet and harmonize with each other. He who said, "Let there be light," said also, "Let there be an eye." He who created the ear created also the air whose music the ear catches and the soul which it thrills. All the highways of science in the earth and in the heavens lead in upon the central throne and bring us into the presence of the one God.

5. God has attributes manifested in nature, such as wisdom and goodness; but these attributes can not exist apart from some essence, or person, in which they reside. We do not find such attributes wandering through space like disembodied spirits. To suppose, therefore, that God is anything but a personality to whom these attributes belong, is to be, in the highest degree, absurd. On the other side there is no question. The Bible knows only a personal God. "Our God is *one* God" is the uniform teaching, and to this one God it ascribes every personal attribute and prerogative. Here, also, we find perfect agreement.

III. *In regard to the divine attributes.* This comparison of teachings can not be carried out to the full extent; for we do not understand all the teachings on this subject, neither in the Bible nor in nature; and in both cases the God revealed

is beyond our perfect comprehension, is infinite; still further, there are attributes of God revealed in the Bible concerning which nature is silent; but, so far as we can see, the same God is made known in both.

1. *Self-existence.* "And the Lord said unto Moses, I am that *I am;* say unto the children of Israel, *I am* hath sent me to you." He is called *Jehovah*, the *I am*, the Self-existent One. According to the Bible He existed before all created things; he is independent and absolute. Nature, scientifically interpreted, teaches the same lesson. Something always was. All theorists make this assumption, and we have seen that this eternal being was God.

2. *Eternity and Omnipresence.* Time and space are conditions of human thought. In our thoughts there is a *where* and a *when* to everything. But we can not say that all beings are so limited. For God, the Absolute Being, there may be no such limitations. If God is the first cause, and self-existent, then he always was; and if he possesses all knowledge, and gives energy and order to the whole universe, then he would need to be everywhere present. Now, what nature dimly teaches the Scriptures declare, enlarge and illustrate. We can not exceed the Bible idea of his eternity: "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world; even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God;" nor of his omnipresence: "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there! If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me. If I say, Surely the darkness shall cover me, even the night shall be light about me; yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the

day; the darkness and the light are both alike to thee."

3. *Unchangeableness.* In the language of the Scriptures He is "without variableness or shadow of turning," "the same yesterday, to-day, and forever." The teachings of science are to the same purport. The laws of nature are but expressions of the divine will and methods of working, and these are unchangeable. The laws of creation and miracle—for miracles *may* have a law—are not evidences of change, but of uniformity. Go far out as we may in space, the same forms and methods are found. Go far back in time as we may, still the same God is there. Neither astronomy nor geology refuses to illustrate this divine oracle.

4. *Incomprehensibleness.* "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven, what canst thou do? deeper than hell, what canst thou know?" Such is the language of the Scriptures. Observe, it does not state that we can not know anything about God, nor that our partial knowledge is unreliable, but that we can not find Him out "*unto perfection.*" Because we can not know space unto perfection, can not know it in its infinitude, we are not to conclude that we can not know anything of space and that our science of geometry is unreliable; nor because we do not possess infinite knowledge, shall we be justified in ignoring what we do possess? So is it in nature. Up to a certain point we may understand, but all beyond becomes mysterious and rises infinitely above us. Though we may constantly push outward the boundary of the known, this will only enlarge the horizon of the unknown. If we can not fully comprehend the works of God, much less can we find out to perfection the essence of Deity and his mode of existence.

5. *Omniscience.* Both reason and science attribute perfect and infinite knowledge to God, that is, he knows all time and

all space; all that is to be known, or is knowable. All things belong to just two categories: *God* and *God's creation.* He surely knows himself and the things which he has made. The Bible presents the same conception. "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world." "Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in His sight; but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do." "For if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart and *knoweth all things.*"

6. *Omnipotence.* It is recorded that God said unto Abraham: "I am the Almighty God: walk before me and be thou perfect." Job said to the Lord, "I know that thou canst do everything and that no thought can be withholden from thee." And Jesus said, "With God all things are possible." This is the uniform Bible teaching. Nature declares and illustrates this attribute of the Creator. All power belongs to God and his universe; He has, therefore, all power and is the Almighty. Matter, so far as science knows, is inert, passive, dead. It is everywhere in motion, but motion has to be infused into it from without. Whatever power man has is derived. Hence all the various lines of force and motion are traced back to the uplifted arm of the Omnipotent.

When it is said that all things are "possible with God," of course it is not meant that he can be either physically or morally absurd. He cannot make a thing to be and not to be at the same time and in the same sense. It is equally absurd, morally, for God to be false, "it is impossible for God to lie." Such things are nonentities, and, in their opposition of nature, non-possibilities. Having given man a mental and moral nature, it is impossible for God to treat man otherwise than in harmony with this nature. Hence he instructs man and influences him by motives. It may have

been impossible for God to give man moral freedom and still prevent moral evil. It seems impossible for man to become strong in virtue without being subjected to temptation and suffering. In the existence of evil, therefore, nature does not question the divine wisdom or power. Infinite wisdom and power could not have produced a better universe than this, the critics and reviewers of "God's Elder Scriptures" to the contrary notwithstanding.

7. *Holiness*, *justice*, *truth*, *goodness* and *mercy*. Nature does not demonstrate these moral attributes of God, or, if she does, it is with such feebleness and uncertainty that a revelation of God is needful. Indeed, it would seem to be impossible for man to know God in these respects from nature unless he could know the outcome of nature's on-going and the final results of human life. All that we see are means to what end? We must judge of the former by the latter. It is said that the ancient Mexicans, in times of famine or war, were accustomed to offer human sacrifices. They sought out the most beautiful and the most gifted. This one was placed in a palace, supplied with the richest viands, delighted with the sweetest music, and his every desire gratified. But when these weeks of seeming happiness were over he led forth the solemn procession which wound its way to the summit of the Temple of the Sun, where the cruel priests laid him upon the cold altar-stone, opened his breast, and held up his palpitating heart an offering to their god of war. All must be judged of in the light of this awful immolation. So, does all end in the grave,—life, thought, love, and very existence? If so, it would seem to be at the expense of every moral attribute of God.

Yet, it is firmly fixed in human hearts that these attributes belong to God. It can not be that the Maker and Ruler of all is unholy, unjust, untruthful, or without goodness and

mercy. Infinite *goodness* implies all the rest. If the end of the human race is to be a proof of malevolence and not of benevolence, this, as yet, is not known; and so far as we have gone and can see, nature exhibits some evidences of divine goodness. She opens her hand and supplies the desires of every living thing. It is pleasant to behold the sun. Every season and every relation and period of human life is crowded with pleasures. Pain is brief and soon forgotten. God thought of us during the upward-toiling ages; and all provisions for human progress, coal and iron laid away in the earth, the purer air and the happier continents, were all prophetic of the coming man. Now these intuitions of the soul and dim shadowings of nature are fully corroborated and perfected in the Scriptures. The very word, *God*, expresses his goodness. "Justice and judgment are the habitation of his throne." "His mercy endureth forever." "For the Lord is good; his truth is everlasting; and his truth endureth to all generations." Jesus is said to be the brightness of the Father's glory and the express representation of his character. Those who saw Jesus in the manifestation of his justice, mercy, compassion, and unspeakable love, saw the Father also.

It is unnecessary to follow this part of the argument further. It is beyond question that nature and the Bible are in accord concerning God—concerning his existence, his personality, and his attributes.

AGREEMENT OF NATURE AND CHRISTIANITY CONCERNING GOD.

I. *In regard to the Divine Existence.*

(1) Atheism can not be proved.
(2) Theism is by far the most reasonable.
(3) Nature exhibits marks of intelligent causation.
(4) Moral government impliès a moral governor.
(5) The belief of common men and of philosophers.
(6) The difficulties of Theism lie with greater force against Atheism, while the latter has insuperable difficulties of its own.

II. *In regard to the Divine Personality.*

(1) Nothing in Nature to the contrary.
(2) Intelligent causation disconnected with personality is unknown to us.
(3) God and man think alike; if one is personal, why not the other?
(4) Nature teaches the unity of God, and this implies personality.
(5) The supposition of spiritual attributes without personality is absurd.

III. *In regard to the Divine Attributes.*

(1) Self-existence.
(2) Eternity and omnipresence.
(3) Unchangeableness.
(4) Incomprehensibleness.
(5) Omniscience.
(6) Omnipotence.
(7) Holiness, justice, truth, goodness, and mercy.

PROPOSITION SECOND. THE BIBLE AND SCIENCE PRESENT THE SAME TEACHINGS IN REGARD TO THE CREATION OF THE WORLD.

I. *They agree in respect to the fact that the material universe is not eternal, but was created, or called into being.*

1. We have seen that something always was; that Dualism, the eternity of matter and mind, is excluded by the law of parsimony; and that it is mind, and not matter, that has always existed. Matter, then, was called into being, for it is now in existence.

2. It is objected that the creation of something out of nothing is absurd. Now the Bible does not say that the world was created out of nothing. There always was something in existence, and this something was the cause of whatever else came into being. Matter was produced by the divine energy. That this was impossible, no man can know; for we do not know what matter is. What is an atom? Has an atom ever been seen, measured, weighed or analyzed? One of the most plausible theories is that an atom is a mathematical point where force is located; a point around which there play unceasingly attractive and repulsive forces. If this is true, that God should call it into being would not seem to be impossible, but analogous rather to what we know of mental power; for man is also a creator, calling into existence thoughts, choices, and bodily motions.

3. This is also the Bible doctrine. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." The word *created* here refers to the production of the material universe, and is placed in strong contrast with the organization of the earth,

which is afterward described. In the first of John's Gospel it is said that "all things were *created* by Him;" *created* in this passage is, in the original, a form of the verb *to be*, and means that all things *were*, or *came into being*, by Him; "What is seen hath not been made out of things which do appear;" Heb. 11 : 3. That this creation was a calling into being is still further evident from the fact that the Scriptures ascribe to God the power to utterly destroy the world of matter as well as to create it.

II. *They agree in respect to the great stages of Creation and their order of succession.*

1. The Bible account is found in the first chapter of Genesis. (1) It states that *in beginning*, or *at first* (Green's Heb. Gram.), God created the heaven and the earth. The existence of God and the origin of the material universe are declared in a single sentence. We are not told *how* God created the heavens and the earth, nor *how long* he was in doing it. The *heavens* include the sun, moon, and stars—all but the earth. Moses begins his account with *all these in existence*. He leaves to science the task of finding out how all were produced, and does not say anything about the order in which the heavenly bodies were created. Of course, it is also implied that in this general statement are included light, heat, gravitation, and all the properties of matter.

(2) Science perfectly agrees with this. By whatever method produced, there was a time when the heavens and the earth stood complete as they now appear.

2. The writer of Genesis, having stated the origin and place of the earth in regard to the heavenly bodies, confines himself to the earth and its progressive modifications. (1) He describes its condition when his account begins: "And the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon

the face of the deep." "Without form;" that is, it was not yet fully organized in respect to land and water, mountain and plain; not yet had its material assumed its final condition and arrangement as solid, liquid, and gaseous, in due proportion. "Void;" it was destitute of organized beings, and man had not yet appeared as its chief occupant. "Darkness was upon the face of the deep;" the shoreless and chaotic sea of mingled elements was in unbroken darkness; the light of neither sun nor star could penetrate the gloom.

(2) According to science, and especially the Nebular Hypothesis, this was once the condition of the earth, and no scientific writer could select better terms by which to bring the earth, in this condition, before the mind. If the earth was thrown off by the sun in a semi-fluid condition, intensely heated, and undergoing great chemical changes, then in passing from that condition to the present one it must have passed through the stage so graphically described in Genesis. If the current notions of world-building are not correct, still science could bring nothing against the Mosaic account in this respect.

(3) How long the earth was in this condition neither the Bible nor science declares, and yet both indicate that the time was long; the *cooling* process was very slow, and the *brooding* of the Spirit of God, as it is in the Hebrew, implies, equally, a long period.

3. The next great epoch was the production of light upon the earth. (1) "Darkness was upon the face of the deep," and God said, "Let light be, and light was." Light was produced where the darkness was, and the darkness was upon the face of the earth, not in the heavens. This was not the creation of light in the absolute sense, but relative to the earth. According to Genesis millions of suns had long been shining in the heavens.

(2) Now, science teaches that as the earth cooled it must have come to a time when the solid portions gathered at the center, with the liquids resting upon them, and with the gases forming the outer envelope; and that at length the light must have shone upon this more solid and more perfectly conglobed world.

4. The next stage is marked by the production of the atmosphere. (1) The creation of the *firmament* was the work of the second Mosaic day. *Expanse*, as all agree, is the true meaning of the Hebrew, and not *firmament*. The Greek and Roman idea of a firm, metallic dome, with the gods above and men below, has no place in the Scriptures. This expanse separated the waters below from those above. Science can not improve the brevity and expressiveness of this description. As the cooling and confining of the elements went on, at length the residual gases, oxygen and nitrogen, were left in mechanical mixture; the heavier liquids settled below, and the clouds floated above. To this condition the earth *did come*, and in regard to it the Mosaic account can not be in error.

(2) That there was light upon the earth before the sun became visible through the dense vapors is the teaching of science as well as revelation.

5. Again we read, (1) "Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear: and it was so." (2) Science also testifies that the earth must have come to this great change. The earth shrank upon itself as it cooled, continents and mountains were lifted up, ocean beds were depressed, and the waters flowed together. Evaporation began, the wind-wafted clouds passed over the lands, the rains fell, the rivers dashed down the slopes, and another great wheel began to revolve and flash in the presence of the Master Mechanist.

6. "Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed and the fruit tree yielding fruit after its kind, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth; and it was so." (1) All the conditions of vegetable life are supplied before plants appear —light, air, dry land, rain, and suitable heat. We are not told *how* God created plants, *how long* he was about it, nor what were the *first* vegetable forms. Here there is room for botanical investigation, with no danger of a collision with the Bible. Plants also preceded the introduction of animal life.

(2) Science fully corroborates this statement. There was a time when plants first grew upon the earth. The profoundest study of biology places the origin of plants just where Genesis does—after the necessary conditions were developed and before animals existed. Plants could live before animal life was possible in an atmosphere laden with carbonic acid; animals must have plant food, the animal food upon which the carnivora subsist being supplied by the vegetable kingdom.

(3) If it be said that the remains of plants and animals are found side by side in the lowest fossiliferous strata, it is replied that the lowest strata have been metamorphosed and all traces of plants obliterated; also, that the existence of carbon in the strata below the remains of animals indicates the prior existence of plants.

(4) It should not be supposed, moreover, that the third Mosaic day and the Carboniferous Period are the same. The beginnings of plant life and its wonderful development in the Carboniferous Period are sufficiently diverse to prevent confusion.

7. "Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days, and for years." "And God made

two great lights;" "He made the stars also." (1) The great event described in this passage was the appearance of the sun, moon, and stars *in the firmament.* They were created at the first, as stated in the first verse of Genesis; therefore, this passage *can not* refer to their creation, but rather to their appearance to an observer on the earth.

(2) However unnatural it may seem that not till this stage of the earth's progress should the sun be visible, yet science declares that this must have been the case. The atmosphere was slowly purified. Plants would grow in a warm, humid atmosphere, though the source of light was not yet apparent. The result of a longer time and of plant development was the removal of vapors so that the heavenly bodies appeared in the firmament.

8. The next stage was the production of animal life in the sea. "Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven." (1) This was a great advance in creation—the *moving* thing that hath *life*, the winged beings that could rise above the waters, but all having their home in the waters.

(2) Now, does this agree with science? Was life first in the sea? Were birds, at first, such as lived in the waters? An affirmative answer must be given to these questions. Air-breathing animals could not have lived at first, since the atmosphere was not sufficiently pure; and flying reptiles, living in the waters and requiring but little oxygen, were the precursors of the true birds.

9. Next, according to Genesis, land animals were created, and science must and does make the same record.

10. Last of all man was created, and science cordially agrees with this teaching. All else was preparatory to man. If Evolution is true, man is the last product. The remains of

man are found only in the most recent strata, and man was the physical structure toward which all beings were moving during the past ages.

11. According to Genesis, God ceased to create in this world; God rested, and consecrated the Sabbath. Science does not know of any creation more recent than man. It is not only admitted that there has been no creation since man was produced, but some go farther, and claim that there never was a creation of anything; much more, then, is it true that there has been none since the creation of man.

The agreement of science and Genesis in respect to the *order* of the great stages of creation is perfect.

It is further evident that the writer of Genesis could not have understood the sciences as they are known in these days, and that he *must have received this knowledge by revelation.*

III. *The Bible and science agree in their teachings in regard to the antiquity of the earth.*

1. The Scriptures assign to the earth a remote antiquity (1) Moses begins his account with the heaven and the earth in existence. He only asserts that God created them, but when, or how long before, he does not say. It may have been many millions of years before Let science apply her mathematical chemistry and determine. (2) Again, how long the Spirit of God brooded on the surface of the great deep he does not say; the *brooding* implies a long period. (3) Still further, the creative days *were long periods.* Among the reasons for this conclusion are the following: (a) The word rendered "day" in Genesis has great breadth of meaning. We read of the "day of prosperity," of "adversity," and of "trouble;" of the day of "temptation in the wilderness," which lasted forty years; of the day of human

life succeeded by the night of death; and of the day of final glory which no night shall follow. (b) In the first chapter of Genesis it is used in four different senses, and in the second chapter is used to indicate the whole period of creation. Since this word has a variety of meanings, the one should be chosen which harmonizes with the context and the subject. (c) Again, some of these days were long periods, and we may hence conclude that all were. "The evening and the morning" were the first day;" that "evening" was the long darkness which was upon the face of the deep before the light shone upon the condensed portions of the earth, evidently a long period, though but a part of that day. The last day, the divine Sabbath, which followed the six days of work, unlike the other days, was followed by no evening, and is still in progress; this is also a long period, including the whole history of our race. If the first and last were long periods, so were all between. (d) This is corroborated by the character of the third and sixth days; the former was long, if the waters were gathered together and the dry land made to appear through natural laws; and the latter also, since *man* did so many things on that day—the occupancy and exploration of the Garden of Eden, the naming of all cattle, beasts, and birds as they were brought to him, the deep sleep, and the acquaintance with Eve. (e) The objection that the language of the fourth commandment fixes the meaning of the day as twenty-four hours is not valid; that the *divine* week is presented as a model for the *human* week is no reason for believing the days in each week are the same in length; if the same in *length*, then why not, for the like reason, the same also in the divine and human *work* performed in them? But this last is absurd; so is the supposition that they were equal in length. (4) Finally, the Bible adds to these long periods, the period of man's life on the earth—from six to

eight thousand years; or, if the Bible chronology is indeterminate, which some maintain, then an indefinite time, but one of long duration. This is a fair statement of Bible teaching to which none will object except those who desire to make out a clashing between Genesis and science.

2. The high antiquity of the earth is taught in all the sciences which bear upon the subject: (1) The history of man, (2) the work accomplished by rivers and oceans, (3) the growth of coral reefs, (4) the formation of peat-bogs and coal-measures, (5) the slow deposition of soils and stratified rocks, (6) the slow-moving panorama of organic life, (7) the cooling of the incandescent globe, (8) and the vast astronomical cycles—all prove that time is long and the earth hoary with age.

Proposition Third. The Bible and Science Agree in their Teachings in Regard to the Creation of Man.

I. *They agree in respect to the material and spiritual constitution of man.*

1. In the Bible we read that God made man's body from the dust of the earth, and that at death it must return to the earth as it was; but that God breathed into man the breath of life and he became a living soul; and at death the spirit shall return to God who gave it. Spiritually he was made in the image of God, knowing, feeling, willing, and holding himself amenable to moral law.

2. Wonderful as these Scripture statements are, they are fully sustained by the various sciences. (a) Chemistry testifies that there is literally nothing in man's body as a material composition not found in the dust of the earth. (b) It is

also a scientific conclusion that man's mind is neither matter nor a property of matter. Anything to the contrary is mere conjecture and vagary. Mere matter does not feel, reason, and choose; at least, these are not *known* to be functions of matter. Mind is not *proved* to be a force correlated with heat and light. Science has much in favor of the Bible teaching concerning the human spirit and nothing against it. (c) Still further, that the mind of man was made in the divine image is evident from the similarity of human and divine work. Art and nature furnish the proof. Both are intelligent, logical mathematical, imaginative, and inventive. Man's ability to comprehend the works of God, his delight in all scientific investigations, and the likeness, and in many instances, the sameness of contrivance, abundantly demonstrate that the divine and human are similar; but only as are the substance and the image, since God is infinite, but man finite.

3. We are not told in Genesis *how* God formed man's body out of the dust of the earth, nor *how long* he was in doing it. The idea that it was done at a word and in an ordinary day, or in less time, has no Scripture foundation. We have only the *fact*, but not the *manner* or *time*. Whether "Evolution" is true or false, it bears on a process concerning which the Bible is silent.

II. *They agree concerning the unity of the human race.*

1. The Scripture teaching is plain. Adam and Eve were the progenitors of all the nations known to Bible writers. "God has made of *one blood* all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." Hence, all alike are objects of his providence and mercy; they are "all one in Christ Jesus."

2. That science teaches the same doctrine, is evident from the following considerations:

(1) Anatomical, physiological and mental uniformities.

Naturalists agree that there are no such differences between them as would justify classification into separate species.

(2) All races of men are capable of interpropagation with fertile progeny. This is regarded by many naturalists as the true test of species.

(3) The higher the class of animals the fewer the species. The pyramid of living forms is broad at the base and narrow at the top. Of the group next to man there are only two genera, *Pithecus* and *Troglodytes*. Of man, therefore, who stands so far above the lower animals there is but one species. If more than one species is admitted, there is scarcely any limit to the number that may be made.

(4) The unity of language and tradition implies a common origin. Many words, such as *pater* and *mater*, can be traced in all languages; and there is a stock of folk-lore common to all nations.

(5) If Darwinism fails to point out the origin of species, it certainly does account for varieties in the same species. It is no longer improbable that Caucasian, Negro, and Indian are but varieties of the one species.

III. *They agree respecting the place of man's origin.*

The Bible assigns the beginnings of human history to Western Asia; scientific investigation confirms this statement.

1. The higher the species the more limited its habitat. Among the higher animals, no species is known to have existed originally within the tropics or temperate zones on both the oriental and occidental continents; and, more than this, species have a limited range on that particular continent to which they are confined."—(Dana).

2. The human race originated on the oriental continent. This has always been, geologically, the continent of progress. The continental types of animal life, beginning with

the lowest, are the Australian, the South American, the North American, and the Oriental; the Orient has passed to the lower stages; and has always been in the advance.

3. No spot would seem to have been better fitted for man's self-distribution and self-development than South-western Asia,. the center from which the three grand continental divisions of Europe, Asia, and Africa radiate. Here we still find the highest type of the highest race.

4. Man is cosmopolitan, and needed not, in order that he might occupy the whole earth, several centres of creation.

5. All the lines of human progress,—migration, literature, and empire, converge upon Western Asia.

6. The plants and animals which man has carried with him, in all his wanderings, are natives of Western Asia.

IV. *They agree concerning the age of the human race.*

1. They agree in this, that both the Bible and science are unable to state the exact time; they agree in the nebulosity and uncertainty of their teachings. Their conclusions, if any they have on this subject, are alike inferences drawn from uncertain data. The Bible is not a treatise on chronology. There are wide gaps. Its genealogical tables are, evidently, not intended, in all cases, to be exact. The guesses of geology, founded on the progress of life on the globe, and the probable time required for certain forces, such as waves, rivers, and organic agencies, to accomplish certain results, vary, of necessity, between wide extremes.

2. They agree in respect to the minimum duration, thus far, of human history. They give almost the same number as the least that will suffice for all the phenomena in the case. (1) The best chronology derivable from the Bible, not Bishop Usher's, and weakened, it is true, by various assumptions, makes it at this writing 7,529 years since the creation of

man. (2) Many geologists assert that their science does not demand a longer period. (a) Science, as well as Moses, asserts that man was the last of created beings; it is not known that any new species has appeared since the origin of man. (b) The remains of man and of his art are found only in the most recent strata. (c) The present tendency of scientific theory is to shorten the time. Many a supposed proof of a long period has been exploded. (d) If man did not come upon the stage till after the glacial era, this may not have been long ago; for the glaciers still remain in some localities. They are found in the Alps, in the Rocky Mountains, and on the shores of Greenland; they are also found in high southern latitudes. The ice-wells of Vermont are believed to be remnants of the glaciers that covered the whole land in no remote past. (e) The Mastodon and other animals which just preceded man have not long been extinct. Bones of the Mastodon are found still, containing twenty-eight per cent. of animal matter, though buried but three or four feet below the surface; the very hair and flesh of these animals are still found in the frozen North. (f) Other sciences than geology tend to the same conclusion. If the present is a means of measuring the past, the rate of human progress, as we know it, would not require a longer time. The records of ancient nations and the monuments of human art corroborate this conclusion. (g) It is only when we assume that man sprang from the lower animals, that he began his career as a brute and not as a man, and that his first upward movements were exceedingly slow, that an immensely long period is demanded; but this demand is made by a theory, and not by any well-established facts. That man was ever any weaker mentally than he is now, is wholly an assumption; an assumption as proofless as it is common. Take any gifted, civilized man of to-day, deprive him of

every thing but his bodily and mental strength, and place him on an uninhabited continent, and would he not be compelled to live as the savages did? Would not his rude implements and ruder mode of life rank him among the lowest of the heathen tribes. A Digger Indian would excel him in fishing and hunting and in the manufacture of arrows and hatchets. (h) Even on the theory that man came into being as the result of a long process of evolution from sheer animalism, still there was a point in this line when reason and conscience appeared, when man appeared; this "differentiation" may not have been long ago. So, the possibility that this more definite Bible chronology may be correct is not disproved, but is granted even by those theories which prefer the longest time.

3. They agree in their conjectures in regard to the possibility of a longer period of human history. (a) No Bible student would maintain that Moses intended to give an exact chronology. Bible chronology is not the work of the sacred writers, but of modern scholars. It is a matter of interpretation or inference; and this interpretation, in putting this and that together, may go wide of the truth. The *relation* of one family and tribe to another was important in the Bible development, and not the length of time. The genealogies may have been copied from older documents, and these may have been sufficiently accurate for Moses' purpose. In some of these genealogies several generations are suppressed, and this may be a greater source of error the farther back we go. Hence, many Bible scholars of high authority are inclined to the opinion that the Bible leaves this question, as it does many others, still unanswered. (b) On the other hand, science often conjectures a much longer period. Le Conte thinks man may have been on the earth 10,000 or 100,000

years. Generally, those who incline to a long period still leave it an open question.

A more perfect agreement is not possible; they agree in the uncertainty of general knowledge on the subject; in the least time that will suffice, and in the common conjecture of a longer period.

V. *They agree concerning the immortality of the spirit of man.*

1. The Bible teaching on this subject is well known. The Spirit came from God and will return to him. Christ brought life and immortality to light. Everlasting punishment and life eternal are the two destinies which include the entire race, present, past and future.

2. On the one hand, science can not prove this Bible doctrine absurd or false; but, on the other hand, it presents many things which fall in with this doctrine and corroborate it.

(1) Science knows nothing of the destruction, or even the deterioration, of matter. So far as may be known no atom of matter has ever been destroyed. Mind is superior to matter, and must, at least, be equally indestructible.

(2) The conservation of force is said to be a great law of nature. No unit of energy has ever perished. Energy destroyed in one form perpetually reappears in another. Heat becomes motion; motion, electricity; electricity, light; light, chemical action. If the soul of man is a form of energy, or possesses energy as an inherent attribute, then it may come under this law, and never perish.

(3) Science affirms the existence of a vast, *unseen universe.* There are animals which have but one sense, that of feeling. To them there is no light or sound, smell or taste. So there may be forms of existence not perceptible by man's senses.

This would not be strange, but in harmony with the condition of all beings below man. Atoms of matter and human souls belong to the unseen. All forces are imperceptible by our senses; their existence is only inferred. There is a vast world of animate life unknown to us except by means of the microscope, and probably there are depths of life lying far below the ken of any instrument. There are worlds so far away that we have no sense, however assisted, that can perceive them. There are forms of matter, such as ether and electricity, as invisible to us as spiritual existence. There is nothing unscientific in the idea of disembodied spirits; nor in the notion that the movements of spirits may be as quick as electric flashes.

(4) We find in man faculties prophetic of another state of existence. The wings of the bird, before it leaves the shell, are predictions of a higher life. So the faculties of the soul, not fully developed in this life and capable of infinitely more than this brief life can accomplish, are prophetic of a future, and hence of an endless, life.

(5) Again, if justice is a divine principle and an established law, then, since it is not meted out in this life, it must be in another; and hence man will survive the death of the body.

(6) These suggestions of nature and science are so plain that the belief in immortality has been universal to all nations and ages of the world.

PROPOSITION FOURTH. CHRISTIANITY AND SCIENCE AGREE IN THEIR TEACHINGS CONCERNING THE NOACHIAN DELUGE AND THE RAINBOW.

I. *In respect to the moral reason for the Deluge.*

1. The Bible assigns the following causes: (1) The general corruption of man's heart and the unrestrained vice of the times. (2) Polygamy and licentiousness. (3) There existed giants in those days, giants in crime. (4) The earth was filled with violence. (5) The only way to save the race was to destroy nearly all of it; to destroy the worst portion of it, and save the best.

2. Now this is just the condition into which any nation would come if unrestrained by education, civil law and religion. (1) History records the extinction of many a tribe and nation through the destructive power of social vice and corruption. (2) Take away from the cities of this enlightened age all the restraints of law and religion, and there would remain just so many Sodoms whose inhabitants would perish by moral gangrene, if not by fire from heaven.

II. *In respect to the extent of the Flood.*

1. The Bible account represents the Flood as being partial to the earth, though universal to man. (1) The object of the Flood being the destruction of man, it needed not to be more extensive than the habitations of man. That man occupied a small portion of the earth is evident. (a) The extreme north and south were not yet habitable, since the glaciers had not yet sufficiently receded. (b) Men in the time of the Flood had only begun to multiply.—(Gen. 6: 1.) (c) Violence filled the land and kept down the population. (d) The dispersion took place at Babel, many years after the

Flood. (2) The terms "earth" and "whole earth" may be rendered "land" and "whole land" when all appearance of universality would disappear from the account. (3) When the Flood was at its height the Ark rested on a mountain of Ararat—not on Mount Ararat; and there are mountains two miles higher than Ararat. (4) The assuaging of the waters by an "east wind" implies the existence of the arid table-lands of Asia. (5) The universal language is to be limited, just as it must be where it is stated that on the day of Pentecost, when Peter announced the resurrection of Christ, there were persons present from "every nation under heaven;" or, as when it is said that all the people of Judea were baptized by John. It is a gross blunder to mistake a figure of rhetoric for literal fact.

2. Science has nothing to say against such a Flood. (1) Geology gives proof that they have been frequent in all past time. The storms attendant on great convulsions and the sinking of large continental areas are a sufficient cause. (2) The Bible account is strongly corroborated by the science of history, since all nations have traditions of a flood corresponding in many particulars with this one. The common tradition arose from the common fact.

III. *In respect to the Rainbow.*

1. There is nothing in the Scriptures to the effect that the rainbow first appeared or was created at the time of the Flood. (1) As in many other cases, an existing object was chosen as the sign of the Noachian Covenant. The rainbow was a suitable object, since it would appear in time of storms when fear of another flood might agitate men, and because of its beauty and grandeur. (2) The language is "I do *set*," or *appoint*, "my bow in the cloud." (3) Genesis 2 : 4-6 has been supposed to teach that there was no rain before the days of

Noah. This is undoubtedly a misinterpretation. The assertion is that in the day when God created the heavens and the earth, *then* there was no shrub nor herb; for at *that* time there had been no rain, and plant life was impossible; but prior to plants and man, God caused a mist to go up and, of course returning in rain, to water the earth.

2. Science also affirms the existence of light, rain, and rainbows long before man existed.

PROPOSITION FIFTH. CHRISTIANITY AND SCIENCE AGREE IN THEIR TEACHINGS CONCERNING THE DESTINY OF THE EARTH AND ITS INHABITANTS.

1. The bold and startling predictions in the Bible are well known. The human race is to become extinct, the elements are to melt with fervent heat, the earth is to burn up, and there is to be a new earth as well as new heavens.

2. Science now shows the possibility and certainty of all this. (1) The extinction of races has been common in past geological time, and the higher the race the more unstable and short-lived it has been. Man must share this common fate. (2) The earth, like the other planets, is at the mercy of the sun. The sun is now known to be a turbulent, intensely-heated body, subject to tremendous convulsions. It is constantly attracting to itself meteoric and cometary masses in vast amounts. No very great change would be required to increase its heat or disturb its electrical equilibrium; and so bring all life to an end on the earth, and "melt the elements with fervent heat." (3) If the Nebular Hypothesis may be received, all worlds pass through stages of youth, maturity, and decay; nebula, comet, ring, incan-

descent planet, mature world, dying world, dead world, are the principal stages. The law seems to be inexorable, and the end of all things certain. (4) It is believed that all space is pervaded by ether, the medium of light, attraction, and electricity. All the heavenly bodies are hence retarded in their courses, and must, at last, fall into their central suns. Our earth is drawn slowly, but surely, toward the sun, where, if not before, it will receive its baptism of fire.

PROPOSITION SIXTH. THERE IS PERFECT HARMONY BETWEEN THE TEACHINGS OF CHRISTIANITY AND MENTAL SCIENCE.

Hitherto we have treated of those sciences which have to do with the material world; now we pass into the realm of mind. Though mental science has been slow in its development, and was little known to the ancient world, yet a true psychology will be found to underlie the principles and requirements of Christianity. Here the agreement is so perfect that unbelief has found it a barren field in which to search for discrepancies.

1. In regard to the nature of mind there is substantial agreement; it is contrasted with matter, superior to matter, of divine origin, and immortal.

2. First truths are used without any attempt to explain and demonstrate them. The senses are believed, consciousness is unquestioned; axioms are not formally stated, though often implied, and never argued.

3. The great law of succession in mental states is obeyed, though not scientifically stated. Intellect is first appealed to,

then the sensibilities, and then the will; and this order is never reversed.

4. Man is treated as a free and responsible being. Fate and chance have no place in the Bible.

5. Both teach man's capability of infinite progress.

This agreement of mental science and the Bible is remarkable; especially when we consider that, since this religion has chiefly to do with mind, any failure here would be fatal, and still further, that psychology is a comparatively modern science.

PROPOSITION SEVENTH. THERE IS PERFECT AGREEMENT BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND THE SCIENCE OF ETHICS.

Here science and the Bible are so perfectly agreed that one statement of the principal points will suffice for both.

1. Both teach the existence of moral freedom, without which all ethical distinctions are absurd.

2. Both affirm the existence and authority of conscience—that it is always to be heard and obeyed.

3. Both teach that the will of God is the supreme rule of right; and that this will may be learned from man, nature, and the Bible; for the Bible, as a book of morals, is accepted by all.

4. Both teach that the heart is the seat of moral character, and that out of it flow the good and the evil.

5. Science accepts the Bible summary of moral law—that love is the fulfilling of the law, and that we should love God with all the heart and our neighbor as ourselves.

6. Both condemn all impurity and unrighteousness.

7. The objections to the morality of the Bible are not

well founded. (1) As a book of history it is faithful, not palliating the sins of its chief characters, nor concealing the crimes of the "chosen people." The wrong in men and nations it usually condemns in the strongest terms, and never approves. That men generally good and a nation chosen of God for a certain purpose, did a certain thing, is no proof that that thing was right. We need continually to ask, "Were these things which are recorded in the Bible approved of God?" That the Jewish leaders consulted the oracle in the Temple, usually by casting lots, and supposed, therefore, that they had the sanction of God, is not always proof that God did so sanction their undertakings. The history is to be interpreted in harmony with the custom of the times. (2) Again, it should be remembered that so far as the Jewish laws were civil enactments, like all civil laws, they did not declare the absolute right, but only the expedient, the best possible under the circumstances. Some of these laws were to guard against the tendency to idolatry; and hence they seem, in these days, to have been trivial, when they really were of the utmost importance. (3) When we see a man executed for crime, if we did not know his crime it would seem to us exceedingly cruel, but when the crime is before us, and the necessity of protecting all the people, then the execution is seen to be an act of justice and of highest benevolence. So the extermination of the idolatrous tribes, whose cup of iniquity was full, was a matter of divine justice. God is equally just and benevolent whether he destroy by the sword or by the natural consequences of national sins. When God commands a people to execute his justice, who shall charge them with crime? (4) Nor must we suppose the cruelty then customary in war, and which the Jews practiced as well as others, was sanctioned in the Bible, and by the God of the Bible. Then, as now, God reformed men by moral means;

his purpose with the Jewish people did not require that they should become absolutely perfect. (5) Slavery and polygamy were practiced by the Jews, the Greeks, and the Romans. (a) The Bible recognizes their existence, (b) nowhere justifies them, (c) softens in many ways their rigor and cruelty, (d) teaches principles antagonistic to them, (e) and places in the world a force which is destroying these and every other form of individual and social evil.

Christianity and science agree in method and in teaching. After this survey of the agreement two remarks may be in place:

First, this agreement is as perfect and extensive as could be expected. (1) It is the sole design of the Bible to make men "wise unto salvation," and not unto science. The science is incidental, the religion essential. (2) A revelation must, in its very nature, go beyond reason and science, but not in opposition to them. (3) The style of the Bible and methods of thought and study are those of ancient times, and while they do not mislead us, are still, in many respects, not scientific. This style and method were adapted to the age in which it was written. (4) It should also be remembered that science is continually changing; when there is a seeming conflict we can afford to wait.

Second, there are certain things that science can never do. (1) It can never disprove the existence and immortality of the soul. (2) It can not destroy the evidences of God's existence, but only multiply them; it can not prove Atheism to be true. (3) It can not prove the absolute uniformity of nature. (4) It can not annihilate conscience, nor right and wrong.

(5) It can not invalidate the morality of the Bible. Hence, all Christian men pray and labor for scientific progress. Science "can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth."

THE BIBLE AND SCIENCE AGREE IN THEIR TEACHINGS.

[CONTINUED.]

II. IN REGARD TO THE CREATION OF THE WORLD.

1. *The world was called into being.*
2. *The great stages of Creation and their order.*
3. *The antiquity of the earth.*

III. IN REGARD TO THE CREATION OF MAN.

1. *The material and spiritual constitution of man.*
2. *The unity of the human race.*
3. *The place of man's origin.*
4. *The antiquity of man.*
5. *The immortality of man.*

IV. IN REGARD TO THE NOACHIAN DELUGE.

1. *The moral reason for the Deluge.*
2. *The extent of the Flood.*
3. *The rainbow.*

V. IN REGARD TO THE DESTINY OF THE EARTH.

1. *Extinction of races common.*
2. *The earth depends upon the sun.*
3. *Nebular hypothesis—dead worlds.*
4. *The resistance of ether.*

VI. IN REGARD TO MENTAL SCIENCE.

1. *Nature of mind.*
2. *First truths are assumed.*
3. *The law of succession in mental states.*
4. *The possession of spontaneity.*
5. *Infinite progress possible.*

VII. IN REGARD TO MORAL SCIENCE.

1. *Moral freedom.*
2. *The authority of conscience.*
3. *The will of God the rule of action.*
4. *The heart the seat of moral character.*
5. *Love as the summary of all duties.*
6. *Objections to the morality of the Bible.*

REMARKS.

First—The agreement as perfect as could be expected.

Second—Things which science can not do.

SECOND PROPOSITION.

Christianity Agrees with Human Nature, Receiving the Sanction of Reason and Being Adapted to the Mental Faculties.

We have laid Christianity alongside of nature and considered their agreement in method and teaching; now we are to place it in comparison with the human mind, and to ask whether it meets the demands of reason and is evidently the religion man needs. If it abides this test, we shall have still further proof that Christianity is not of man, and that its Author is divine.

I. *Reason sanctions the Bible as being the best method of revelation that could have been employed.*

1. Such a revelation would need to be in harmony with the nature of man. It must conform to the laws of human thinking and be exactly adapted to the stage of intellectual development attained when the revelation is made. This is evidently true, unless God would transform the human mind, giving it new powers and making it other than it is. (1) If one would instruct a child, he must come down to the child's level. His words, his illustrations, and his methods, must be adapted to the child nature. Those who teach imbecile persons have to begin where those persons are, not only in mental progress, but even in physical condition and in manifested sympathy. They get down upon the floor, attract attention by bright colors, call into exercise what power the imbeciles have, and gradually approach the harder things.

Every wise instructor adapts himself to the age, experience, and social condition of his pupils. (2) The reasons for this are obvious: Every mind must acquire some simple, elementary ideas, must have some experience, before any other ideas can be imparted. In conveying ideas we only direct the mind of another in constructing the idea we wish to convey; and he must construct this idea out of ideas already in his possession. Whether the instructor be human or divine, he must use the knowledge and experience already acquired. (3) These principles would require that the revelation should be *through* man as well as *for* man. Coming through man, it would conform to the laws of human thought, and would employ the common stock of human ideas and experience. There would be a bond of sympathy between the teacher and the taught which would facilitate intellectual commerce and make impressions more lasting. Not angels, but men, are the appropriate instructors of men; parents instruct their children; the learned, the less learned; and men of genius, the masses of mankind.

2. A revelation to every man, perpetual and universal, would be liable to serious objections. (1) It would be contrary to the principle just discussed, that, in general, man must be the teacher of his fellow-man, since if all were directly taught of God they would need no other teachers. (2) Such a revelation would be regarded as a law of nature, and, like the intuitions of the mind, it would be no proof of the existence of a personal God, and so would fail in the main object of a revelation. (3) A revelation given in this way would be liable to great misapprehension, and its authority would hence be undermined. Its interpretation would be subject to ignorance, imbecility, prejudice, and every corrupting influence, since one man's word would be as good as that of another. The belief in such a revelation, even when

limited to certain subjects, as for example, to the interpretation of the Bible through direct spiritual aid, has always led to the grossest fanaticism. The teachings of one age would be in conflict with those of another, since men are greatly influenced by the different degrees of civilization. (4) But more than all, a revelation so made could not be authenticated by prophetic utterances and miraculous displays; for, if the revelation was perpetual and universal, so must the authentication be; this would make prophecy and miracle perpetual and universal, and hence a matter of natural law; but if these were classed with natural phenomena they would cease to indicate the divine sanction. Any appeal to them would be like saying, "That my doctrine is true, you may know by the rising of the sun to-morrow morning."

3. Evidently, then, a revelation given through a few chosen and holy men would be the best and the only method. (1) It would be capable of prophetic and miraculous demonstration. (2) It would use the best minds as the medium of revelation, and thus avoid many sources of error. (3) It would fall in with the law and method of all instruction—with the law that men are the best teachers of men, and the fact that in all other fields of thought this has been the method of progress; men of genius have ever been the discoverers of truth and then the instructors of mankind. (4) Such a revelation would be complete, and so leave no expectation of future and modifying revelations.

4. A revelation by man and for man would need to be in the language of men. (1) It could not be embodied and taught in the forms of nature, for it has to do with the supernatural. Like the moral and scientific teachings of nature it would be slow, variable, and uncertain of attainment. It would lack the universality and authority necessary in a revelation for all men. (2) Language is the usual, and

almost the only, means for the communication of thought. Voice, ear, and mind, are finely adapted and accustomed to this method. It would be impossible to make a complete and permanent revelation to man in any other way. (3) Language, it is true, is not a perfect medium of communication, as the human mind is not a perfect receptacle for any form of knowledge; but language is the best medium possible, and this method would be in harmony with all mental law and habit, and not contrary to both, as any other method would be.

5. The literary form of the Bible is the best one devisable. (1) Its immense variety adapts it to all classes of men and to all stages of progress. It has law, history, and poetry. It abounds in simple narrative and in the profoundest philosophy. It has the incidents of calm, pastoral life, the grandeur of gathering armies, and the heroism of martyrdom. As a single book, there is no other literary work in the world that compares with it. It is *the* book. This variety is secured through a variety of authors, writing in as many different ages and countries. (2) Its narrative and dramatic form, in many portions, adds to its attractiveness. Had it been written in the abstract, in a mathematical or legal style, with no interest of incident and person, how much this would lessen the number of its readers! (3) Its close union with all history gives it an air of reality, and greatly multiplies the proofs of its veracity. (4) Its progressive form is pleasing to the logical faculty and suited to the work of instruction. This is seen to be the more important when we remember that these lessons needed to be learned and to become a part of human life, as a preparation for still higher revelations. (5) That some of it is figurative is no objection, since figurative language is more impressive and permanent than literal. Words may take on new meanings or become obsolete, but a

figure of speech drawn from nature or common life remains ever the same. As long as the sun shines and vines grow, the Savior's words, "Ye are the light of the world," "I am the vine and ye are the branches," will be plain and impressive. (6) Its want of strict classification, and the scattering of its truths over valley and mountain, desert and field, in the open path and in the deep mine, as in nature so here, will quicken the intellect and stimulate study and comparison.

Reason, then, sanctions the Bible as being the best method of revelation; unless man was to be remade by divine power infinite wisdom must have adopted this method.

II. *Reason sanctions Christianity in its principles and methods.*

1. It assumes and teaches that God is just and holy. He had a benevolent purpose in our creation. His administration of the government of the universe is wise and beneficent. The toil and the trial, the suffering and the sorrow, so far as they are not the result of sin, are all a means of good. "The light afflictions which are but for a moment shall work out for us a far more exceeding and an eternal weight of glory." In God, all is purity. In him there is no darkness at all. Now, reason agrees that this must be so. It can not be that impurity and injustice are the habitations of his throne. It can not be that malevolence and death are supreme. A religion that did not teach the justice and holiness of God could not be accepted for a moment.

2. Again, the moral teachings and arguments of Christianity are in the highest degree in harmony with the necessary character of God. Nothing is required as a matter of belief and obedience that is impure, immoral, or unworthy of the most enlightened. Duties to God are summed up in the one law of supreme love for Him, for him who is infinite

in every adorable perfection. Is this wrong? Could reason sanction any other relation to the Supreme Being? Duties to man are included in the law of universal benevolence, in the love which is the fulfilling of the law. "To fear God and keep his commandments is the whole duty of man." Can any man truthfully say that Christianity requires of him any wrong toward his fellow-men? When we analyze these two great commandments, when we study the specific principles and commands, each one must receive the same assent of the reason and the moral judgment. The demands of Christianity are just, whatever may be said of the underlying fact and philosophy.

3. Its allegation that sin and guilt are universal is as true as it is terrible. In the Roman letter it is asserted that all have sinned, Jew and Gentile. In response to this every man is compelled to say, "It is true; I have sinned." Laws and penalties, without which the race would soon perish, the wreck and ruin of humanity, the bloody pages of history, the daily record of crime, disease, and death,—all unite in the same testimony. This universal consciousness of guilt has manifested itself in prayer and sacrifice, and in apprehension of divine judgments; and this admission prepares the way for the reception of Christianity.

4. The consequences of sin, as made known in the Bible, are in the highest degree reasonable. True happiness is impossible to one who loves sin, continues in it, and bears its guilt; impossible here and hereafter. If God is holy, sin must exclude from his presence and array against itself the divine power and justice. If sin continues and guilt, so must suffering; and if the former goes on forever, so must the latter. Deep remorse is the severest torture, and who can say that the fiery symbols of the Bible, as a representation of

such suffering, are too intense? as "the worm that dieth not and the fire that is not quenched." The Bible representation of sin, in this life, is true in every particular; may it not be equally true for the world to come?

5. Equally reasonable are the commands of the gospel. What more reasonable than that men should believe or trust God? What more reasonable than that men should not defend sin and persist in it, but confess and renounce it? What more reasonable than that we should comply with Heaven's terms of pardon? What shall one do who finds himself pursuing a dangerous path? Common sense would direct that he should, at once, retrace his steps and find, if possible, the safe way. This is all that the gospel requires. Reason, with a thousand voices, declares that he who leads the Christian life has nothing to fear. Here, then, is perfect safety.

6. Undoubtedly, nine-tenths of all the precepts and requirements of the Bible need no outside proof. They commend themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God. If it be said that these self-evident or reasonable requirements needed no revelation, it is answered that they needed to receive the *sanction* of a positive revelation. That laws find a response in human nature does not obviate the necessity of authority and penalty. It may be that heathen philosophers and men of genius taught many of the sublime truths of the Bible, but they did not do this by divine authority; and hence their teaching can not bind the conscience; in no sense are their writings words by which we must be judged at last. And yet, all such teachings show that reason, in its highest manifestations, is on the side of the Bible.

III. *Christianity as a remedial system is adapted to the constitution and laws of the human mind.* If so, it is the product of divine wisdom; there can be no better, and no other true, religion.

1. The first thing needed in order to the redemption of man was a revelation of the true God. (1) Man everywhere is a religious being. All nations have had their gods, altars, and temples. A man without any system of worship is an exception. Modern exploration has only tended to confirm this generalization. (2) Men always assimilate to the character of the god whom they worship. If the worship is sincere—and nothing else is worship—this is a natural and sure result. Hence idolatry has always a downward tendency. Man makes the moral character, as well as the form, of his idol; it is, therefore, the embodiment of his own corrupt nature. The worship of this idol makes the worshipper still worse, and capable of producing an idol still more corrupt. The history of idolatry fully confirms this reasoning. Men worshipped first the sun and the hosts of heaven; then deified heroes; then objects in nature most fruitful, most beneficent or hurtful; then beasts and creeping things; and then stocks and stones. Moral corruption, made most luxuriant by this fostering tendency of all false religions, has been the ruin of cities and mighty empires, of tribes and nations. (3) While a revelation of the true God was essential to man's elevation, he could not by wisdom arrive at this knowledge. No heathen nation, whether ancient or modern, has been able to rise by its own unaided efforts to this high religious plane. Idolatry is as abject, senseless, and cruel as in the days of old. Where the Bible shines there is light, but nowhere else. (4) This knowledge of the true God must be given under circumstances such that it would be retained.

2. The second thing needed was a people prepared to become the depositary of this revealment of the true God, and of the evidences which were to establish the Messiah's claims. The Jewish nation was chosen and prepared in the following way: (1) Abraham was chosen as the founder of this nation. He was a monotheist, a man of extraordinary faith, and the glory of all Jewish peoples. (2) This nation was united by a common bondage in Egypt and by a deliverance as remarkable as their bondage had been severe. (3) They were made loyal to God by their great deliverance, the plagues which demonstrated the power and goodness of the Almighty and the nothingness of all idols, and by their preservation in the wilderness. (4) They were still further preserved from idolatry by the isolation of the Promised Land, by certain social arrangements, and by peculiar religious institutions. (5) The whole history of the Jews till the close of the Babylonian captivity was a divine training for the correction and destruction of idolatry among them. The period of the Judges was full of the most impressive lessons —oppression as a judgment for their idolatry, and deliverance when they returned to the worship of Heaven. Ten tribes were, at length, cut off, because hopelessly gangrened by idolatry, and were carried into a captivity from which they were never to return. Then followed the captivity of the two remaining tribes and their restoration. The lesson was learned, and the world began to roll out of the darkness into a brighter day.

3. During this period of training the idea of God was continually becoming more definite and glorious. (1) He was revealed to Moses from the flaming bush as the "I Am," the self-existent, the eternal, and, therefore, the covenant-keeping God. (2) The wonders in Egypt presented him as the Almighty Vindicator of justice. (3) In various ways the

people were taught the holiness of God; they were to sanctify themselves and not approach the boundaries of Sinai; the altar must not be polluted; only clean animals could be offered; these were to be offered by men who were ceremonially and morally pure. The offerings and the priests must be without contamination, defect, or blemish. (4) God's justice and mercy were taught in the institutions of sacrifice. Life must be given for sin, and yet God could show mercy to the sinner. The idea of substitution and of atonement was fully illustrated, so that the transition from Jewish offerings to the Lamb of God was clearly understood. (5) God was revealed in his providence as the rewarder according to the deeds of men, as one who hears and answers prayer, as the one who guides the nations, over-ruling even the wickedness of kings and leading the world toward higher forms of civilization. (6) Last of all, at the close of the Jewish dispensation, God is revealed as "Our Father who art in heaven." A father's love, tenderness, and mercy are manifested in the life and sufferings of Jesus. He is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express representation of his character. This revelation of God is now complete, and the full light of divine love is turned upon the human heart.

Time was required for this revelation of God; since love, and mercy, and justice could not be revealed in the lightning flash nor in the storm, but through centuries of providential dealing. Time was especially needed to make the Divine Being known as one who would remember his promises and keep his covenants. Time was needed that these lessons might pervade the nations of the earth and might become a permanent possession of the human mind.

4. During all these years there were preparations going forward for the advent of the Messiah. Among them may be enumerated the following: (1) The development of this

idea of God. (2) The types and symbols of the Jewish religion were given and exactly correlated with the institution of the new dispensation. (3) Messianic promises were given and the prophetic history of the Christ was written. (4) The union of sacred and profane history was secured, and thus an unanswerable argument provided. (5) The world was brought into a most favorable condition for the inauguration of the Kingdom of Heaven. (a) The union of nearly all nations in the Roman Empire. (b) The profound peace that prevailed. (c) The scattering of the Jews, and with them the Old Testament Scriptures. (d) The desuetude of all heathen religious systems. (e) The expectation of a great teacher, prevalent among the Jews, and elsewhere entertained. (f) The light of historic literature enjoyed in the golden age of Rome, and especially bright over the land of Palestine. It was the fulness of the times. So far, every step taken in this development seems to have been in harmony with mental law, and to have followed in the necessary order.

5. The manifestation of Christ is seen to be such as it must have been, when we consider his relations to man and God. (1) He came at the right *time*. Among all the centuries one more favorable could not be named. (2) He came in the right *country*; where the evidence was held in possession; and whence the gospel could be published to the whole world—in Europe, Asia, and Africa. (3) He came in the right *condition* of human life. (a) So as to rebuke selfishness, pride, love of wealth, and worldly ambition. (b) In such a way as to show the value of man as man, and apart from all circumstances of genius, wealth and power. (c) That he might manifest divine esteem and sympathy for all men. (d) That he might exalt and ennoble the common lot of man. (e) That he might begin his work among the lowly,

whence it might rise through all the ranks of society. Any other condition than the one he assumed would have lessened his power. (4) He sustained the right *attitude* toward Jewish ideas and expectations. (a) He was in opposition to the Jewish interpretation of the Messianic prophecies, and yet in harmony with their true meaning. Hence Apollos could mightily convince the Jews, proving from the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ. (b) He stood in opposition to all Jewish bigotry and exclusiveness. He went among the Gentiles; he taught that God was acceptably worshipped wherever and whenever it was done in spirit and in truth; he condemned Pharisaic traditions and sent his gospel to all nations. (c) He armed against himself every sect among the Jews—Pharisees, Sadducees, and Herodians. He was compelled to this by his love of truth, and in so doing he gave proof that he was not a deceiver. No false Christ could have taken such a course. (5) The character of his *miracles* was such as his mission demanded. (a) They were of great variety; on nature, on man, and on the spirit world. There was a great number and variety of each kind. (b) He had a choice between great publicity, such as Moses gave to the wonders in Egypt, and a partial publicity. He wisely chose the latter, to avoid immediate death or immediate exaltation as a temporal king; hence his frequent injunctions of silence, and his efforts to suppress his rising fame. (c) His miracles were not mere wonders, but such as to preclude the supposition of satanic agency, since they were benevolent, and such as would overthrow the kingdom of darkness. What greater number or kind of miracles could have added to the evidence or more fully illustrated his power to save? (6) His manifestation of God, by which he would secure an affectionate obedience on the part of man, is profoundly philosophical. This profound philosophy is seen in the following points:

(a) The object to be gained was the repentance and affectionate obedience of man. (b) This affectionate obedience, this moral change, could not be secured by any amount of mere physical or creative power; but only by moral means. (c) By some moral means love for God and his law must be produced in the human heart. Love is the only possible motive in the case. (d) This love must be produced by a manifestation of God's love for man. Like begets like. Power, authority, command, could not produce this love. (e) But love produces the greatest effect when manifested in the following way: 1° When wholly undeserved. 2° When its object is in the greatest extremity. 3° When manifested by one whom we have deeply wronged. 4° When the one showing this love is of the highest purity and dignity of character. 5° When the manifestation of this love was at a fearful cost of suffering and life.

It is needless to say that in the death of Christ all these conditions are satisfied. "God *so* loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son." "When we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." So far as reason can see, this is the only way in which an affectionate obedience could have been produced. Mere physical science never attempts the accomplishment of such an object, and it is entirely destitute of the means. Repentance and loving obedience are not produced by any display of mere wisdom and physical power. The gospel *is* the power of God unto salvation, and the only power of this *kind* known to man.

6. The conversion and pardon of the sinner are in the highest degree rational and in harmony with mental and moral law.

1° The ground of pardon, or the atonement. (1) Since man can not successfully contend with God, he must be punished for his sin, or he must be pardoned. He can not

secure pardon on account of any works of righteousness he may do, for to keep, in the future, the whole law would afford no ground for pardon, and anything short of this would be demerit rather than merit. The sinner must rely wholly on the grace and mercy of God. (2) The sacrifice of Christ meets the demands of justice. (a) Law and penalty are for the good of the governed. If law is violated something must be done by which to maintain its authority. Usually this is secured by the punishment of the wrong-doer. But whatever will secure the object for which penalty is inflicted may be accepted, provided no injustice is done. The King of the Locrians, whose son had violated a law, the penalty of which was the loss of sight, suffered the loss of one of his own eyes. Probably his government was not weakened, when all the people saw that he gave his eye to maintain, partially, the sacredness of law; then he could justly show mercy, provided his son was penitent and worthy of such parental love. At the close of our civil war, those called rebels were not executed for treason. Half a million of the people, both north and south, had been sacrificed upon the altar of law and union. Numerous executions could not have added to the sacredness of national sovereignty. The government could be just, and yet pardon those lately in arms against it. Not only all the people, but those pardoned, especially, must see and be deterred from a repetition of the crime. (b) The sacrifice of Christ accomplishes what the death of the sinner would accomplish. Its effect upon the moral universe, and especially upon the heart of the man who believes and accepts it, is a mighty restraining influence; so that God can be just and the justifier of the one who believes in Jesus. (3) This implies no injustice to the Savior. (a) His sufferings were voluntary. (b) Voluntary suffering that blessings may come upon the undeserving and

the evil, is a law of human society. The mother suffers for her children and the patriot for his country. A whole generation often suffers that blessings may come upon generations yet unborn. (b) He was divine, and the source of all authority; like the parent or the king, he had a right to suffer for his creatures, if he chose. (4) It was needful that the one through whose mediation men might be saved, should be divine; divine that he might have authority to forgive, power to overcome death and the grave, and that when lifted up and drawing all men unto him, they might be drawn to the love and worship of the Divine Being. (5) The death of Christ gives the highest assurance of pardon. If any sacrifice at all was needed, this was the greatest; if any mediator, he was the divinest; if any intercession, his was the most potent. If for *any* reason God can forgive, surely this must be the most worthy, that Christ "tasted death for every man." With Christ, God will freely give us all things. Here the conscience finds perfect peace and assurance.

2° The process of conversion is equally rational. (1) We have here recognized the great law of succession in mental states; knowing, feeling, willing. Knowing is the basis of emotional excitement; and both knowing and feeling must precede willing or choice. The Apostles were sent first to turn men from darkness to light, to make known the great facts of the gospel. Preaching the word and thorough instruction were to precede all else. The feelings were to be aroused and kindled into godly sorrow by the nature of the gospel facts; facts, as above shown, finely adapted to produce this result; and then, as a final result, were to follow, in most natural order, confession of faith in Christ and actual consecration to his service. (2) That faith should be chosen as the mental and moral act by which the facts and

commands of the gospel should be appropriated, is also in harmony with mental habit and law. This faith is a belief in the divinity and Messiahship of Jesus and the trusting of the soul to him. (a) Nearly all that men know comes through the avenue of faith as contrasted with personal knowledge,—all that we know of the past and the distant, and nearly all we know of the results of scientific observation and experiment. (b) By faith we all are walking into the unknown future; there is great gain when our future is guided by a faith which is confirmed by all the experiences of this life. (c) Faith controls the affections and desires (d) Faith binds the conscience. If we believe in Mohammed we are false unless we become Mohammedans; if the heathen mother believes that her god demands her child, it must be given up. (3) Equally rational is the requirement of an overt act, such as baptism, as a test of soul-obedience and a visible consecration to the new life. (a) The gospel is for all. One who is intelligent enough to sin is intelligent enough to become a Christian. For the undeveloped and the ignorant, the act of submission to Christ needed to be very simple; yet this act would imply the requisite mental and moral states, however unable the subject might be to analyze them. (b) Even those who are accustomed to mental introspection need this test of their professed faith and penitence. (c) It is needful that there should be a public, and a solemn acceptance of Christ, and that a definite line should be drawn between the church and the world. Every baptism is a sermon, a living sacrifice, and a monument confirming the central facts of the gospel.

7. Christianity having been cordially received, it is well adapted to secure the believer's steadfastness and growth.

(1) The various means of grace are such as to keep him steadfast. Among these may be enumerated: (a) Prayer,

including confession of sin, pardon, harmony with brethren, and grace to help in time of need. (b) Bible reading, with its instructions, warnings, promises, and hopes (c) The Lord's-Day, with the Lord's-Supper, exhortations, and public worship. (d) The church and its help; sympathy, love, admonition, and assistance in time of want. (e) And work for the extension of the church, in which there is a constant pledging of fidelity and a constant identification with the cause of Christ. So efficient are these means of steadfastness, that no one who has been faithful in their use has been known to fall away. There comes a neglect of some of these before final apostasy.

(2) It is adapted to the growth of the intellect. (a) It brings the soul from under the dominion of appetite and passion. This it does by turning the heart away from sin of every kind and by filling the mind with an intense longing for a holy life. It leads away from temptation and all impure society, and places one in the midst of favorable surroundings. (b) It assigns to truth the highest place. The truth is to make men free, while error brings them into bondage. It is to be sought for more than for hidden treasures. We are to receive the truth, however it may humiliate and condemn us. But truth is the food upon which the intellect thrives and expands. (c) It inculcates the largest toleration and freedom of opinion. Christian men do not fear to think, nor to give free expression to their thoughts. The liberty they demand for themselves, they cheerfully accord to others. Whatever, in the history of the church, has been contrary to this, has been anti-Christian in spirit and practice. Persecution has always indicated the absence of the spirit of Christ. (d) It excites to study. It proposes questions of its own which have stirred the thought of all Christian ages. It *can not* be passively

received, nor retained in a thoughtless soul. (e) It furnishes the highest kind of knowledge; knowledge without which all other knowledge would be incomplete and unsatisfactory. The what, the when, and the whither of human life; the character of God and his relation to us; and the mystery of human suffering, are examples, of this higher knowledge, (f) It furnishes the most powerful motives to intellectual effort; man's being in the image of God; the immortality of the soul; its almost infinite value; the grandeur of its possible eternal progress; and the necessity and possibility that we may be agents of Heaven in saving our fellow-beings. (g) Accordingly, the capital, the colleges and universities, the teachers of science as well as of religion, and the literature of the educational world have mainly been provided by Christian men; provided, not as a matter of government taxation, but through the promptings of Christian benevolence.

(3) Christianity is adapted to the sensibilities or the affections. (a) It builds the Christian home and throws around it all possible safeguards. Its exaltation of marriage, so that it is seen to be an institution of Heaven's appointment; its requirement that love shall be the bond of union, and that this union shall be for life; its elevation of the wife and mother to be an equal with the husband; the altar erected there; the nurture and admonition of the Lord in which the children are to be brought up; and the sympathy and forbearance enjoined—all combine to make the Christian home the purest and the dearest spot on earth. How many millions of such homes are there in all Christian lands! (b) The church is a training-school for the affections. Whatever would destroy friendship is excluded. In drawing near the cross, men are drawn near one another. We are required to love not friends only, but even enemies. The services of

song, social prayer, communion, and the united burden-bearing of its members, powerfully enlist the holiest feelings. (c) It affords consolation in hours of affliction. It provides human sympathy; we are to weep with those who weep. It assures us that it is a kind Heavenly Father who permits affliction to come. It gives us a hope which reaches to that within the vail. It teaches us to place our affections not on the things on the earth, but upon those in Heaven; not upon the flowers of earth, which droop and die, but upon the stars which shine on forever. (d) It assigns the highest place to love. God is love. Love is the fulfilling of the law. Without love we are nothing. Love is eternal. (e) It develops the affections by its teachings concerning a future state. The grave is not the place where we treasure those we love. To the mother's outstretched arms the babe shall be given in its immortal beauty. By the husband's side shall walk in white, his bride far more beautiful than in the bright days of earthly love. The good, and brave, and glorious, shall all be gathered at last into our Father's house. If hearts are desolate here and home circles are broken, rejoicings and reunions are there. Love shall have for its raptures, not fleeting moments, but eternal ages.

(4) Christianity is adapted to the will. (a) It teaches and illustrates its freedom. (b) It preaches not a gospel of despair and annihilation, but sets before man the possibility of rising to glory, honor, and immortality. It offers the greatest rewards,—crowns and kingdoms and worlds. (c) It thoroughly arouses and engages the sensibilities. (d) It trains the will to firmness and power by the self-denial it requires in the daily life, and by its examples of heroic labor and martyrdom.

(5) Christianity is adapted to man as a social being. (a) It teaches the equality of all men before God, and that

they should be equal before all human law. All have a common origin; God loves all; Christ died for every man; the gospel is to be preached to every creature; on the same terms all are admitted to the church and to Heaven at last. "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." One must go, not to the Indus, but to the Jordan, for this doctrine of social freedom and equality. (b) Christianity is the chief support of civil and religious liberty and of social order. All men and all human rights are sacred. The civil magistrate is God's minister appointed to this very thing. We are to honor kings and submit to the powers that be; the powers that be are ordained of God. (c) It cultivates that love and brotherhood which unite men in large enterprises for the good of the race. The organization of the mail service; lines of travel by rail or steam-ship; civil law and its enforcement; asylums for the deaf and dumb, the blind, the orphaned, and the imbecile; hospitals and reformatories; institutions of learning; missionary societies; tunnels which pierce mountain barriers and inter-oceanic canals—all these it renders possible and successful. (d) It does much to accumulate the capital and develop the learning which are moving the nations to higher and still higher forms of civilization. It enjoins industry and frugality, the dual law which determines the growth of the world's wealth. Whatever the future may produce, the learning and sciences of the past and the present have, with few exceptions, been the growth of Christian culture. If the principles and precepts of Christianity were fully received and perfectly obeyed, human society would be perfect, whether in the family, in the State, or on the wider plane of international relations.

(6) Christianity is adapted to man as man, since it has a

fitness and a tendency to become universal. (a) It is founded on the common facts, intuitions, and longings of human nature. Wherever God is apprehended, wherever men desire to know the meaning of this life; wherever conscience lifts its voice of authority; wherever men sin and feel the burden of guilt; wherever death reigns and homes are desolate; wherever men love life and desire life eternal; there Christianity is needed and there it will go as naturally as the rivers flow into the ocean. (b) It is suited to all time as well as to all countries and conditions of men. No individual and no nation can outgrow it. There evidently never will be a time when its revelations and promises will not be most precious. (c) It stands aloof from all mere local and political questions, unless these questions obtrude themselves within the sphere of morals and religion. It spreads among the people, whatever the form of government or state of civilization. It does not excite to rebellion and civil revolution, but, like an angel of mercy and good-will, glides into lonely hearts and homes, weeps at the grave with those who weep, points them to a heavenly world where all tears shall be wiped away, and inspires courage to continue the battle of life. (d) It has a strong tendency to spread and become universal. It is composed of seed, which has in itself life, power, and the means of rapid propagation. Like Andrew, when one has accepted this religion, he immediately seeks his brother and brings him to Christ. When scattered abroad, Christians go everywhere preaching the word. They constantly hear the command, "Go, preach the gospel to every creature." To propagate this religion becomes the one great purpose of life; a purpose to which they devote property, education, and life itself.

8. *That Christianity is adapted to human nature is fully confirmed by the results of eighteen hundred years' trial.* This trial has demonstrated the following propositions:

(1) We must, as civilized men, accept Christianity or have no religion. All idolatries and mythologies go down before the march of science; Christianity alone endures. If the God made known in the Bible is rejected, there can be none other. There will be no evidence, no manifestation, left. If the Christ and the pardon offered in the Gospel are refused, there is no other name, no other sacrifice. If the great body of evidence offered in defence of Christianity can not lead to full belief, then it would seem that no evidence can. This is confirmed by the fact that men who reject Christianity are fast coming to this very conclusion. "God is unknowable. Whether there will be a future life for man is unknown. The soul may be a form or an activity of matter. All endeavor to secure the favor of God or to prepare for a future state is unreasonable." Such men try to be content. They build no system in place of Christianity. And this position is a logical necessity of the rejection of Christianity. All evidence of history, intuition, reason; all experience of the good and wise in former ages, having been rejected, there is nothing left whereon and wherewith to build. Primeval darkness, untraversed by a single ray, still encoffins the human race.

(2) Christianity always and everywhere does good. We have no fear of its entrance. (a) It is a blessing to the individual. It turns him from darkness to light, from the power of evil unto God. It gives faith in God, love for man, and hope of an eternal life. It subdues the passions, and leads to the contemplation of the true, the beautiful, and the good. It opens the fountains of sympathy, and prompts to the divinest moral heroism. It gives patience in life and triumph in death. (b) It is a source of good to the family.

It makes better fathers, mothers, and children. It intensifies the sense of parental responsibility, and adds the authority of Heaven to that of parents. It saves from all the cruelties of heathenism, and moderates the eager pursuit of wealth and fame. And when bitter partings come the remembrance of many a sacred hour spent in the quiet and beauty of family worship will be a pledge and a foretaste of the higher and the perennial enjoyments of Heaven. Christian parents and Christian homes are the hope of the world. (c) It is a blessing to any community. If one were choosing a home would he go to a village without a sabbath and without a church? Would he prefer profanity to worship, saloons to school-houses, theaters to churches, gambling to prayer meetings, and Hell to Heaven? What the best men know to be true, even the worst man would confess if he were about to invest capital or select a life-long home. (d) What is true of individuals, families and communities, must also be true of nations. That the rulers and legislators of a nation should be God-fearing men, that the officers and voters should hold themselves amenable to Christian law, are pledges of good government, of justice and peace. Its spread is not feared like a pestilence of infidelity. It is not a cause why parental hearts are breaking over lost sons and daughters. As Pilate said concerning Jesus, for whose crucifixion the Jews clamored, so it may be said of Christianity, "Why, what evil hath it done?"

(3) It is a matter of *fact* that Christianity is the only system whose sole object is the saving of men from the love and practice of sin. (a) As we have seen, the Gospel is God's power for this purpose. (b) A revival sermon and its results are peculiar and wonderful. What are these people assembled for? What is the subject of discourse? Why this excitement, these pleadings, these tears? What are

these persons confessing? Sin, Christ, repentance, consecration to a new life. Why this exultant hymn of praise? Where else do we find anything like this? What other society has such an object, or can achieve such a result? (c) The prayer-meeting is equally remarkable. Listen to these prayers, these confessions, these aspirations after a higher life, these proffers of aid and sympathy! There is nothing else like it beneath the sun! (d) What Christianity promises to do in saving men from sin it has done in many millions of cases, and will continue to do till the end of time. Every child brought up in a Christian home and led up to a noble manhood; every dissolute young man snatched as a brand from the burning; every earthly miser induced to lay up treasures in Heaven, is an unanswerable fact for Christianity.

(4) It undermines and removes all social evils. It is the sworn antagonist of whatever opposes God or injures man. (a) It makes unrelenting war on idolatry. Wherever it goes, there idols are broken; sacrifices bleed no more; self-torture ceases; infants and aged parents are not abandoned; and widows no longer burn on the funeral pyre. (b) It opposes all forms of cruelty. So far as possible it mitigates the severity of punishments, tries to reform the prisoner as well as protect society, and to have due regard for the delicacy of women and the feebleness of age. It banishes gladiatorial shows and softens the savagery of war. The squirrels that chatter among the trees, the lark that rises on exultant wing, the ox that toils, and the worm that crawls in the public path, have reason to bless the prevalence of Christian kindness. (c) It removes, so far as possible, all great forms of social evil—slavery, the debasement of woman, intemperance in all its Protean forms, and licentiousness. It does not always and at once oppose these by a direct attack. It cures the

disease by removing the cause. Its teaching and example of love have nearly banished slavery from our world. Its assertion of absolute human equality has elevated woman to be man's companion and equal, and has drawn the nations into a common commercial and intellectual brotherhood. Wherever it goes all these blessings follow. It is not the devouring lava current, but the broad river winding through the valley and bringing verdure and bountiful harvests wherever it goes.

(5) It is the only religion that can lead our race to the highest forms of civilization. The facts of eighteen centuries and of the present time abundantly prove this. (a) The degree of enlightenment is in exact ratio with the prevalence of pure Christianity. Are England, Scotland, the United States, and Germany in the van? there, also, we find an open Bible and an efficient Christian ministry. Are Italy, Spain, Austria, and the States of South America scarcely half enlightened? there the Bible is kept from the people, and the currents of religious thought are obstructed and corrupt. Are large portions of the earth in the darkness and crimes of paganism? there as yet, the Bible has not been opened, and the hearts of men have not been stirred by the great truths of Revelation. The experiment has been going on for many centuries and in many lands, and always with the same results. (b) Christianity is the great missionary of scientific and moral truth. It first subdued the Roman world. Then it grappled with the barbarism which invaded the Roman Empire, and at length came out of the clouds of battle, the darkness of the Middle Ages, a conqueror. The Reformation gave new access to the word of God, new life to the church, and new zeal for the conversion of the world. About one hundred years ago the first missionary societies were formed, and now there are over forty thousand missionaries in

heathen lands; there are a million heathen children gathered into mission schools, and these are sustained by an annual outlay of scores of millions of dollars. Outside the church there is not one society for the civilization of savage millions, while the bare enumeration of church societies and missions would be tedious.

Christianity as a remedial system is adapted to man, and this is seen in its actual results as well as in a careful analysis. It is the religion that man needs, that all nations need. If the negation of this system of religion be the truth, then a false system is better than the true one. Certainly, whatever may be said of its divine origin, he who tries to lessen its influence over the nations is an enemy, conscious or unconscious, of the human race. If true, and hence of divine origin, how glorious, both at home and abroad, is all missionary work.

CHRISTIANITY IS ADAPTED TO MAN.

I. In the Bible the best method of revelation is employed.

1. *Must be in harmony with man's nature.*
2. *A revelation to every man liable to objections.*
3. *One given through chosen men the best.*
4. *Needs to be in the language of men.*
5. *The literary form of the Bible the best devisable.*

II. Reason sanctions the principles and requirements of Christianity.

1. *Its teaching that God is just and holy.*
2. *Its moral requirements.*
3. *Its allegation that sin and guilt are universal to man.*
4. *The consequences of sin reasonable.*
5. *The gospel commands reasonable.*
6. *Nine-tenths of Bible precepts self-evident.*

III. Christianity as a remedial system adapted to man.

1. *A revelation of God first needed.*
2. *A people prepared to receive this revelation.*
3. *God more perfectly revealed in his providence.*
4. *Preparation for the advent of Christ.*
5. *The manifestation of Christ just what was needed.*
6. *Conversion and pardon rational.*
7. *Christianity secures steadfastness and growth.*
8. *Conclusions confirmed by the results of eighteen centuries.*

THIRD PROPOSITION.

CHRISTIANITY IS SUPERNATURAL AND SUPERHUMAN.

I. *It is not a natural outgrowth of human nature, nor of the peculiar circumstances of its origin.*

1. It is supernatural so far as man, in general, is concerned. It is not a plant that sprang up naturally from the soil of human nature. (1) Its doctrines are distasteful to wicked men—responsibility to God, the fact of sin, and the need of penitence. (2) Its requirements demand self-denial, self-conquest, and cross-bearing. The irreligious bias, the set of human nature against Christianity, is so strong as to become the chief reason why scientific theories hostile to Christianity are broached and defended. The maxim seems to be, "Anything to get God and Christianity out of the way." Often, the more clearly a man sees and feels the force of Christian truth the more fiercely will he fight against it. (3) All false religions and superstitions are confessedly the product of the human mind; but Christianity persistently and powerfully opposes all these. It is exclusive and destructive of everything else; thus giving proof that it is not of this world, nor a product of mere human nature.

2. It is supernatural in that it could not have been the product of Jewish thought, certainly not of those Jewish peasants who became the immediate followers of Jesus. (1) The Jews were narrow, bigoted, and illiberal in the highest degree; how could they have become the authors of a

religion the most liberal and comprehensive possible? How could *they* have founded a religion which declared the desolation of the Temple, the destruction of their worship, and that they had become the murderers of the Messiah? How could they have produced a system which avowedly and actually made war on themselves and all they held dear and sacred? a system which, to this day, they abhor? How could they have invented a Messiah and a Messianic career so utterly opposed to all their ideas and hopes, and to all their interpretations of the prophets? And yet the writers of the Bible were Jews who, in some way, were enabled to rise above themselves and all the summits of national pride and prejudice. (2) The unaided, peasant disciples of Jesus could not have produced the New Testament. (a) How could they have put off all the results of Jewish training and have arrayed themselves in the garments of Christian light and philanthropy? (b) Could *they* have produced the discourses of Jesus, the admiration of all ages? (c) Could they have invented the system of Christian morals, founded on the deepest principles, suited to all men in all times, and everywhere self-consistent? (d) Could they have invented such a character as Jesus of Nazareth? a perfect man? a perfect manifestation of God? not an abstraction but one made concrete in words and deeds? one placed in peculiar circumstances of mission, trial, and death? Could Matthew, the publican, have done it? Could any four of them have done it with such wonderful agreement in their idea and its realization? Whether referred to human nature in general, or to the immediate disciples of Jesus, it does not seem to have been a natural result.

II. *Christianity is superhuman.*

We know pretty well what man has done and what he can

do. We also know in a good degree what Christianity is. Could man have produced it? Man can make his artificial lake, but could he have made the ocean, measured its waters, established its bounds, and correlated it with continents, winds, and suns? Man can erect the granite shaft, but could he have lifted the mountains to the sky and made them awful and sublime? So man could have written many things in the Bible and could have discovered many truths there revealed and sanctioned by the divine name, but could he have invented Christianity as a system? Are there not in it oceans whose waters he did not gather together, and mountains on whose summits he never stood? Among the proofs of superhuman origin are the following:

1. The account of Creation as given by Moses. (1) No man could have then known the *earlier condition* of the earth. (2) He could not have known the exact *order* of Creation. (3) He would not have fallen into the seeming inconsistency of putting the creation of light on the earth before the appearance of the sun. (4) He would not have allied birds in their origin with fishes and reptiles. (5) He could not have risen to the full comprehension of all nature; God, the heavens and the earth, the grades of beings on the earth, and man as related to his Creator and to all other created things.

2. The writers of the Bible could not of themselves have known the destiny of the earth and of all things upon it, as science now teaches.

3. The unity of the Bible is superhuman. The Bible consists of sixty-six different portions, written by at least forty different persons, during sixteen hundred years, in many countries, and under a great variety of circumstances; and yet it is one book, not in mere form, but in the subject matter and the law of progressive development. "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." Appropriate as are the

opening chapters, giving an account of the Creation, and the closing words in which Heaven makes its last appeal to man, equally appropriate are all the portions which lie between. Any other work similarly produced would be regarded as superhuman. If forty sculptors, living in different countries, scattered through sixteen centuries, and belonging to several schools of art, should fashion, without knowledge of each other or concert of action, as many different parts of a marble statue, and if at the end of these centuries it should be found that these portions exactly fitted one another and resulted in a work of art the most perfect and the most sublime, then all would recognize the miracle, and that there was a presiding intelligence more enduring and more exalted than man. Such are the circumstances under which wrought the forty sacred writers, and such was the result of their labors—Jesus, the Great Teacher, the perfect man, and the perfect manifestation of God,—Jesus, the admiration of all the ages. The astronomical cycles which run backward and forward millions of years, the progressive stages of vegetable and animal life, and the plans which comprehend the whole, imply one who inhabits eternity and who sees the end from the beginning. So, the cycles of Christianity, including the beginning and the end; the progress of revelation running through Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian dispensations; and the vastness of the plan of salvation, all point to the Divine Being as the author and finisher of the whole. The character and conditions of the work render it impossible to man.

4. The self-restraint of Bible writers is superhuman. The silence of the Bible is quite as remarkable as its great revelations. How insatiable is human curiosity! What pride men have always taken in the explanation of mysteries! Who does not wish to know the place and condition of the dead?

Who does not desire a minute account of Heaven, its joys and employments? What religious impostor has failed to gratify this curiosity, to solve all the mysteries and to tell all about the world unseen? Mahomet told his followers of the pleásures and recreations of Heaven. All false religions abound in such revelations. But our sacred writers never yield to such impulses. Not a word to satisfy mere curiosity; not a step beyond the one purpose of Scripture—the purpose to make men wise unto salvation.

5. The perfect adaptation of Christianity to human nature is superhuman. We have seen how perfect this adaptation is; adapted to intellect, sensibility, imagination, and will; adapted to the moral and religious faculties. This adaptation was effected long before there was any true and scientific analysis of mental faculties, and when such adaptation was impossible as a matter of human science and skill.

6. The conception and portraiture of such a being as Jesus of Nazareth, as he is presented in the New Testament, is superhuman. He is a perfect man and a perfect manifestation of God. He is not an abstraction, but a living person. He never says or does anything unworthy of this dual and perfect nature. He came on a peculiar mission, fulfilled this mission under circumstances of peculiar trial. Yet all ages have admitted that he is perfect. *One* writer of genius could not have invented this character. He could not have found in all literature, nor anywhere in actual life, a model for his guidance. That *four* writers should succeed in such a portraiture would be still more superhuman. Jesus was an actual being, or he was invented; in either case he was more than man.

7. Christ's conception of a universal and imperishable spiritual kingdom, his clear perception of the means for its establishment, and the fact of its undeniable success, are

superhuman; and this is true whether these conceptions are to be attributed to Christ or to his Apostles. It is the conception of a moral kingdom, a moral supremacy, over human hearts and consciences; of a kingdom which should pervade and underlie all earthly kingdoms; which should disregard wide oceans, mountain ranges, and all differences of race and language; which should be adapted to all ages and nations; which should wield an authority mightier than Roman Emperor or Russian Czar, mightier than sword or fagot; of a kingdom which should flourish amid the ruins of cities and empires. This dominion over all men and all time was to be gained by this Galilean peasant; to be gained by the simple power of truth and love. He would lay the foundations of his kingdom in his death, in his shame and ignominy. The success of this conception is as real as it is glorious. Jesus has many millions of subjects. They give him the high allegiance of heart and conscience. His simple word is mightier than all national decrees, though backed by fleets and armies. If kings rule at all it must be in harmony with the principles of his kingdom. Nor can the time ever come when this authority shall wane. The truths he uttered will be as changeless as God himself. So long as men sin, so long as human hearts are breaking, so long as graves are made, and so long as the soul shall yearn for eternal life, so long will he maintain this supremacy.

8. The philosophy and the power of the Atonement are superhuman. (1) Its grandeur is seen in some general facts. (a) No event of time or eternity, so far as we know, can equal it in moral sublimity. (b) It has done more to bring sinners to real repentance than all other forces combined. (c) It is the inexhaustible fountain of self-sacrifice for the good of man. (d) It is, to-day, the chief factor in all moral and religious progress. (e) The study of the Atonement

leads to the investigation of the deepest principles of all just and benevolent government. (2) Through the Atonement God can be just and yet justify the one who believes in Christ. Probably no created intelligence can understand the full meaning of this statement, but some things are evident. (a) So far as the moral universe is concerned the death of Christ accomplished what the punishment of the sinner would have done; it fully sustains the sacredness of the law. (b) The death of Christ so affects the believing penitent that to forgive him would not induce to further sin, and would be just as well as merciful. (c) It offers no pardon to one who is not thus affected, to one who is not dead to sin. (d) In the Atonement there is no injustice, since Christ was a divine and a willing sacrifice; as divine he was the source of all authority, and as a willing sacrifice he manifested the love of God in the highest degree. (e) That God should pardon *all* sin or *no* sin would be alike unreasonable. The gospel proclaims that he will pardon on certain conditions. Human governments find it usually impossible to pardon and be just; but it is not so with God. Well might Paul exclaim, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God!"

9. Christianity, in its purpose and method, is superhuman. (1) It is the sole purpose of Christianity to save men from sin; from its love, its practice, its guilt, and its power. Other systems of doctrine seek to save from particular forms of sin, and they do this from worldly and superficial motives. This would save from all sin, and its reasons are derived from the intrinsic nature of sin as opposed to the character of God and the welfare of his moral universe. This was the great object of the Savior's life and death; for this the gospel was to be preached; for this the Apostles and martyrs suffered; for this the church exists. Every true prayer is a pleading

against sin; every religious meeting where men confess their errors to one another and to God; every instance of church discipline; and every missionary to heathen lands, proclaims that this is still the great purpose and the divine spirit of Christianity. Here our religion stands alone and in strong contrast to all other systems. If Christ had been an impostor or an enthusiast he could not have chosen such a purpose—at once a severe condemnation of all imposture and a death chill to all enthusiasm. If the Apostles had been deceivers how could they have chosen to suffer martyrdom in such a service? The whole scheme originated with the One who understands and hates sin, and not with man, who ignorantly loves it. (2) Equally superhuman is the method by which Christianity would accomplish this purpose. It was to be done by the simple story of the cross. The Jews sought for a sign and the Greeks for wisdom; but in opposition to all the science and philosophy of his time, Paul declares this story of the cross to be the wisdom of God and the power of God. The motive to be employed was not the wisdom, nor the power, nor the justice of God, but the *love* of God. Nature does not give a sufficient revelation of this love. Nature has her terrible, as well as her kindlier, moods. It seems to one enjoying only the light of nature, as though love would have gone further and not have left thorns, and floods, and earthquake shocks, and contagion, and sickness, and death, and sorrow. Whether love for us is manifested depends upon the outcome; if all tends but to the silence, the darkness, and the nothingness of the grave,—and all human paths bend thitherward,—it is difficult to see the divine goodness. Reason affirms that the world is governed in benevolence and not malevolence. The witnesses, sense and reason, do not agree. Between them, to say the least, men are in doubt. The light of nature is cold, often

freezing. Imagine Paul at Athens, not preaching Jesus and the resurrection, but discoursing of sea and sky, mountain and plain, storm and calm, matter and force. Would even a Dionysius or a Damaris have become his disciples? Modern science is equally impotent. Moral power does not reside in matter. Lightning may strike the body, but not the soul. Not only, therefore, must the conception of divine love as the "power of God unto salvation," but also the manifestation of this love, have been supernatural and superhuman. Christianity stands apart. Its purpose, like the sinlessness of Jesus, declares its superhuman character. Like an angel whose shining garments declare its heavenly origin, Christianity, in its efforts to save men through the power of divine love, is clearly not of earth.

10. The triumph of Christianity over all opposition proves it to be both true and superhuman. Christianity is a wonderful phenomenon; how is it to be accounted for? We know something of the power of truth and the weakness of error, something of the power of God and the weakness of man. Now to which cause shall we attribute this phenomenon—to deceitful man, or to the true and living God?

(1) First of all, let us consider the nature of the effect whose cause is in question.

(a) Its beginning was the lowest and feeblest possible; it was the seeming triumph of all the powers of darkness. The brief career of Jesus of Nazareth is ended. He has gained only a few disciples, and these are illiterate and unknown. He has not commanded a single soldier, but has seemed to despise all ordinary means of success. He is not known beyond the narrow bounds of Palestine. He leaves on record not a single sentence of poetry or philosophy. He is condemned by Jews and Gentiles. His disciples forsake him. He is publicly executed amid the cruel mockeries of

the Romans and the execrations of the Jews. He lies in the rock-hewn sepulcher. The great stone which closes the entrance to his tomb bears the seal of the Roman Empire, and Roman soldiers stand on guard. His followers are scattered, his body is mouldering back to dust, and his teachings are fading from the memories of men. It was a meteor that flashed across the Judean sky, and not the radiance of the Sun of Righteousness! Is it possible that Christianity shall rise from that deep, dark grave and go forth from conquering unto conquest?

(b) The persons who are to begin and carry forward this scheme of Christianity, who are to change this crushing defeat into victory, are evidently inadequate to the task. They are few, disheartened and dispersed. One of them was a traitor and a suicide. Another disowned his Master and denied him with an oath. There was rivalry among them and a contest concerning who should be the greatest. All of them were ordinary peasants, illiterate, unacquainted with the world, and under the odium which rested on the Jewish nation. What could these men do, but, like the women, embalm the body of the dead Nazarene and weep at his tomb? When they gathered for the last time about their Master, a broken band, poor, despised, and shivering in their timidity, how preposterous seemed the great commission, "Go *ye* into all the world and preach the gospel unto every creature."

(c) In all human wisdom, still more impotent was the doctrine they were to proclaim. This gospel which was to be the light of the world, which was to transform all characters and civilizations, which was to be the foundation of a kingdom that can not be moved, what was it? The story that one Jew, one Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified at Jerusalem, in the days of Pontius Pilate, died for all men,

died as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world; that his is "the only name given among men whereby we must be saved;" and that he is appointed the final judge of all generations, the living and the dead; the story that this crucified Jew arose from the dead, ascended to the right hand of God, and was there crowned Lord of lords and King of kings. This gospel was to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness. Proclaimed in Jerusalem, it stirred up the lowest dregs of Jewish society and excited to mob violence; proclaimed in Athens, the philosophers said, "What will the babbler say?" for Paul seemed to be "a setter-forth of strange gods." Determined to know nothing else among men but Jesus, the Christ, and him crucified, the world said that Paul was "beside himself," was insane. Had the disciples been permitted to bear to the nations some grand system of ancient philosophy or modern science, then reason could have detected some elements of success; but no, they were restricted to this gospel. They were to make it stand forth in its naked simplicity, foolishness, and yet divine power. It was not to be propagated by the sword, nor guided by human wisdom. A curse was upon them, and even upon an angel from heaven, if they should dare to preach any other gospel.

(d) If success from such a beginning and with such means seems impossible, much more was it impossible when we take into account the fact that Christianity, from the first, has met with bitter and powerful opposition. It was opposed by *hostile religions.* It was itself hostile, exclusive, aggressive. It asked not that men should modify their forms of worship, but throw them all away; not that Christ should have a niche in the Pantheon, but that it should be thrown down, and the cross alone be erected in its place. It armed against itself all priests and peoples, whether Jews or Gentiles. The

Jewish religious system, consolidated by fifteen hundred years of glorious history, with its temple, its priesthood, its splendid ritual, and its political power; and the religions of the Pagan world, hoary with age, accepted by the millions of peoples, and defended by the sword—these did not yield without a struggle, long, obstinate, and bloody. It was opposed from the first by hostile *governments* and armies. The first sermon was a fearless attack upon the murderers of Jesus, and was answered by the flashing of swords. Peter and John are cast into prison. All the Apostles answer before the Sanhedrim, are scourged without mercy, and barely escape with their lives. Stephen, the first of a long line of martyrs, is stoned to death while he prays for his enemies. James is beheaded. Saul makes havoc of the church, breathing out threatening and slaughter. Thousands perished at Rome, devoured by the wild beasts of the amphitheater, and burned, wrapped in their sheets of fire. In Pontus and Bithynia none were spared till the whole province was depopulated, and Pliny, the heathen governor, plead in their behalf for mercy. Besides the bloody waves which constantly beat on all shores of the empire, there were ten great tidal-waves of persecution, which seemed sufficient for the destruction of Christianity—tidal-waves whose ebb left the earth strewn with mangled bodies and wrecked churches. The evidences that millions perished are hidden away and still preserved in the catacombs of Rome—crosses, blood-stained vials, and sad inscriptions engraved in the darkest days of Christian history. More universal, more inveterate, and more powerful, is the opposition of corrupt *human nature*. In Bible language, this religion has to oppose "the world, the flesh, and the devil." It must fight the world—its pride, its ambitions, its fashions, and its dishonest maxims and practices; it must contend with the flesh—its appetites,

its passions, its love of wealth and power, its love of ease and fear of ridicule; it must antagonize the devil—every form of crime, every malignant purpose, and every grade of selfishness. Men love their sins. Nearly the whole philosophy of unbelief is found in this secret, implacable hostility to the penitence, purity, and piety demanded by our holy religion. This intense hostility will search heaven and earth through to find means of self-deception and reasons why one should not believe, should not forsake his sins, and should not deny himself and "bear the cross." Besides its small beginning, its feeble supporters, and its doctrines so ridiculous in the estimation of the world, Christianity had to meet this formidable array of mighty enemies.

(e) Continuing our analysis of Christianity as a wonderful phenomenon which must have had an adequate cause, we come to the final specification—its unparalleled success. We must see not only the little stone cut out of the mountain without hands, but we must also follow its growth till it becomes a great mountain and fills the whole earth. The first announcement of the resurrection and coronation of the Messiah, in Jerusalem and but fifty days after the crucifixion, results in the conversion of three thousand persons. The next sermon increases the church to five thousand. A great company of the priests are obedient to the faith. Soon there are churches throughout all Judea, Samaria, and Galilee. Within thirty years after the beginning multitudes of Christians were found in all parts of the Roman Empire. If persecuted and scattered abroad they went everywhere preaching the word. They left all things for Christ. Paul, in his wonderful missionary life and success, was only an example of tens of thousands. Within three centuries Christianity had conquered the Empire. So numerous were Christian churches and peoples that Constantine the Great

found it impossible to rule the Roman world except as a Christian Emperor. Then there followed a long battle with ignorance, barbarism and bigotry. Savages poured down upon the Roman civilization, and for long centuries the combatants were almost lost in the darkness of the Middle Ages. The Great Apostasy arose and filled all Christendom with superstition and cruelty. The Reformation came, but with it a stubborn fight against the scepticism of the seventeenth century. Christianity still lives, and most remarkable are her triumphs of the present century. They are simply ignorant of the facts who think Christianity is losing its primitive vigor, and that there are signs of speedy decay. In A. D. 1500 there were one hundred millions of Christians; in 1700 there were one hundred and fifty-five millions; and now there are over four hundred millions; an increase of two hundred and fifty millions since A. D. 1700. There are over forty thousand missionaries in heathen lands and five hundred thousand children in missionary schools. All church and benevolent enterprises were never before so well organized and sustained. The colleges and the governments of the civilized world are under the control and influence of Christianity; while all nations are open for its propagation and reception.

(2) Such is the effect to be a accounted for; what is the cause?

(a) If we admit the truth of Christianity, and hence the divinity of Jesus Christ, it is all very plain. This would be an adequate cause. If Christ lived and taught as the New Testament declares, if he wrought the miracles ascribed to him, fulfilled the prophecies, and arose from the dead; if he poured out the Holy Spirit upon his waiting Apostles; if the Lord worked with them, confirming their word with signs and miracles following their preaching; then we have a sufficient

cause for their faith and heroism, their persistence amid persecutions and martyrdoms, their early triumphs over opposition, and for the place which this religion holds to-day in the estimation of the most enlightened portions of mankind.

(b) The best effort to account for the survival and the triumph of Christianity, on the supposition that it is of human origin, was made by Gibbon in his Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. He attributes its success to five causes: The inflexible and intolerant zeal of Christians, their doctrine of a future life, the miraculous powers ascribed to the primitive church, the pure and austere morals of Christians, and the union and discipline of the church. It is easy to see that these are not causes so much as parts of the effect to be accounted for. We are to find the cause of the "inflexible zeal," for the faith in a future life, for the belief in miraculous powers, for the pure morals, and the union of the Christian republic. What power was it which produced a religion and a church capable of such wonderful results, and that, too, in the face of all possible antagonism?

(c) If Jesus was not the Christ and the Son of God as he claimed to be, then was he an impostor, and in no true sense the founder of Christianity; then this religion ought not to bear his name, but that of some subsequent deceiver. The death of Christ and the thirty years more or less which intervene between his death and the writing of the New Testament would completely sever Christianity from Jesus as in any sense its author. Jesus left nothing on record; the discourses of Jesus, on this supposition, were never delivered by him, but were gotten up by this subsequent writer. Jesus could not have known the time and manner of his own death, and could not have controlled the men and the circumstances which brought it about. He neither planned

nor carried out this scheme of religion. He wrought no miracles, he set no sinless example, for he was false from first to last. He made no revelation of the Father's character and love. All the admiration bestowed upon Jesus by those who deny his divinity, but laud to the skies his perfect manhood, is misplaced. For eighteen hundred years Jesus has been shining in borrowed garments. The credit and the glory of originating Christianity belongs to some unknown man, who combined the genius and mendacity of the demon with the sublime conceptions and the benevolence of an angel. Now, on the supposition that Christ was an impostor and that the whole story was invented by a subsequent deceiver, what was the task before this one and what the possibility of his success? He saw that out of the career of Jesus, whatever it really was, and out of his tragic death, he could manufacture the beginning of a new religion. He saw the main outline of a plan far-reaching and permanent. He saw minutely some of the first steps in the development of this plan, and had the boldness to enter at once upon this path of imposture. He called together some of the friends of Jesus laid before them his plan, gave them confidence of success, courage to begin, and inspired them with all the heroism of martyrdom in the greatest of all deceptions. He invented the life of Jesus; suited it to the real meaning of the prophecies, though this meaning was then unknown to the Jewish scribes; so contrived his scheme as to render it capable of explanation and support by the Jewish laws and customs, and yet drew a clear and wonderful distinction between the old dispensation and the new, retaining and leaving out just what his scheme required. He invented the discourses of Jesus, and yet refused to connect his own name with these sublime teachings. He invented the account of the resurrection of Jesus, and the infallible proofs by which

it was to be sustained. While carrying on this deception and wholesale lying and blasphemy he refused to conform his religious requirements to the corrupt passions of man, but taught the sternest morality and the most heartfelt piety. He perfectly adapted this system to the faculties of the human soul and to the time-lasting progress of the human race. He made his associates in this scheme so true to his falsehoods, to himself, and to one another, though false to everything else, that no one of them ever turned state's-evidence. He made the people of Jerusalem and of all the East, in the very time of the Savior's alleged miracles, death, and resurrection, believe his account of Jesus and become his followers. He invented, or caused to be invented, the Acts of Apostles and the Epistles, made them current as inspired books, made them such as to be supported by all profane history, and such as not by a single mistake to reveal their true character. He so devised this scheme, and so balanced the forces which were to carry it out, that it was able to conquer all the opposition of human nature, of established religions, and of hostile armies. He so devised this scheme that it presents the only religion worthy of an enlightened man, and is the chief factor in all civilization; so devised it that this stupendous falsehood is a greater blessing to mankind than all the supposed truth of Infidelity.

That Jesus was not the author of Christianity, and that such a subsequent deceiver achieved such a remarkable victory, is sufficiently impossible and absurd. The success of Christianity, therefore, indicates its superhuman origin.

If Christianity agrees with nature in its methods of development and in its teachings; if it agrees with man, receiving the sanction of his reason and being perfectly adapted to the renovation of his moral nature; and if it is both supernatural and superhuman, then Jesus of Nazareth, the Author and finisher of this faith, must have been the Messiah, the Son of God.

I. *Christianity* DOES *agree with nature in its methods and teachings.*

II. *Christianity* DOES *agree with man's nature, receiving the sanction of reason and being adapted to his mental faculties.*

III. *Christianity* IS *supernatural and superhuman. Therefore, Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God.*

CHRISTIANITY IS SUPERHUMAN.

I. NOT A NATURAL OUTGROWTH OF HUMAN NATURE.

1. *Supernatural so far as man, in general, is concerned.*
2. *Not the product of Jewish thought.*

II. CHRISTIANITY IS SUPERHUMAN.

1. *The Mosaic account of Creation.*
2. *The destiny of the earth.*
3. *The Unity of the Bible superhuman.*
4. *The superhuman self-restraint of Bible writers.*
5. *The perfect adaptation to man.*
6. *Jesus of Nazareth as a literary production superhuman.*
7. *Christ's conception of a universal kingdom.*
8. *The philosophy and power of the Atonement.*
9. *Christianity in its purpose and method.*
10. *The triumph of Christianity superhuman.*
    - (1) The effect to be accounted for.
        - (a) Feeble beginning.
        - (b) The persons who were to win.
        - (c) The doctrine to be proclaimed.
        - (d) Bitter and powerful opposition.
        - (e) Its unparalleled success.
    - (2) What was the cause of this effect?
        - (a) The New Testament assigns an adequate cause.
        - (b) Gibbon puts effects for causes.
        - (c) That a disciple and not Jesus was the author is absurd.

Conclusion.

DISCUSSION OF OBJECTIONS.

Since objections to Christianity are the product of so-called reason and science, this is the appropriate place for their discussion. In the argument from science and reason, in which it is shown that Christianity and nature agree in method and teachings and that Christianity is both supernatural and superhuman, most of these objections have been either answered or obviated; but a logical classification and refutation of them will be more satisfactory: more satisfactory, since it will clear the field and show that none of any importance have been avoided or omitted.

Objections against a given demonstration may be of two, and of only two, kinds; those which lie *against the proposition* and those which lie *against the proof*. The objector, in order to succeed, must show either that the proposition is false, or that the arguments brought to sustain it are not conclusive; not conclusive, because the premises are false or the logical inference unsound. We have, therefore, to consider two classes of objections; *first*, those which are alleged against Christianity as a system of religion, and hence against the central proposition which affirms the divinity and Messiahship of Jesus; *second*, those which are supposed to lie against the evidences adduced.

OBJECTIONS BROUGHT AGAINST CHRISTIANITY AS A SYSTEM OF RELIGION.

I. *Objections which lie with equal force against nature, and are, therefore, invalid.*

1. Objection is made, in one respect, to the Bible representation of God. The revelations of the divine goodness,

mercy, and fatherhood are unhesitatingly accepted; but those statements and facts which present the Divine Being as one who will punish transgression and disobedience, and who will by no means clear the guilty, are not so readily received. Especially is objection made to the God of the Bible as known in his judgments against wicked peoples and in his threatenings against the finally impenitent. It is said that God would not have destroyed the innocent with the guilty in the days of Noah, that he would not have destroyed the innocent women and children of the Cities of the Plain, nor have required the extermination of the Canaanites; that he would not inflict eternal punishment.

Now this is an objection to the God of nature as well as to the God of the Bible. (1) Every violation of nature's laws is followed by penal consequences. Nature pronounces not only her blessings on the obedient, but also her curses on the disobedient. How tender she is in caring for the bud, the birdling and the babe! How severe and unrelenting when fever wastes the body and insanity destroys the mind! The delirium of the drunkard and the rotting body of the debauchee proclaim that the God of nature is "a consuming fire." (2) How often do the innocent perish with the guilty! The contagion, the earthquake, and the cyclone, do not discriminate between the good and the evil. The cholera, nature's avenger of violated law, marches round and round the world, sparing neither age nor sex. The God of nature adjusted all these terrible forces and foresaw all their minutest consequences; and yet he continues to do, as the years go by, all these seemingly cruel things. There is no escape from this conclusion except in Atheism. The philosophy which will explain nature, in this respect, will also explain the Bible. (3) The consequences of violating nature's laws are often without remedy and, so far as we can see, eternal. A

day lost will never return. No power of nature will restore life to the murdered man, nor quench the fires of remorse in the conscience of the murderer. (4) These revelations of the divine severity harmonize with all our moral intuitions. If he were not a God of justice, pledged by his very nature to punish the iniquitous as well as to reward the righteous, he would be unworthy of universal homage and authority. Physical death is not the greatest calamity that can befall man. God knows how to save the innocent and how "to reserve the unjust unto the day of Judgment to be punished." The Flood, and the fire that fell upon Sodom, were no worse than the convulsions in modern days which sink islands and destroy cities. Whether God destroys by famine, pestilence, slow decay, or by the sword, the destruction is the same. If God permits sin and suffering in this world, why not in the next? If for seven thousand years, why not forever? (5) The severity of God is no argument against his authorship of nature; neither is it against his authorship of Christianity. Are there good reasons why he is severe in nature? There are equally good reasons, whether we can know them or not, for his severity in the moral world.

2. A second objection, often alleged, is the existence of physical and moral evil, and the Bible account of God's relation to it. This objection presents two questions: *First*, why did God create or permit evil. It assumes what all will grant, that there is evil in existence. Right and wrong are verities, and wrong exists. Sin exists. Suffering exists. Known unto God are all his works. He saw the end from the beginning, and all that lies between. The Bible represents that he was free; that he had all power and all wisdom, and could have made a different world. The objector says, "Why then did he not make a better world? Why did he not make this earth a heaven to begin with?"

The *second* question is, why does he permit evil to continue? He has the power to anticipate and prevent it; he has power to end at once this tragedy of human life. Why does he not do so? Why does he not destroy the devil? Why does he not render sin impossible? Why does he not abolish Hell?

In answer, let it be said. (1) That this objection lies in all its force against nature. The Bible is not responsible for the existence of evil, nor for God's relation to it. Take the Bible away, and sin remains, suffering remains, and God remains. The unbeliever in Christianity has this problem to solve as well as the believer. If his solution will vindicate the God of nature, so will it the God of the Bible. (2) Christianity offers the only reasonable solution of this problem. Some have sought a solution in a denial of God's fore-knowledge; or, rather, of his perfect knowledge. He has been playing with tremendous forces and sporting in the sufferings of immortal spirits. He is moving with his universe into the darkness and can not tell where he will bring up. Others question the omnipotence of God. He did the best he could, and who could do more? He had poor material to work with; for matter is inherently vicious, and it has been growing more and more corrupt for eternal ages. I need not say how puerile are these suppositions. The Christian view includes the following points:

(a) There is the unshaken belief that whatever God has done is right and the best possible. Considering his own nature, the whole history of time, and the relation of this world to all other worlds, he saw it was best to make a world like this. *He did it*, and we therefore know it was right. (b) He could not give man moral freedom and still bind him fast. In giving man moral freedom he decreed the possibility of sin and all its consequences. (c) God's having made it possible for man to sin, and the divine fore-knowledge of sin

in general and of every particular sin, does not shift the responsibility for sin from the sinner to God. If there was but one way by which God could fore-know an event depending on the human will, and if that one and only way was God's having predetermined that the event should take place, then fore-knowledge would imply predetermination and responsibility for the event. But no one can know that this is the only way. Surely there may be many ways by which God may know all the future. Man's knowledge of the past did not determine it; so God's knowledge of the future, though it may imply the certainty of that future, may have no causative power in bringing it to pass. (d) God would seem to be responsible for sin and righteousness and for all things under the sun, in this general sense; he gave man and other beings moral freedom and made it possible for sin to enter our world; when the whole plan was before him and he saw all its results—what man would do, what other beings would do, and what he would do—he evidently said, "The summing up of earth's history will be well." He moved the lever and the great engine started with its innumerable inter-actions of blind natural forces and independent wills, created and divine. The Infinite One assumed this responsibility, and surely the Judge of all the earth did right. (e) Christianity presents the only remedy for sin, the only hope in respect to a life to come, and the only assurance that right and justice and infinite benevolence shall at last be vindicated.

3. Christianity was delayed in its introduction and is partial in the distribution of its blessings. (1) This is also an objection against the order of nature. The blessings of civilization have been long delayed. How dark and wintry have been former ages and countries! How unequally are nature's blessings now distributed! How wretched the life

of the Greenlander as he shivers and starves in the long, polar night! How lavishly cared for is the inhabitant of the tropics! How great the disparity between the South-African heathen and the civilized man of Europe or America!

It may be said, in reply, that this parallel is not just, since the salvation of the soul does not depend upon these physical and intellectual conditions as it does upon the reception of Christianity. The reply is two-fold: (a) These lower conditions often determine the higher, and, if so, they are just as important as the higher. The want of bread may lead to crime. Many a man's intellectual and spiritual condition —and the same is true of nations—may have been determined by the incubus of physical want and climatic influence. (b) Partiality and injustice in the least would be just as grave a charge against God, as in the highest measure. When this delay and partiality in nature are fully accounted for and reconciled with the divine goodness, the same sound philosophy will apply to Christianity.

(2) Among the reasons for the delay and unequal reception of Christianity the following may be named: (a) Multitudes of individuals in all the Christian centuries have refused to accept it; this is also true of some nations. Jesus declared that this would be so till the end of time. (b) The change in men in order to salvation is a moral one, to be brought about by moral means. This change can not be wrought in the soul of man by force. God could create loyal sons out of the very stones; but this would not be the salvation of sinners. Time, therefore, was required for the development of Christianity and for the production of its proofs. Time is also consumed in its propagation, since this must go forward in harmony with the laws of the human mind. The divine effort to save man was conditioned and limited by the nature of man. (c) God will deal justly with all men, and with

those as well who have had no opportunity to accept Christ. Those who have lived without law shall be judged without law. Much will be required only of those to whom much has been given. This is only to say that though all have sinned and Christ is the only Savior, still to those out of Christ no injustice will be done. (d) The delay and partial dissemination of Christianity may, in the ages to come, cease to have any force as an objection, and for another reason: the centuries of introduction, compared with the ages of complete and universal sway, may dwindle into insignificance. One is the half of two, but it is scarcely any part of a million. This triumph certainly remains for the Kingdom of Heaven which shall never pass away.

4. Again, it is objected that the doctrine of the Atonement requires the innocent to suffer for the guilty; requires that Jesus, who was holy, harmless and separate from sinners, should die for a sinful world. It is true that the Atonement was made by the innocent suffering for the guilty; suffering that blessings might come to the undeserving. (1) But if this is a valid objection against Christianity it is one equally strong against nature. The seed dies in the ground that it may nourish the younger life. One generation toils and dies to give place and possession to the next. Parents suffer for their children, and more for the prodigal son or daughter than for any other. Patriots die for their country, even for the rebellious. The martyr dies that truth and liberty may still survive and bless generations yet unborn. It is a principle woven into the fabric of all organic and social life. This objection must prove that nature is not the workmanship of God before it can discredit Christianity.

(2) This principle as having a place in Christianity is worthy of a special vindication. (a) Though it was according to the purpose of God, still Jesus was a willing sacrifice.

(b) Christ was of the divine nature, the source of all authority. Who shall deny his right, if he chose, to suffer for his creatures? (c) The voluntary suffering of the mother and of the patriot is among the highest manifestations of a noble nature. What is more divine in human nature than that a good man suffer, not for a child, or a friend, but for an enemy! (d) This fact is the source of the wonderful power of the gospel to reconcile man to God. A guilty man dying for another guilty man, or the innocent for the innocent, might move human hearts; but not half so powerfully as when the one bitterly wronged suffers for the wrong-doer. "Scarcely for a righteous man would one die, yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die; but God commendeth his love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us."

5. It is said to be an objection to Christianity that it makes salvation depend upon *faith;* depend on believing in Christ and obeying him. (1) But the same requirements are found in the book of nature. The language of nature is perfectly parallel, almost identical, with the words of the gospel. "He that believes in the laws of nature and obeys them shall be saved; he that believes them not—for then he would not obey—shall die." Knowledge and obedience are nature's conditions. If not whimsical and absurd in nature, neither are they in Christianity.

(2) Faith or belief as a condition of salvation is, in the highest sense, reasonable. (a) What a man believes is an important matter. "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he." If he believes there is no God, no right and wrong, no future life, and that man is only an animal, what can keep him from illustrating this last item in his creed. (b) To put faith, or trust, in God is due the Creator. One who does not trust God, in well doing, is unreconciled to God, and can have no

real peace of soul. (c) Faith controls the feelings, the conscience, and, so far as possible, the will. (d) Faith is required because without it there can be no honest obedience. Every man has some faith. To believe in error leads to death, to believe in Christ leads to life and peace.

II. *Objections arising from the superhuman nature of a Revelation.*

1. A brief enumeration of these objections is first in order.

(1) The mystery of the divine nature and existence: how can God be self-existent? What has he been doing, and what will he be doing, throughout the eternities and immensities of time and space? How is there one God and yet three persons—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit? It is supposed there is something wrong or deficient in a revelation which does not reveal these things.

(2) The mystery of man's nature. Whence comes the spirit of man? What is it like? How is it united with the body? How is it released at death? and where does it go? It is said that this should all be cleared up.

(3) The mystery of the future life. Where is Heaven? Where is Hell? How do spirits get to either place? This should all be made clear.

(4) The mystery of the incarnation and death of Christ. How could God become man? How could he so love the world? How could a divine being suffer and die?

(5) The mystery of the resurrection. "How are the dead raised up and with what body do they come?" What is the necessity of the resurrection? Where is the soul between death and the Judgment?

(6) The mystery of sin. Why should God hate it so? Why was there no remission of sin without the shedding of

blood? Why are all celestial beings so interested in saving man from sin? And why does sin lead to eternal banishment from God?

2. The answer to these objections and others like them is found in the finiteness and weakness of the human mind. That we do not understand these mysteries implies no fault in the revelation, nor in man. It is just as it must be in the nature of the case. (1) Every thing about us is full of mystery; the vegetable cell, the chemical atom, the rays of light, the flashes of lightning, the sea, and the sky. Our eating, breathing, walking, thinking, living, and dying, are all mysteries which defy our powers of analysis. Science reveals more mysteries than it explains; but we do not, on this account, refuse its truths, nor the help it affords. (2) The very conception of a revelation, in part, of things so far above and beyond our powers, carries with it the idea of mystery, of only a partial understanding. (3) The absence of all difficulty of comprehension would be a mark of human origin. What one man has evolved or invented another man may perfectly comprehend. It is not so with the works of God. In investigating the divine working we always come to a gulf beyond which we can not go—the great gulf lying between the relative and the absolute, the finite and the infinite. (4) It is an abuse of reason to reject a fact or principle, however strong the proof for it, simply because it is mysterious. There are things above reason; we can not judge of these in themselves, but only of the evidence by which they are sustained. We are but blind fish in Mammoth Cave, and are poorly prepared to give an *a priori* judgment concerning the nature and reasonableness of all things in the universe. We may demand proof that the Omniscient One is speaking, but when we are sure that he is speaking it is absurd to question what he says.

III. *Objections which arise from false views of what Christianity is and of what a divine religion ought to be.* This class of objections is exceedingly numerous. They have their source in ignorance and error; and since the forms of ignorance and error are multitudinous, so also are these objections. Truth is confined to reality, and must walk in the one straight and narrow way, but Error has a thousand broad and devious paths, and may build how and where she pleases. Therefore, only some of the chief objections of this kind will be presented here.

1. False views of Inspiration. (1) If it be assumed that every thought and word of the Bible were inspired by the Holy Spirit, inspired in the sense that God gave it as the expression of his absolute knowledge and will, then a formidable objection will start up. The Bible has not the style, order, consistency and perfection which this assumption implies. (2) A correct idea of inspiration will obviate this objection. The Bible is the word of God in the sense that it is such a book as he desired to have written, collected and preserved. The Holy Spirit vouches for the *sufficient* accuracy of every part. The material of the Bible was gathered from various sources; former documents, individual experience, dreams, and visions, the communications of angels, and inspiration. These things were written and gathered under the guidance of the Spirit. It was not needful that the writer should lose his own style, or adopt an unusual mode of thinking. It was not necessary that every thing should be put down with the same degree of minuteness. It is enough if the representations of human nature and history are true, if the revelations of the character and will of God are reliable.

2. False views of the purpose of Revelation. If the Bible is regarded as a work on ancient geography, on ethnography,

or astronomy, or geology, or chronology, any or all of these, of course it will appear insufficient and unworthy of its divine endorsement. For the most part, it presents the ideas of science which were current at the time among the people when and where written. If the Holy Spirit should give the world a treatise on astronomy it would be wonderfully able, exhaustive, and subversive of human systems. That if we shall keep in view the great purpose of Revelation as a whole, and the purpose of the special parts, most of these difficulties will disappear, is well illustrated by the following examples: (1) It was the one all-comprehending purpose of the Scriptures to make men *wise unto salvation.* It is asserted and granted that they are able to do this.—II. Timothy 3 : 15. This wisdom is of the first importance. If saved, there will be time enough in heaven to gain all lower wisdom. All interpretation should be conducted in the light of this prevalent purpose. (2) Again, if it is assumed that each of the Evangelists intended to give a chronological and complete account of all that Jesus said and did, then they can not be reconciled with one another, nor with the promise of perfect guidance. John gives his purpose when he says, "Jesus did many other things not written in this book, but these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through his name." This being the purpose of each writer, it could not be expected that they would write the same things and in the same order. (a) They were different persons, (b) writing at different times, (c) for different readers, (d) at different progressive stages of revelation, (e) and having different relations to what had already been written. Hence, though there are no contradictions, there are many differences. Many objections have been urged from this false view of the purpose

of the Gospels, but they all fall to the ground when the true purpose is discovered.

3. False views of the perfection to be expected. The Holy Spirit might have made the Bible absolutely, rather than relatively, perfect. It might have given an ideal history of perfect laws, men, and nations; and all this in the language of Heaven. When the reader finds that the Bible falls below this high ideal he, perhaps, objects and declares the whole account unworthy of God. That this absolute perfection ought to be found is a false view. (1) It was written for imperfect men. It had to be given in *our* language and illustrated by human events. (2) It gives a history of imperfect men and nations, and it had to be true to this living imperfection. (3) Its history is imperfect, since it treats of but one nation, and of this nation in only one respect, its religious development. (4) Its laws are, in some instances, imperfect, since they were suited to an imperfect state of society, and were the best that could be enforced. The perfection of the Old Testament is relative, not absolute.

4. False views of Bible teaching concerning the divine purpose and election. Hyper-Calvinism has been the prolific source, not only of the many forms of Universalism, but also of many stalwart objections to Christianity itself. If God elected a certain number of mankind to salvation, but passed by the rest of the race, who were equally deserving; if for these only Christ died; if these only receive the effectual call; and these only are made to preserve, it seems impossible to reconcile these points of Calvinism—not of Christianity—with any correct idea of divine justice and love.

There is a Bible doctrine of election, and in the light of this doctrine all difficulty vanishes. (1) God elected to make and carry onward a world like this, a world in which every moral being should be free in the formation of his own moral

character. (2) He elected men and nations to accomplish certain purposes, but never without due regard to their fitness for these purposes. (3) He elected unto eternal life all who will believe in Christ, obey him, and be faithful unto death. He has elected a certain *character*, not persons. Whoever will put on the wedding garment and wear it will not be cast out. We are elect through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth. "Whosoever will, may drink of the water of life freely." In his election to eternal life every man has a right to give the casting vote.

5. False views of conversion. It is often assumed that conversion is a miracle, a result of the direct and immediate impact of the Holy Spirit upon the human spirit. This theory begins with the doctrine of total depravity. It is said that man is so dead in trespasses and sins that he can not hear, repent, and obey; that, first of all, the Holy Spirit must regenerate the soul, must impart new life; that Heaven will do this whenever proper spiritual conditions are supplied; and that then the renewed soul can believe, repent, and be saved.

This makes conversion consist of a spiritual, but not a moral, change. It is wrought by the sheer power of God and in answer to prayer. This view is a source of objections. (1) It is a miracle. (2) Since the initiative is with God, the responsibility for the loss of any soul is thrown upon the Divine Being. (3) Many seek conversion by this method, and go away not only disappointed but convinced that there is nothing in it. (4) It does not seem to be a rational process, since regeneration comes without a moral change, and the evidence of it is to be found in the uncertain and excitable realm of the sensibilities; and this change is to be recognized and clearly distinguished in the experiences of children, of the ignorant, and of degraded people. These experiences

generally conform to the theory entertained. The preaching of the Gospel would have no relation to conversion, since the sinner must be converted before he can hear it. Thinking people are inclined to reject a process so uncertain and so apart from any rational philosophy. Indeed, if these miraculous conversions were a reality, all argument on the evidences of our religion would be useless. Call fifty converted men into court and let them testify to these miracles. By the mouth of these witnesses every word should be established.

The Bible teaching on the subject of conversion leaves no room for these objections. It teaches that all men who have become moral agents are sinners and depraved. There are no degrees in state or relation. A man is a citizen or he is not. He is wholly a citizen or wholly an alien. So a man is a citizen in the Kingdom of Heaven or he is not. If by "total depravity" any one means that the unconverted man is wholly out of Christ, the doctrine, so defined, might not be far from the truth. But it is certain that few men are so depraved that they can not understand and obey the Gospel. Then all mystery and miracle disappear. The Spirit of God works through the word of God. One believes, turns about in his moral purposes or repents, and goes on obeying Christ; and this is conversion.

6. False views concerning the nature of eternal punishment. If it is assumed that the Bible language descriptive of the condition of the unsaved is to be taken in a literal sense, some object to the doctrine on the ground of its being contrary to the divine character, and such as even to destroy the happiness of Heaven. Such as like to press this objection dwell on the physical horrors of Hell—the worm that dieth not, the fire that never shall be quenched, and the smoke of torment that ascends forever and ever.

But if the language of the Bible, in this instance, is

figurative and not literal, then the objection falls. Undoubtedly this is the case. Both Heaven and Hell must be described by symbols which we understand. No intelligent person thinks Heaven is a real city, with gates of pearl and streets of gold. The most precious things of earth are used to represent it. So the most terrible things are chosen to present the condition of the lost. One need not see in the description mere physical pain, but rather intense spiritual suffering—guilt, remorse, and despair. That which begins on earth is but continued in a state of eternal bliss or woe.

7. False views of Biblical interpretation. This is worthy of discussion here; for a false method of interpretation leads to false conceptions of Bible teaching; and this, to untold difficulties. The people are making great progress in scientific interpretation; and nothing gives a fairer promise of the substantial union of all Christians in doctrine and effort. It will be sufficient to name some errors which produce objections to Christian belief. (1) There is a failure to recognize the three great Dispensations whose successive development we have in the Bible: the Patriarchal, the Jewish, and the Christian. Standing between the first two and marking their limits is Mt. Sinai; and between the last two, the cross of Christ. Change of dispensation implies a change of authority, and, consequently, of the law. We live under the Christian Dispensation, and here we must find our law. (2) Some fail to mark the four natural divisions of the New Testament: the Gospels, giving the testimony which produces faith in Christ; the Acts of Apostles, which tells us how the gospel was preached and obeyed—the book of conversions; the Epistles, to instruct the church in Christian living; and the book of Revelation, presenting the final triumph of the church. (3) There is a failure to recognize the exact time when the reign of Christ began on earth and when the law

of the Lord—the law of the gospel—went forth from Jerusalem; the exact time when the Holy Spirit came upon the waiting church, and the Apostles began to speak as the Spirit gave them utterance. (4) There is a failure to follow the inductive method. As nature is one, so is the Bible; and the same method applies to both.

OBJECTIONS BROUGHT AGAINST THE EVIDENCES ADDUCED

I. *Objections against the premises employed in this demonstration.* It has been the aim in the argument for the Proposition to use no premises that are not known to be true; to use none that are not axiomatic, admitted by all parties who have a right to pass judgment, or proved to be valid beyond all reasonable question. If all the premises are of this character there can be no *valid* objections against them. To show that all the premises employed are of this nature would be to repeat the entire argument. For a refutation of all such objections, therefore, the student is referred to the relevant portions of this treatise. Two popular objections, however, will be noticed here.

1. The supposed opposition of Christianity to the progress of science. When it is said that Christianity is in harmony with science, that it is adapted to the intellectual development of individuals and nations, and hence that it is the religion man needs, it is objected that Christianity has always disputed the onward march of science, and that the premise in this argument is not wholly true.

(1) A brief and decisive answer is found in the distinction between Christianity and the teachings and lives of those

who profess to be Christians. The Scriptures will be searched in vain for a single word or fact which opposes or discourages the advancement of science. On the other hand, it furnishes the highest motives to the study of nature, and Christian men have ever been the most numerous and the most devoted seekers for scientific knowledge. If a thousand Dr. Drapers had succeeded in as many volumes like the "*Intellectual Development of Europe*" and "*The Conflict of Religion and Science*" in proving that all Christians, both Catholic and Protestant, in all ages, had opposed science, still it could have no logical force against Christianity. If all Christians have been such as this objection affirms, they have all been miserable exponents of the divine religion. As well say that Christianity sanctions the martyrdom of good men, because Roman Catholics tortured and burned Protestants. Nor can this assertion of opposition be sustained on the general ground that a revelation can not brook any human amendments and innovations. Christianity guards jealously its own domain, it is true; but it can manifest no such jealousy on subjects concerning which it is silent.

(2) But illogical as the objection may be, the case of the objector is not clearly made out. A few thousand bigoted Catholics or Protestants are not the Christian world. There never was a time when the great majority of Christian men would not have condemned the persecutors of Galileo, Kepler, or any other scientific discoverer, ancient or modern. The Pope and his Cardinals never were the Christian Church. The simple fact is that an unreasoning conservatism which clings to the old and rejects the new has always been a constituent of *human nature*, whether in the church or out of it. Opposition to the advancement of science on the part of Christians is the exception, and not the rule—an exception conspicuous on account of its rarity.

2. Again, when it is argued that by the fruits of Christianity it may be known to be divine, since these fruits are ever on the side of justice and benevolence, it is objected that Christianity has been the cause of many bloody wars and cruel persecutions; that is, the premise is denied.

(1) Not the presence of Christianity, but the *want* of it, has led to persecutions and wars. Were the early Christians the cause of their own martyrdom because they would not renounce their faith? Were *they* guilty rather than their persecutors? If Protestants were warred against by Catholic armies, were these Protestants the cause of such wars, and on account of these wars were they guilty before God? Is the man who does right always responsible for the consequences? If it could be proved that all the wars since Christ died were caused and carried on by professed Christians this would be no condemnation of Christ and his religion.

(2) We *know* that the teaching and tendency of Christianity is just the opposite.

II. *Objections to the conclusiveness of the arguments employed.* These objections fall into three sub-classes: Those which deny the relevancy of particular and independent arguments; those which deny the truth of one or both of the premises in particular arguments; those which lessen or deny the conclusiveness of a series of arguments when combined as they must be in all moral, or probable, reasoning. Whether the particular arguments employed are relevant and conclusive or not is a question of fact, and this fact is to be ascertained by examining the arguments themselves; this is also true of the conclusiveness of arguments when combined. Here, also, the reader might be referred to the appropriate parts of this work; but some of these objections are so common, and are thought to be so important, that a separate answer may be needed.

1. It is maintained by Evolutionists that Christianity is but one of a series of religions through whose experiences our race must pass on its upward way. They do not agree in regard to the members which compose this series. Comte, author of the so-called Positive Philosophy, gives four stages of this religious progress: fetichism, polytheism, metaphysics, and positivism. Herbert Spencer would begin lower, and, perhaps, go higher. It is assumed that man began as an animal, and that as he rises through the grades of intelligence he discards one form of religious superstition after another. It is said that the evidence for the divine origin of other members of this series is inconclusive; why not also the evidence for Christianity?

(1) Even on this theory, why may not Christianity be the last of the series; the ultimate and the perfect religion? In the development of organic beings man is believed to be the last of the series. He is perpendicular; beyond him progress can not go. Is not Christianity just as evidently perfect, a religion for the entire race and for all time?

(2) But there is no evidence of such a series, nor of such a law of development. (a) Man did not begin as a brute, nor as a human fool. So far as known, the earliest men had as much brain and mind as have men now. There is evidence that monotheism was the first (b) religious faith. (c) Metaphysics pervades all human thinking and all religious speculation. It can not be set off as a period by itself. (d) Positivism is only a name for a false system of metaphysics. Mental science is just as positive as any other science, since it gives certitude to all other science. Evolution is too immature and too much in doubt to furnish a basis for such an objection.

2. A second objection is presented in the statement that Christianity is just like all other religions. Other religions

are admitted to be false; hence Christianity is also false and the evidence for it is inconclusive. This objection will have no force when it is seen how wide is the difference between Christianity and all other systems.

(1) Of course, all religions are alike in many respects. (a) They agree in this, that they are all religions, or systems of divine faith and worship. (b) They must be alike in that they are partial expressions of man's common religious nature. A feeling of dependence, consciousness of moral responsibility, consciousness of sin, a desire for pardon, a fear of punishment, and a yearning for immortal life and love, are experiences of all men. (c) They would be alike on account of a common interpretation of that natural religion which all nations have recognized—God in nature, reward and retribution, duties to self, fellow-man, and God. (d) All religions are alike in having altars, sacrifices, temples, priests, and religious rites and worship. (e) They are still further alike in having, each and all, many correct moral maxims and many sublime doctrines. To maintain that Christianity is different from all other religions in *all respects* would be contrary to fact, and would also furnish ground for the objection that it is not adapted to human nature. A counterfeit is always similar to the genuine.

(2) The points of *contrast* show the superiority and the divine origin of Christianity. (a) It must be admitted that it is not just like all other religions. No religion is just like any other, for then it would be the same. Every religion has its characteristic differences. We arrange them into classes: Those belonging to the lowest tribes, and which are forms of fetichism and animal worship; those whose gods are deified men, and which make no claim to universality; those which present one god, pantheistic or monotheistic, and which aim at universality. Who will say that Mohammedanism, Brah-

minism, Zoroastrianism, the religion of Scandinavia, and that of the North American Indians, are all alike? No more is Christianity like any, or all, of the rest. (b) They differ in their results. Christianity purifies the heart and corrects the life. It destroys domestic and social tyranny. It elevates woman and secures the education of children. It undermines and destroys all social evils. It promotes science, and brings all nations into commercial harmony. It cares for the imbecile, the deaf and dumb, the blind and the poor, as no other religion does. He who does not accept this statement is ignorant of the facts. (c) It differs from all other systems in its fitness to become universal. It is founded on man's common religious nature. It meets the wants of all men, those that are deepest and most pressing. It has nothing in it partial and merely ethnic. It is suited to all ages and states of civilization, as well as to all zones. (d) The missionary zeal and effort produced by Christianity are peculiar. It is propagated by the power of truth and love, not by the sword; by the self-sacrifice of its missionaries, and not by despotic power. It is flooding the world with Bibles, and sending the living heralds of the cross into all lands. What other religion can compare with it? Buddhism has no mission stations in England or the United States. Missionary societies for the conversion of the world to Brahminism are not characteristic of Hindostan. (e) Christianity is the only religion that can endure in the light of reason and science, the only one that a scientific and civilized man can accept and propagate. The cosmogony of any religion except Christianity is enough to condemn it. Take, for example, Buddhism, which some would rank with Christianity: "It makes the earth consist, reckoning from its foundation upwards, of a layer of wind, a layer of water, a layer of substance resembling honey, a layer of rock, and a layer of

soil. The minute details of its monstrous cosmogony, with its description of fabulous oceans inhabited by fishes thousands of miles in length, and of wonderful forests abounding in trees four hundred miles high, and haunted by singing lions that leap two miles at a bound, occupy many chapters of its sacred volume." It would weary to go the round of all false religions and show how equally inconsistent they all are in the light of science.

Different as Christianity is from all other systems in these outward effects and distinguishing facts, it is still more diverse in the inward and fundamental causes of these outward manifestations. This list of differences is continued. (f) No other religion can produce one hundredth part of the evidence in its support. (g) No other religion presents so clear, so full, and so faultless a revelation of God. The character of the God that is worshipped is fundamental and central in all religious systems. This revelation of God in Christianity begins with his appearance as the Almighty, the Creator of heaven and earth. He is made known to Moses as the Self-existent One, and finally Jesus makes him known as "Our Father who art in Heaven." Every scene in the life of Christ is a photograph of Our Father's character. It is an insult to the average intelligence of men to institute a formal comparison of this one God with the idols and chimeras of heathenism. (h) Christianity is unlike all other religions in having a divine founder and savior. It is superior in that Christ is admitted to be superior to all other religious teachers. (i) Its great object is not priestcraft, but to save men from *sin*. In the sacrifice of Christ it presents the *highest possible* assurance of pardon and acceptance with God. (j) The gospel has a unique and divine power to bring men to repentance. This power, when analyzed, is found to be strictly philosophical, and the only efficient agent possible in

the case. Think how the ranks of the army of the Lord are kept full by millions of conversions every year; and all these converts are subdued by the truth and pathos of the cross. (k) Christianity comes with a divine sanction. It brought life and immortality *to light.* It gives us not a mere hope and a theory concerning the life to come, but a grand *fact.* It gives us moral and religious precepts, not as opinions of philosophers, but as the law of the Lord. With all morality and religion it connects the *God-sense*, and so binds human conscience. Even if it taught only what of truth may be found in other systems, this one characteristic would vindicate its superiority. (l) Finally, this religion is absolute; it comprises all religious truth essential to this life and excludes all error. It is not that false religions have beautiful and sublime teachings, but that they have puerile, corrupt, and absurd things, while Christianity has not. It is not that Socrates, Confucius, and Buddha uttered some exalted sayings, but that these are mingled with false morality, absurd science, and illustrated by heathenish lives; while Christ taught, lived, and died like a God. Take a single example. Buddhism gives the following way of escape from the ills of life: Existence is attended with *misery;* the cause of misery is *desire;* hence the *suppression of desire* is the one thing needful. The believer, therefore, must get rid of all evil desires, then of ignorance, then of doubt, then of heresy, then of unkindness and vexation; and this last sounds like Christian doctrine. But when this stage is reached, what is next? *Nirvana.* What is Nirvana? The extinction of personal being, *annihilation!* Probably that *would* remedy all desire and misery!

The statement is not true that Christianity is just like all other religions, and the objection falls.

3. A third objection to the conclusiveness of the evidence

may be stated in the following words: The evidence for the miracles of Christianity is just like that for all other miracles; it is inconclusive in regard to the former, and so must it be in regard to the latter. The miracles of Christianity are those recorded in the Bible, especially those of the New Testament; the evidence for these is affirmed to be like that for the miracles of the Apocryphal books, ecclesiastical miracles, and those of heathen mythologies. That this objection is not founded in fact is perfectly evident from the following contrasts:

(1) The Christian miracles are highly *probable*, but the others are as highly *improbable*. The nature and needs of the human soul in connection with God's power, wisdom, and goodness, have produced, among men, a definite and persistent expectation of a divine revelation; nay, such a revelation is demanded by the principles of divine benevolence and justice. But, in its very nature, a revelation is a miracle, nor could a revelation be established and made authoritative except by miraculous testimony. One claiming to speak for God would be a subject for ridicule if the only credentials he brought were some human achievement; as, that he had written a poem, gained a great battle, or made some important scientific discovery. Miracles, therefore, for this purpose, are highly probable because a revelation is. Atheism is the only escape from this probability, but there is no argument here with the Atheist. The existence of God is a postulate laid down in the beginning.

For the other class of so-called miracles there is no such probability. It is exceedingly improbable that Heaven would work a miracle simply to save an individual from some temporal calamity, to satisfy curiosity, or to gratify the pride of some charlatan. The reasons for working such miracles at all would be reasons for *their continuance throughout all*

time; but if wrought continually they would cease to be miracles and become natural phenomena, thus losing all their power and becoming absurd. It is unspeakably improbable that the Divine Being would enter upon any such pseudo miraculous displays.

(2) The great *purpose* for which the Christian miracles were wrought is widely different from the various purposes of the contrasted so-called miracles. If an action attributed to a certain man is worthy of him, like him, and such as naturally and continually are emanating from his heart and brain, it would be easy to believe; if, on the other hand, it was such a deed as, considering his moral character, could not have been performed by him, belief would be impossible. Now, on what occasions and for what purposes would the great God interfere with human affairs? Would it be to redeem a world from sin and to place in human hearts an undying hope, or to destroy the flies which troubled St. Bernard when he was preaching? One might well believe the former, for it would be like the Heavenly Father, but belief of the latter would be impossible. If the calling back to life of the widow's son of Nain was to authenticate the Savior's claim to be divine, and to show that he held in his hands the issues of life and death, the miracle had a god-like purpose; but if it was simply to assuage the sorrow of the widow it would be unreasonable; for God would not have cared for this widow simply, and left the myriads of other mourners to their unmitigated grief. The miracles that are vaunted as being equally worthy with the New Testament miracles have not usually the excuse that they were for the benefit of some individual; they were for puerile, unworthy, or vicious purposes.

(3) The miracles of Christianity are worthy of their divine source, while the contrasted miracles are scarcely worthy of

their human origin. The miracles of the New Testament, without an exception, are various, dignified, unmistakable, successful, and consecrated by the high purpose for which they were wrought. The contrasted wonders, as a class, are grotesque and unworthy. They are the same in kind as multitudes of marvels known to be the result of deception and so-called magic. A large proportion of them have been exploded, showing the character of the whole class. An Apocryphal Gospel relates that Joseph made the throne of Herod too short, but the child Jesus drew it out to the right length and remedied the blunder. Thomas a Becket was wont to prove the resurrection possible by restoring to life dead lambs, pigs, and geese. St. Francis preached to a congregation of doves, crows, and other birds, which showed their appreciation of the sermon by stretching their necks, opening their mouths, and flapping their wings; when the benediction was pronounced they all flew away, like any other sensible audience. Need one recount the fables of mythology and the modern miracles in answer to prayer—modern miracles which, if true, would only serve to show how fickle and partial and unaccountable are the doings of Heaven!

(4) The miracles of Christianity are an *essential and inseparable* part of the Christian system, a system of which all, except the miraculous part, *is admitted to be true;* while the contrasted alleged miracles are constituent parts of systems of religion *known to be false*, and assumed to be false in the objection we are discussing.

(a) The miracles are an essential and inseparable part of Christianity. The religion itself is a miracle. Christ was a miracle, his atonement was a miracle, the resurrection of Jesus was a miracle, the descent of the Holy Spirit was a miracle, and the Ascension was a miracle. Take out the

miraculous portions and all these fundamental facts are gone; all divine authority is gone; all morality is gone, for this is all enforced by religious considerations; all perfect example is gone, for Christ and his Apostles were impostors. Take away the supernatural part, and the morality left would not be so good as a garment of fig-leaves—fig-leaves which could not cover the nakedness of Earth's first sinners. The miracles are not a creation, nor a fungus growth, but the very core and substance of Christianity. Let no one think he can give up the miracles and still retain the morality and the religion.

(b) The same certitude, therefore, pertains to the miracles as to any other portion of the Christian system, the same as to those portions which are admitted to be self-evident and unquestioned truth. A single stone can not be made to hang in the air unsupported; but build this stone into a solid arch and it will hang there over the centre of the stream till the arch itself falls into ruin. The miracles are a stone built into the grand arch-way of Christianity, and so long as any other stone shall keep its place so long the miracles will not fall. Is the morality divine and self-evident? so must the miraculous facts on which it rests be most certain. Do all accept the ordinary portions in the life of Jesus? so must they accept the extraordinary, for all rest on the same testimony. Was Christ sinless in other respects? so was he when he claimed to work miracles. Must the wonderful results of Christianity be accepted? so must be the miraculous facts which are the only adequate cause of these results. Must the miracle of prophecy be admitted? so must be these supernatural facts which are the more wonderful fulfilment of prophecy. Is it reasonable to accept the rich promises and hopes of Christianity? it is equally reasonable to accept those manifestations without which these promises and hopes would be nothing other than delusion and mockery.

(c) Take, for example, the resurrection of Christ. This is not a naked, unsupported miracle, but one built into the solid arch. Unquestionable as is the testimony of the Apostles, to whom Jesus made himself known by many "infallible proofs," and with whom he companied during forty days, still this is but a small part of the testimony. It was an event forward to which looked four thousand years of religious development, and back to which looks the whole Christian world as it beholds the rising sun of every Lord's Day. It was the resurrection of one who "spake as never man spake," even when he said he "would rise on the third day;" of one who was without sin and without fault; of one who had fulfilled all the Messianic prophecies down to the moment when the stone was rolled to the door of his sepulchre; of one who wielded divine power over nature, over man, and over the spirit-world; of one who himself raised the dead. It is only as we feel the force of Peter's statement when he said, "It was not possible that he should be holden of it," that we shall fully realize the height of this great argument.

(d) On the other hand, the miracles contrasted with those of Christianity derive no support whatever from the systems of which they form a part. Those systems are false, and they carry down with them all these pretended miracles.

(5) The miracles of Christianity and the contrasted marvels differ vastly in the special testimony by which it is sought to establish them.

(a) Usually, the testimony for these false miracles may be received and yet no miracle be seen; the miracle, in such cases, is an unwarranted inference. Some of those who visit the shrine of a Roman Catholic saint may recover from some malady, but there is no miracle about it. A statue of the Virgin Mary might be seen to weep, but the inference of a miracle would be a false one, for it might be found that those

tears were caused by the condensation of steam rising from a vessel of boiling water. The office of a mesmeric mountebank may be full of cast-off crutches, but this would not prove him to be a miracle-worker; many diseases depend on the state of the mind; and many of the victims of this deceiver would be glad to get their crutches back. A majority of these appearances correctly reported by the witnesses are readily accounted for on natural principles.

It is not so with the miracles of Christ. No deception was possible; the number, variety, and public performance forbid it. Jesus and the Apostles professed to work miracles, and they could not have been deceived in reference to their own power. These miracles are not capable of scientific explanation. They were real miracles or they were conscious frauds.

(b) The New Testament witnesses testified to what *they had seen.* Their testimony is not a rumor, a report taken at second or third hand, a newspaper item, nor an account of something done in distant ages and countries. Not so with the other class of witnesses. Who pretends to have seen the metamorphoses of the pagan deities? The Apocryphal miracles are readily detected as counterfeits of the genuine. Ecclesiastical miracles have no better vouchers.

(c) In the case of the Christian miracles, there was no temptation to fraud. In preaching Jesus and the resurrection, the Apostles had everything to lose, but nothing to gain, if their report was false. On the other side there have always been manifold temptations to deceive the simple-hearted people. The love of money, of licentious indulgence, and of power, have always combined to pay the successful deceiver an ample reward.

(d) The witnesses for the miracles of Christianity gave such evidence of absolute honesty and truthfulness as can

not, for a moment, be pretended in behalf of the opposite class. Never was it known that a sane man suffered martyrdom before he would renounce an unprofitable falsehood—a falsehood known by him to be such, and known to be without promise of reward in wealth, fame, power, or in any other way. Yet, if the Apostles were not truthful, they did this very thing. They all, save one, suffered martyrdom, as did many thousands of the first disciples of Christ; they suffered for no other reason than this testimony for Christianity; and this testimony was that Jesus "died, was buried, and rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." That such testimony should be dishonest and untruthful would be a greater miracle than the resurrection of Jesus. No eye-witness for these spurious miracles ever gave such evidence of honesty. What monk ever died on account of his testimony to ecclesiastical miracles? Generally, no one cares whether these pretended miracles are true or false, but if any one had sifted the testimony and followed it back to the original witnesses, would they have been found to be such witnesses as the Apostles of Jesus Christ?

It is *not true*, therefore, that the miracles of Christianity are just like the false ecclesiastical, apocryphal, and pagan miracles, nor that the evidence for the one is no more conclusive than that for the other.

UNANSWERED OBJECTIONS AND THEIR FORCE.

There is possibly a third class of objections, and one not considered in the foregoing discussion. We have gone over the entire field and have examined the most popular and formidable allegations against Christianity; but if the answers

above given may not be satisfactory to some persons, and if there may be objections lying within and without our classifications not brought into this discussion, what degree of weight should be allowed to such objections? Objections fully answered do not simply go for nothing. Every objection that is answered comes over to the side of Christianity, since it strengthens the conclusion that the Christian hypothesis includes, and accounts for, all the facts in the case and must, therefore, be the true one. Now what is the force of unanswered objections? By what principles are they to be estimated? Are objections necessarily fatal; and if not, how far may their influence extend? Of course, every adverse argument must stand or fall on its own special merits, but there are certain general considerations of great importance.

1. There may be unanswered and unanswerable objections to a proposition whose truth can not be questioned. Motion is certainly possible; yet it is objected that a body can neither move where it is nor where it is not, and, therefore, that it can not move at all. There are lines, and yet one can not see how a line can be made up of points which have only the sole attribute of position. The minute-hand *does* overtake and pass the hour-hand; but there is this objection: if the minute-hand is at twelve and the hour-hand at one, while the former passes from one to twelve the latter will have moved along; while the first moves over *this* space the second will still have moved on, and so *ad infinitum;* hence the minute-hand *can never* overtake the hour-hand. Whether these objections are answerable or not, the man who does not *know* the answer, *must believe*, notwithstanding the objection. An objection, therefore, is not necessarily fatal; nay, it may have no influence whatever. If there were

unanswerable objections to Christianity, they might have the least possible influence upon our faith.

2. In moral reasoning there usually is a balancing of arguments for and against; there are objections, but they may be far from being decisive. There are objections against the study of the ancient classics, but there are stronger arguments for their study; every student who chooses his own course is compelled to weigh and decide. So, it is no matter of surprise, if there should be unanswerable objections to Christianity; as reasonable and conscientious men we should be guided by the preponderance of evidence.

3. The last paragraph suggests a third principle. Often a question lies between a given proposition and some other. In such a case the decision turns not upon the objections brought against the given proposition, but upon whether the objections to the given proposition are more and stronger than those against any other proposition. There may be objections against Christianity, but are there not more and stronger ones against any and all adverse systems? Infidelity is negative. It finds it pleasanter and safer to destroy than to build. It has never been able to hold a positive theory. Its changeful history is a perfect vindication of Christianity, which is ever the same. An investigator should weigh the objections on both sides. In a naval battle, consider the weak points in your own ship as well as those of your enemy.

4. Again, it should be remembered how many objections are made to anything and everything. There are objections and objections. Some men were born and bred in the objective case. Some object to a republic and declare that an absolute monarchy would be far better. One scientific writer objects to the cause of temperance, alleging that the "fittest should survive," and that intemperance is nature's

way of destroying the unfit. Hence drunkards and their children should be permitted, and helped by the saloons, to perish speedily! Objections are made to the benevolence of Christianity which cares for the helpless, the imbecile, and the aged. Nothing is easier than to invent a score of plausible objections.

5. An objection, however strong, may be very limited in its influence. It may affect but a single statement, promise, or inference. If the passage in Josephus in which Jesus is referred to should be proved to be spurious, there would be little loss. If a single prophecy should be misapplied, the great body of prophecy would still remain; the absorption of a single ray, or even a partial eclipse of the sun, would not dim perceptibly the brightness of day. If the Fourth Gospel should be given up, the other three would hold the field. The vast accumulation of Christian evidences, gathered from all history and all science, is not diminished by the plucking away of straws. Tourists may send large rocks thundering down the mountain side, but the Alps themselves will still remain.

6. Finally, a large proportion of the objections to Christianity are *wholly subjective*, are difficulties in the objector rather than in the religion. Most objections are not absolute, but relative; they are objections growing out of the objector's relation to the subject-matter—out of his ignorance, his pride, or his moral condition. (a) There are no difficulties in mathematics nor in nature. Everything in mathematics is as plain and true as that two and two make four. The objections and difficulties are in the mind of the student; in his ignorance or want of application. Nature is all right, but not so her blundering investigators, who place many false theories and other difficulties in their own way. What is true of every other subject of investigation, is equally true

of Christianity. (b) Ignorance is a prolific source o. trouble. One who is undrilled in the ancient methods and styles of writing, and who has no skill in the art of interpretation, will find obstacles in every paragraph. One who knows scarcely anything of history can not see demonstration in the historical argument, nor can he untangle the fallacies of an ingenious objector. Ignorance of mental science will keep one blind to the perfect adaptation of Christianity to the human soul. A thorough education, not in chemistry and zoology merely, but in the sciences which Christianity involves, and especially in the Bible itself, would abolish a host of objections and silence many an opponent of this holy religion. (c) Many objections originate in pride. They are not objections against the doctrine nor the evidence, but to a course on the part of the objector, which would antagonize his pride. He desires to maintain a false consistency, to pass for a peculiar and a smart man, and to avoid the acknowledgement of error. (d) Many of these so-called objections to Christianity originate in a settled hostility to its requirements. "The fool hath said in his *heart*, There is no God." It is not an intellectual conviction, but he wishes there were no God. He is a fool *morally* and not intellectually, since he has sense enough to see that if there is a holy, just, and almighty God, it will not be well for him. The hearts of the children of men are "fully set in them to do evil," but this religion requires them to cease to do evil and learn to do well. The objector does not wish to give up his ill-gotten wealth, to forsake his wicked companions, nor to renounce his sinful amusements. He dislikes to undertake the new duties required. He draws back from the life of self-denial and sacrifice which might be his. Above all, there is a deep repugnance to the repentance, confession, and humiliation demanded. To one who knows how hard it is to induce the

confession of a wrong, or to reconcile enemies to one another, there is no cause for astonishment in such a state of mind. Unquestionably there are many honest doubters and seekers after truth; but the moral condition of men is the chief reason why they have difficulty with Christianity. "He who is willing to do his will, shall know of the doctrine."

DISCUSSION OF OBJECTIONS.

I. Objections to Christianity as a System of Religion.

1. *Objections which lie with equal force against nature.*
   - (1) To the Bible representation of God.
   - (2) To the Bible account of the origin of evil.
   - (3) Christianity delayed and partially diffused.
   - (4) The doctrine of the Atonement.
   - (5) Salvation depends on faith.
2. *Objections which arise from the superhuman nature of revelation.*
   - (1) Mystery of the divine nature.
   - (2) Mystery of man's nature.
   - (3) Mystery of the future life.
   - (4) Mystery of the incarnation of Christ.
   - (5) Mystery of the resurrection.
   - (6) The mystery of sin.

3. *Objections which arise from false views.*

(1) False views of inspiration.
(2) False views of the purpose of revelation.
(3) False views of the perfection to be expected.
(4) False views concerning the divine purposes.
(5) False views of conversion.
(6) False views of eternal punishment.
(7) Incorrect methods of Biblical interpretation.

II. OBJECTIONS TO THE EVIDENCE ADDUCED.

1. *Objections to the premises employed.*

(1) Supposed opposition of Christianity to science.
(2) Christianity the cause of persecution and war.

2. *Objections to the conclusiveness of the arguments.*

(1) To particular arguments.
(2) To combined arguments.
(a) Theory of Evolution and Positivism.
(b) Christianity is like other religions.
(c) Christian miracles are like other miracles.

III. UNANSWERED OBJECTIONS AND THEIR FORCE.

1. *They may have no effect.*
2. *In moral reasoning there is a balancing of arguments.*
3. *There may be more objections to infidel systems.*
4. *Objections may be made to anything.*
5. *An objection may be limited in its application.*
6. *Most objections are wholly subjective.*

(a) On account of ignorance.
(b) On account of pride.
(c) On account of moral hostility.

PART III.

ARGUMENT

FROM THE

OLD TESTAMENT.

ARGUMENT FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. We have seen that the New Testament is genuine and credible; we have seen that the foundation principles of all historic truthfulness must be removed before we can reasonably deny that Jesus was a real personage and the founder of Christianity; we have seen that from the established truth of the New Testament we logically, and, therefore, certainly, derive the Messiahship and divinity of Jesus. Still further, Christianity as a system of religion, considered in itself and as cut off from the great historic facts which gave it origin and power, is seen to be in perfect harmony with nature and reason: it so commends itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God that nine-tenths of its precepts and requirements are granted without controversy; science, which overthrows all false religions, can not destroy this, but brings up on every side corroborative testimony; it agrees with the works of God in method and teaching; it is adapted to human nature, and especially to its moral renovation and support; the experience of mankind for eighteen hundred years proves it to be the religion that man needs, and which alone can lead him to higher and still higher planes of civilization; and we have seen that in many wonderful respects it is supernatural and superhuman, and, as a logical necessity, that its author must have been divine.

Now, how could this testimony for the divinity of Jesus be increased, doubled, and even more than doubled? Were the proposition we are proving only a matter of history, or of abstract truth; were it a question of less importance than the

salvation from sin and death of countless myriads of immortal souls, the argument might be permitted to end here. But, in a case like this, neither human reason nor divine mercy could remain satisfied unless all possible proof had been brought to bear. How, then, could this testimony be increased? (1) The historical proof could not be made stronger than it is. More Gospels, another Acts of Apostles, another score of corroborating Epistles, could not have increased the certainty. It is difficult to see how the evidences of genuineness could have been strengthened in number or kind, or how the lives and characters of the sacred writers could have been more worthy of implicit confidence. (2) The evidence derived from nature and reason is all that could be expected; for, when it is remembered that nature is asked to corroborate the supernatural and reason to sit in judgment upon a revelation, the wonder is that the proof from this source is so abundant and satisfactory. (3) Mathematical proof can not reasonably be demanded, for it would not be relevant. Such proof does not apply to history. Indeed, no mathematical proof can establish a fact. It can demonstrate that *if* a certain figure is a triangle, then the sum of its angles is equal to two right angles; but it can not prove that the figure *is* a triangle. (4) Scientific experiment and verification can not be required; the ages will not turn back, the events of history will not repeat themselves. The question still remains, how shall the evidence be increased? (5) What is impossible to man may be possible with God. Prophecy and its fulfilment would more than meet this demand. Prophecies minute, exact, written centuries before, and indisputably fulfilled; prophecies fully presenting the character of the Messiah and the events of his life, and written so long before as to imply the divine plan and fore-knowledge, would have the conclusiveness of a mathematical demonstration.

2. Prophecy would not only greatly increase the evidence, but it would have peculiar advantages over other kinds of proof. (1) It would be free from some of the objections which are supposed to lie against miracles. It is not contrary to general human experience that men should write books. They are only ordinary facts, that the Old Testament and the New Testament were written and that nearly five centuries lie between them; no extraordinary proof, either in kind or degree, is needed to establish this. In the main, the *facts are still in existence;* for there lies the Bible with its ancient records; and there lie the ruined cities, the desolate countries, the broken nationalities: and the church still exists vital with the spirit of truth and the energy of the earlier years—all of which are counterparts of prophetic utterances. If when the two classes of facts are compared a result superior to human intelligence is recognized, still this miracle is not one transpiring in a far-away time, but rather one taking place in our own time, and before our own eyes. (2) This kind of evidence would be continually growing in breadth and cogency. As the prophetic and historic scrolls are unrolled side by side, instances of fulfilment will be greatly multiplied, and the farther the event from the time when the prophet lived the more sure the indication of divine foresight. (3) Prophecy would open an inexhaustible mine of demonstrative proofs. The development of this line of evidence might begin with the first sin and run through all preparatory ages and dispensations. It might be made to run on indefinitely after the Messiah came; and so this argument might rise higher and higher as the ages passed away. Long lines of prophets might add to its strength, and all history, the past and that which is yet to be, might be made to bear concurrent testimony. And besides, this kind of argument no human ingenuity could counterfeit, and no power of sophistry

could lessen its cogency. (4) Prophecy would be a kind of proof peculiar to Christianity. As a matter of fact no false religion can lay claim to such evidence. No impostor would risk his claims and the success of his cause on pretended prophecies, reaching far into the future, and whose fulfilment would be entirely beyond his control. (5) This kind of evidence would invest Christianity with a peculiar grandeur, with somewhat of the grandeur of Him who "inhabiteth eternity," and who "sees the end from the beginning." Its origin would be in that "beginning" when the Word was with God and was God; and its consummation when the angel shall proclaim that time shall be no more. (6) Finally, the prophetic evidence would be adapted to give confidence in the Scriptures as the word of God; confidence in its promises and threatenings, and in its revelations of what is in the world of spirits, and of what will be after death and the Judgment. The enthusiasm of the great host of the redeemed as it marches on would rise higher and higher, and its confidence in its mighty Leader would become more and more implicit as the incidents of every campaign and the results of every great battle were found to be in exact harmony with the predictions of ages gone.

3. The criteria of true prophecy are the following: (1) The event must be beyond the power of man to foresee. It is not a vision of hope or fear, not the result of a mathematical calculation, not the forecast of political or scientific sagacity, and not a fortunate conjecture. (2) It must be demonstrated that the prediction was written before the event. (3) The prediction must be applicable to the event. (4) The language of the prediction must be unambiguous and unmistakable. (5) The prediction must have a clear and demonstrable fulfilment.

4. This argument from prophecy will have the greatest weight under the following conditions:

(1) If it shall be shown that the writers of the Old Testament were historically truthful and reliable.

(2) If it shall be shown that the writers of the Old Testament left on record many remarkable prophecies which have met with complete fulfilment; and, hence, that these writers were not only truthful but inspired men.

(3) If it shall be shown that these truthful and inspired writers left on record a long line of prophecies concerning the Messiah and his kingdom which find exact fulfilment in Jesus and his religion.

When these three conditions are established as matters of fact, then this argument from the Old Testament will have been made the strongest possible, and then it will of necessity and logically follow that "Jesus is the Christ the Son of God."

PROPOSITION FIRST.

THE WRITERS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT ARE HISTORICALLY THUTHFUL AND RELIABLE.

Sacred history is more than two thousand years earlier than profane history. As soon as profane history becomes authentic, or as soon as we find any relevant historic monuments, we may begin to apply the tests which they furnish us.

I. *The genealogy of the sons of Noah* as given in the tenth chapter of Genesis is our first example. The celebrated geographer, Dr. Carl Ritter, declares that of all the writings of antiquity none are receiving such confirmation from the modern researches in geography and ethnography as this tenth chapter of Genesis and the works of Herodotus.

1. The very names of the earliest peoples and countries are monumental testimony to the truth of this chapter. These names have come down to us from a remote antiquity. If engraved upon the rocks of the lands to which they are applied they could not have been more closely associated with those lands, nor have been made more changeless. On an ancient map which lies before me are found the names of Noah's grandsons: Elam (Persia), Asshur (Assyria), Lud (Lydia), Cush (Ethiopia), Mizraim (Egypt), Canaan, Madai (Media), Javan (Ionians). At a glance it is seen that these families expanded into nations and gave their names to the countries which they inhabited. The ancient countries, as well as this genealogical table, give also the names of many

a great-grandson of Noah: *Gomer*, the Gimri, or Kimiré, of northwestern Asia; *Tiras*, or the Thracians; *Elishah*, or the Æolians; *Kittim*, the people of Kition or Cyprus; *Dodanim*, or *Rodanim*, the Rhodii of the island of Rhodes; *Seba*, Sebæans; *Sabtah*, the Sabota of Pliny and Ptolemy; *Lehabim*, Libyans; *Parthusim*, the people of Pathros; *Philistim*, the Philistines; *Eber*, from whom descended the Hebrews; *Aram*, the Armenians; and *Joktan*, the Kahtan of Central Arabia. Besides these names, easily traced and identified, there are many others not so evident, but still not in doubt. These names and this distribution of the nations in the ancient world are confirmed by all we know from other sources.

2. The ethnic affinities given in this tenth chapter of Genesis are confirmed by modern science. (1) This chapter classifies all the various races of men under three heads: the sons of Japhet, the sons of Ham, and the sons of Shem. Modern ethnological science, after a careful analysis of race peculiarities, languages, and history, has agreed on a triple division of mankind, and speaks of all races as either Semitic, Aryan, or Turanian. (2) Scientists divide the Aryan branch into five classes: 1. Indo-Persian; 2. Celts; 3. Teutons; 4. Græco-Persians; and 5. Slaves. "Moses, anticipating this discovery by the space of above three thousand years, gives as members of one family—1. Madai, the Medes; 2. Gomer, the Cymry or Celts; 3 Tiras, the Thracians (Teutons); 4. Javan, the Ionians (Greeks); and 5. Magog, the Scythians and Sarmatians (Slaves)." The only difference between the two schemes is that "Moses adds further a sixth race, Tubal, the Tibarene, and a seventh, Meshech, the Moschi,—races which rapidly declined in power between B. C. 1100 and 400, and which perished without leaving either a literature or descendants, whence modern ethnological science takes no notice of them." (3) The sons of Ham were Cush, Mizraim,

Phut, and Canaan. These four Hamitic races are identified with the Ethiopians, the Egyptians, the Nubians, and the people of Canaan; for it must be remembered that the ancient names of Ethiopia and Egypt were Cush and Mizraim. As Moses assigned to the descendants of Japhet the North and Northwest, so he teaches that the sons of Ham settled in the South and Southwest; and he groups the four nations as belonging to the one ethnic family. Now modern ethnology has nothing against this, but rather finds in this reason a number of languages, partly ancient and partly modern, which have common characteristics, and which evidently constitute one group. (4) The sons of Shem were Elam, Asshur, Arphaxad, Lud, and Aram. These developed, according to Moses, into the third group of nations. These have all been identified except the people descended from Arphaxad. Ethnic science properly agrees with this statement.

Certainly the author of Genesis stated the truth in regard to the distribution and ethnic affinities of the ancient nations, or there is no truth in modern researches and classifications.

3. There is truth in this chapter of Genesis concerning what were the earliest civilizations. In general the Bible teaches that the valleys of the Euphrates and the Nile were the homes of the most advanced nations. All the lines of history center back upon these lands, and there we find the most ancient ruins. The account in this chapter is, however, specific. (1) The founder of the Babylonian monarchy was Nimrod; its site is Shinar, or Babylonia; its ethnic character is Cushite, or Ethiopian, for Nimrod is a descendant of Cush. Its great cities are four—Babel (Babylon), Erech, Accad, and Calneh. Now "recent researches in Mesopotamia have revealed to us, as the earliest seat of power and civilization in Western Asia, a Cushite kingdom, the site of which

was Lower Babylonia, a main characteristic of which is its possession of large cities, and which even seem in an especial way to affect, in its political arrangements, the number *four*. Babel, Accad, and Erech are names which occur in the geographic nomenclature of this monarchy. Nimrod is a personage in its mythology." (2) Immediately connected with this account of Babylon, we have given the rise of the Assyrian kingdom. "Out of that land"—the land of Shinar —"went forth Asshur, and builded Nineveh and the streets of the city, and Calah, and Resen between Nineveh and Calah; the same is a great city." Here we have three things: (a) Babylonia was earlier than Nineveh; (b) that Asshur and his people were driven out by the encroachments of Nimrod and his people, and so builded Nineveh; (c) and that the Babylonians and the Assyrians were of different races, Nimrod being a Cushite and a descendant of Ham, and the Assyrians being the descendants of Asshur, a son of Shem. Till within a few years these statements seemed to involve great difficulties; for it was taken for granted that Nineveh was a colony of Babylon, and, of course, that the people of these cities were of the same ethnic origin. But late researches have demolished this view. The recovered monuments show that the Mosaic account is, in all respects, true. The *early* Babylonians are proved to have been an entirely distinct race from the Assyrians, whose language is Semitic, while that of their southern neighbors is Cushite. (3) Again, the early civilization of Egypt is fully attested in Genesis, chapter twelve, where we have an account of Abraham's going into Egypt. This account clearly teaches three things: (a) That the people of the neighboring nations often went into Egypt on account of famine in their own land; (b) that Egypt was already under a settled government, having a king and subordinate princes; (c) that the king of

Egypt was called *Pharaoh.* Now it is admitted that Egypt was the earliest of nations, and both Herodotus and the hieroglyphic inscriptions, as read by modern scholarship, give the king the title of Pharaoh. That the valley of the Nile was a refuge to other peoples in a time of scarcity needs no proof.

II. We have another illustration of the historic truthfulness of the Old Testament in the striking confirmation of the record in the *fourteenth chapter of Genesis, where we have an account of the battle of four kings with five others, and of Abraham's rescuing Lot.* Here three things are distinctly implied. (a) That between the time of Nimrod and that of Abraham power had passed from the Babylonians to a neighboring nation, that of the Elamites; (b) that the king of Elam in the days of Abraham was Chedor-laomer; (c) and that, assisted by his vassal kings, he made successful war on the kings of the lower Jordan. While there is nothing to contradict any portion of this narrative, these three points are fully established. The change in the position of Babylon, the rise of the Elamites to the supremacy, and that Elamitic expeditions were made into Palestine and the adjacent countries about this time, are witnessed to by documents recently disinterred from the mounds of Mesopotamia. The name of the Elamitic king, though not yet actually found on any monument, is composed of elements both of which occur separately in Elamitic documents, and the whole name, Chedor-laomer, is of a type exactly similar to other Elamitic names of the period. One called Chedor-mabuk is denominated the "Ravager of the West." This incidental testimony of long-buried inscriptions is more convincing than more full and direct testimony would be, since it precludes all suspicion of contrivance and fraud.

III. *The Israelitish bondage in Egypt, the Exodus, and the conquest of Canaan* are strongly confirmed by all relevant monumental and profane history, while there is no conflicting testimony.

1. The central fact of the Exodus and the final settlement in Canaan. Four historians have left a record of this event: *Hecatæus* and *Manetho*, who wrote in the third century before our era, who were intimately acquainted with Egyptian tradition and history, and who are regarded by Josephus as of high authority; *Chæremon*, who wrote about the beginning of the Christian era; and *Tacitus*, belonging to the last of the first Christian century. Though these accounts differ one from the other as well as from the Scriptures, yet they substantially agree in respect to the main events. They agree (1) that there was an Exodus from Egypt of unclean persons, who rejected Egyptian customs, refused to worship their gods, and killed for food the animals which they held sacred; (2) that this Exodus was connected with Joseph and Moses; (3) that southern Syria was the country into which the unclean persons withdrew; (4) and that this Exodus took place in the reign of a certain Amenophis, son of Rameses and father of Sethos, about B. C. 1400–1300.

2. The condition and customs of Egypt are correctly given. So many, so minute, and so accurate, are these references that they could not have been given except by an eye-witness of the scenes described; they are so accurate as to render the supposition of fabrication in the after time perfectly absurd. This argument requires only a brief synopsis: The king was called Pharaoh; he was an absolute monarch; he had his counselors and ministers; he had an Oriental court; he had a chief baker and a chief cup-bearer; he rode in a chariot; there were priests, soldiers, physicians, and herdsmen; there were magicians; they practiced

embalming; the priests were the ruling caste; they disliked shepherds; they permitted the intermixture of the sexes in social gatherings; their women were noted for unchastity; they employed slaves; they traded in the spices of Arabia; they washed guests' feet; they sat at meals; they used meat and wine; they practiced divination with cups; they used gold and silver as money; they used chariots in war; they cultivated wheat, barley, flax, and rye; they kept cattle partly in the field and partly in the stable; they stored water in vessels of wood and stone; employed mid-wives; used papyrus for boats; had furnaces and ovens; used kneading-troughs, walking-sticks, hand-mills, bitumen and pitch; they irrigated the land; and used, as common articles of food, fish, cucumbers, melons, onions, garlic, and leeks; the kings kept large numbers of horses. The points of discrepancy that have been made are the following: (1) They are said to have had camels and asses; (2) the blasting of the grain; (3) the cultivation of the vine and the use of wine; (4) the use of animal food; (5) the employment of eunuchs; (6) possibility of famine; (7) the possibility of a marriage such as that of Joseph. Yet every one of these points is turned against the objector, and the accuracy of Genesis fully established.

3. The bondage in Egypt. The Bible account implies the following things: (1) The Jewish race was reduced to slavery. (2) Their lives were made bitter with hard service. (3) They worked making brick, building houses, and toiling in the fields. (4) They were liable to cruel scourgings. (5) Their overseers were often punished if the tasks were not exacted. (6) They used straw and stubble in making brick. (7) They irrigated the fields. Now, almost every point in this list is capable of illustration from the monuments. They had slaves, as the monuments show, and these were usually

foreigners. They mingled chopped straw and stubble with the clay, as the brick now show. The remains of the treasure cities still exist. The task-masters, as they appear on the monuments, carry rods for the punishment of slaves. Every circumstance corroborates the truth of the Bible narrative.

4. The route from Egypt to Sinai. Thorough explorations of the Sinaitic Peninsula have resulted in identifying nearly all the encampments on the way to Sinai. "The encampment by the Red Sea, mentioned in Num. 33 : 10, proves that the Israelites kept down the coast after crossing the Red Sea somewhere in the neighborhood of Suez. They first 'went three days in the wilderness and found no water.' They then came to Marah, where the water was bitter, so that they could not drink it, and from there they removed to Elim, whence they removed to their encampment by the Red Sea. Now the traveller to this day, on his journey to Mt. Sinai, after traversing a long strip of barren desert, without water, that extends down the coast, comes to a district where the water is brackish and unwholesome; a day's journey next brings him to an elevated plain, where there are wells of water and palm-trees; and then he descends again to the sea-coast, having been compelled to pass round the back of a mountain which reaches out into the sea. Thus the character of the country and distances from point to point exactly agree with the Bible narrative. And this is the case the whole way to Mount Sinai; for next comes a large plain that answers well to the Wilderness of Sin, where the Israelites were first fed with manna; and from the plains one of the principal wadies affords an easy road to Mount Sinai, a day's journey from which is a spot which tradition marks as the site of the battle of Rephidim, and which agrees well with the short description we have of that battle-field. So mountainous is the country that there is only one other route which could

possibly have been followed by the Israelites; and the mention of the encampment by the sea renders that almost impossible. Thus the features of the country bear out and explain the Bible narrative, and researches here, as elsewhere in Bible lands, confirm our belief in the truth of that history of God's chosen people which has been given us in the Holy Scriptures."

IV. *The history of the Jewish people from Joshua to Samuel is nowhere contradicted, but, on the other hand, strongly confirmed in many points.*

1. The ancient geography of the land of Canaan as given in Joshua, in connection with the conquest of the land, is found to be wonderfully correct. Its notices, not only of distinct regions, but of valleys, mountains, and villages have been confirmed with surprising certainty and particularity. (1) Joshua's second campaign in the south of Palestine furnishes a good example, Josh. 11 : 16 and 15 : 21. Ritter, the German geographer, shows that the divisions of the country then into five parts, the scene of that expedition, rests upon a basis of geographical conditions which none but an eye-witness could have remarked; he shows that many of the cities mentioned in the book retain to this day their ancient names, and also occur together, precisely as the sacred writers represented them as arranged of old. (2) Another illustration may be drawn from Saul's last battle on Mount Gilboa. This field now lies mapped out on the face of the country as plainly as in the book of Samuel. All the places, except Aphek, have been identified under their old names,—Gilboa, Jezreel, Shunem, and Bethshean. They are located at such points precisely as the course of the battle indicates, and one can trace the progress of the battle by going over the ground with the sacred account in hand. Every new

exploration of Palestine increases the number of places identified and gives additional confirmation to the history.

2. The silence of profane history concerning this portion of the sacred narrative is also a proof of the reliability of the Scriptures. It is just as we should expect to find it when we consider the isolated condition of the Jews and the character and condition of the surrounding nations. The land of Canaan was isolated by the sea, deserts and mountains. The tribes who vexed them during the Judges were illiterate, and have left no literature or permanent monuments. It was also a period, as their records show, when the Assyrians on the east and the Egyptians on the southwest did not carry their conquests much beyond their own limits; hence they had no occasion to refer to the Israelitish people.

3. There are traditions of Joshua's wars. The nations of Northern Africa believed themselves to be of Canaanite extraction, and that they descended from certain fugitives who, they say, were expelled from Palestine by "Joshua, the son of Nun, the Plunderer." Near modern Tangiers there stood, in ancient times, two pillars of white marble bearing Phœnician inscriptions to this effect.

4. The Bible account of David's wars is confirmed. (1) David, according to the book of II. Sam. 8 : 3, made war upon Hadadezer, king of Zobah, and defeated him, whereupon the Syrians came to the help of Hadadezer, and then both peoples were made tributary to David. This war is mentioned by Nicolas of Damascus, the friend of Augustus Cæsar, whose account was evidently not derived from the Jewish Scriptures. He says: "After this there was a certain Hadad, a native Syrian, who had great power; he ruled over Damascus and all Syria, except Phœnicia. He likewise undertook a war with David, the king of Judea, and contended against him in a number of battles; in the last of them all

near the river Euphrates, and in which he suffered defeat." (2) Two writers of the time of Alexander the Great, Dius and Menander, spoke of Hiram, king of Tyre, as reigning at this time, and as having certain transactions with David. Eupolemon says that "David reduced the Syrians who dwelt by the river Euphrates, and the Assyrians and Phœnicians who dwelt in the land of Gilead; and he made war on the Ammonites, and Moabites, and Itureans, and Nabatæans, and Nabdeans; moreover, he made an expedition against Suron (Huram or Hiram), king of Tyre and Phœnicia, and compelled all these peoples to pay tribute to the Jews."

5. Many incidental references are found to be exact. The allusions to Tyre and Sidon as being then large and growing cities; the ascendancy of the Hittites among the other tribes of Canaan, confirmed by Assyrian inscriptions; the power of the Philistines as testified by Egyptian records and alliances with them; and the manners and customs of the time; the use of chariots in war, the worship of Ashtoreth, the increase of Philistine power, the name of Jewish judges, *Shophetim*, placing the foot on the necks of conquered kings, the practice of mutilation before execution, the solving of riddles, the shaving off of half of the beard in derision, and the wearing of ear-rings by the men. Every fact recorded stands unchallenged, and every allusion verified.

V. *From the days of Solomon down to the end of the Old Testament history* profane history is so abundant that the parallelism can not here be fully pointed out; space would not permit. A few examples and a summary of the testimony for this period must suffice.

1. The Bible account of Solomon's reign is fully substantiated. (1) The extent of his kingdom and its character as composed of several subordinate countries and princes that

paid to the Jewish king an annual tribute, is in harmony with the character of the well-known contiguous nations—Babylonia, Assyria, Media, and Lydia. (2) The Phœnician historians, Dius and Menander, as reported by Josephus, attest the fact of Solomon's reign; of his friendly relations with Hiram, king of Tyre; of Solomon's Temple being founded in the 144th year before the founding of Carthage, or B. C. 1007; of Solomon's letters to Hiram being preserved in the Tyrian archives; of Solomon's marrying a daughter of Hiram; of the excellence of Tyrian artisans in iron, silver, gold, stone, and wood. (3) Recent discoveries in Mesopotamia, Nineveh, and Palestine fully illustrate and confirm the Scriptural account of Solomon's magnificence. The House of the Forest of Lebanon clearly resembles the throne room of an Assyrian palace; its roofing, its proportions, its numerous columns, its windows and doors, are all in keeping with this model. The ornaments—palm trees, open flowers, pomegranates, and lions; the height of the pillars, Jachin and Boaz, and the finish of their capitals; the ivory throne and the lions which guarded it—all are true to the art of the time.

2. The Moabite Stone is an important witness. This stone was found by Rev. F. Klein, at Dibon, in 1868. The words and the ancient forms of the letters indicate that the inscriptions on it were made as early as 900 B. C. It is a monument commemorative of the victories of Mesha, king of Moab. It testifies (1) that Omri was king of Israel; (2) that Omri subdued Moab and that Israel oppressed that country forty years; and (3) that Mesha threw off the Jewish yoke and rebuilt the desolated cities. On this stone twenty-four Bible proper names occur. It is needless to say that this is a close parallel to the Bible history.

3. The history of Assyrian and Babylonian aggressions, and of the captivity of the Ten Tribes and then of Judah

and Benjamin, is fully corroborated. (1) All the kings have their true places and characters—Shishak, Zerah, Benhadad, Hazael, Mesha, Rezin, Pul, Tiglath-pileser, Shalmaneser, So, Sargon, Sennacherib, Tirhakah, Merodach-Baladan, Esarhaddon, Necho, Nebuchadnezzar, and Evil-merodach. (2) The laws of the Assyrians; the despotic character of their kings; their luxury and magnificence; their habits of life; and their methods of warfare, are all given true to life as portrayed in profane history and on their recently discovered monuments. (3) There is no clashing, and in only two cases is there any doubt concerning the perfect parallelism of the sacred and the profane accounts. The two exceptions are the Bible mentions of Pul and of Darius, the Mede. So until lately Isaiah 20:2 was the only evidence of the existence of such a king as Sargon. For twenty-five centuries his name stood on the sacred page, without the least support from outside history. Assyrian discoveries, however, have put an end to all doubt in reference to Sargon, and have demonstrated the accuracy of the Scriptures. Undoubtedly, all uncertainty concerning Pul and Darius, the Mede, will also vanish before increasing light.

So far the historic truthfulness of the Old Testament has been considered. Bible history is inwoven with the rise and fall of nations, and with the progress of civilization. This line of history is very long—forty centuries—with many turns and windings in and out. How ample the opportunity to detect errors! How great the desire to find historic falsehood in the Scriptural record! And yet, long as is the coast-line and fierce as have been the storms of criticism which have raged for nearly two thousand years all along this coast-line, not a single land-mark has been changed; there stand the mountains outlining the progress of the nations, and there lie the historic continents, teeming with the art, science, laws,

and customs of ancient times. Not only in history, however, but in other respects the Old Testament is reliable.

VI. *A large proportion of the Old Testament is not subject to the tests of history, but is presented as political, moral, and religious truth.* This truth is to be measured and valued by reason and human experience. Such portions are the laws enacted, the customs established, the religious institutions, and its moral teachings. In all these respects the older Scriptures are worthy of their professed origin and design. Considering the time, the people, and the purpose, (1) where shall we find a legal code that excels the Mosaic law? Where a better summary of fundamental law, human and divine, than the law of Moses? Where a more just application of these principles to actual life? Where can be found sounder political maxims than are contained in the promises and threatenings of Deuteronomy, and in the warnings and denunciations of the prophets? (2) Who will question the great lesson of the book of Job, viz: that the problem of the existence of evil is too high for human reason: that trust in God's goodness is the supreme wisdom? or the conclusion of Ecclesiastes, the preacher, that the whole duty of man is to fear God and keep his commandments? or the lesson of the Song of Solomon that lascivious thoughts, such as this poem presents, will cause the moral downfall of the wisest man—a downfall such as the writer himself exhibited in his old age? (3) The proverbs and separate moral precepts need no confirmation other than that of universal human experience. It is evident that large portions of the Hebrew Scriptures need no vouchers; they bear the stamp of essential and self-evident truth.

VII. A good portion of the Old Testament is occupied with the portraiture of human nature in its various manifesta-

tions of guilt and innocence, of barbarism and civilization, and this portraiture is true to human nature. (1) None of the characters of the Bible are perfect. Adam eats of the forbidden fruit, Abraham deceives, Moses disobeys, Aaron is envious, David commits a dark crime, and Paul finds that when he would do good evil is present with him. We should know the Bible to be false if the men spoken of were represented as perfect. (2) It does not conceal the bigotry, barbarity, and cruelty of the Israelites, nor of the surrounding nations. It represents things as they were; sometimes it does not formally condemn the wrong, but it nowhere justifies the iniquitous. (3) It is a history of sin as well as of Heaven's efforts to introduce a remedy for sin. Its fundamental postulate is that all have sinned, that the world is debased and guilty, and that the best men can be saved only through the mercy of God. (4) It must not be taken for granted that because a crime is narrated in the Bible, or because it was committed by one who is commended in other respects, that therefore it is sanctioned. Yet we must remember that when God commands, it is right for man to obey, though such obedience may seem contrary to all man's ideas of right. What is absolutely right, absolutely best for all, God alone knows.

VIII. It remains to speak of the miracles of the Old Testament. These are questioned, though in all other respects these ancient Scriptures are accepted. Were it not for these accounts of miracles and for the support which the Old Testament gives to Christianity, few would have any difficulty with this portion of the Bible. Concerning these miracles the following may be said:

1. These records are not, logically, to be rejected on account of these miracles. It has been shown that miracles

are possible since there is a God; that they are just as probable as a revelation, for a revelation would be a miracle; and that miracles are a matter of fact, since nature and science so testify.

2. The miracles of the Old Testament are a part of the grand development by which Christianity was finally produced. Taken singly and apart from the great scheme, they might not seem probable, but it is quite otherwise when we consider the need that men should retain the idea of God, and that long centuries of preparation should precede the Messiah's advent. Was it needful that God should reveal himself, that the Jews should become his people, yielding affectionate obedience, that he should be revealed in his providence as rewarding and punishing, and that the prophets should be clothed with authority to speak for him? Then these miracles were a necessary part and well adapted to these purposes. They are just as probable and reasonable as that the Divine Being should do for man anything whatever.

3. Whether some accounts in the Old Testament are miraculous or not is a matter of interpretation. Was the Flood the result of natural causes, or was it wholly a miracle? Was it universal to man only, or was it universal to the globe itself? The assumption or rejection of many miracles depends upon the answer. Did the sun stand still at the command of Joshua, or is the account only a poetical quotation from the book of Jasher? Did the ravens feed Elijah, or the villagers? These are questions of exegesis.

4. It should be remembered that the divinity and Messiahship of Jesus do not depend upon the miracles of the Old Testament. Their immediate object was not that men might believe in Jesus; but they were wrought for men and objects of other days, and they were perfectly adapted to secure those objects. How well adapted were the plagues of Egypt

to destroy all faith in Egyptian gods and to produce faith in Jehovah. The translation of Enoch and Elijah was needed to keep alive the hope of immortality. The warnings of the prophets and the coming of threatened judgments were powerful means for the preservation of faith in God and in the reality of moral government.

The Old Testament is, therefore, in all respects, reliable. It is true as a matter of history; its moral precepts are unquestioned, and these are a large part of its contents; its portraiture of human nature is perfect, and its miracles are a part of the great scheme, though not bearing directly on our main Proposition. The Old Testament has a sub-stratum of substantial truth. It is a wonderful book: venerable as the high antiquity whence it comes; and marvelous in its vitality which keeps it fresh and vigorous in the midst of perished literatures and mouldering superstitions.

INTRODUCTION.

1. *Re-statement of argument from New Testament.*
2. *This argument from New Testament could not be stronger in itself.*
3. *Prophecy would greatly add to the proof.*
4. *Prophecy would have peculiar advantages over other proof.*
5. *Criteria of true prophecy.*
6. *Three-fold division of this argument from Old Testament.*

THE OLD TESTAMENT TRUTHFUL AND RELIABLE.

I. THE GENEALOGY OF THE SONS OF NOAH.

1. *Their names given to the countries of the East.*
2. *Ethnic affinities of the tenth of Genesis.*
3. *The earliest civilizations.*

II. GENESIS 14TH CHAPTER—THE BATTLE OF FOUR KINGS WITH FIVE.

III. THE BONDAGE IN EGYPT.

1. *The fact of the Exodus corroborated by four writers.*
2. *The condition and customs of Egypt.*
3. *The bondage of the Jews.*
4. *The route from Egypt to Sinai.*

IV. HISTORY FROM JOSHUA TO SOLOMON.

1. *Geography of Canaan.*
2. *Silence of profane history on this period.*
3. *Traditions of Joshua's wars.*
4. *David's wars confirmed.*
5. *Incidental references exact.*

V. FROM SOLOMON TO THE END OF OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY.

1. *Account of Solomon's reign confirmed.*
2. *The Moabite Stone.*
3. *Assyrian and Babylonian aggressions.*

VI. RELIABILITY OF OLD TESTAMENT AS TO POLITICAL, MORAL, AND RELIGIOUS TRUTH.

1. *Civil law and political maxims.*
2. *Great moral questions.*
3. *Moral precepts self-evident.*

VII. ITS PORTRAITURE OF HUMAN NATURE CORRECT.

1. *None of its characters are perfect.*
2. *It does not conceal Jewish bigotry and barbarism.*
3. *A correct history of sin.*
4. *It does not endorse crime, though its history is given.*

VIII. THE MIRACLES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT REASONABLE.

1. *Miracles not to be logically denied.*
2. *These miracles part of a great scheme.*
3. *Correct interpretation does away with supposed miracles.*
4. *The claims of Jesus not dependent on these miracles.*
5. *Conclusion.*

PROPOSITION SECOND.

THE WRITERS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT WERE NOT ONLY TRUTHFUL BUT INSPIRED MEN, SINCE THEY LEFT ON RECORD MANY REMARKABLE PROPHECIES WHICH HAVE MET WITH COMPLETE FULFILMENT.

I. *The prophecy of Noah*, Genesis 9:25–27. "Noah was a just man, and perfect in his generation, and Noah walked with God." He was perfect and walked with God when all flesh had corrupted its way. Peter says he was a "preacher of righteousness." He was one of the "holy men of old who spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." His worthiness is shown by the fact that he was chosen to be the second father of the human race. This prophecy sketched the grand outlines of all history as it was differentiated in the fortunes of his three sons and their descendants. As, according to Bible usage, *Israel* usually means the people of Israel; so Shem, Ham, and Japheth mean, respectively, the peoples and races that descended from these sons of Noah. Interpreting this prophecy in the light of Hebrew scholarship we have the following analysis:

1. "Cursed be (the father) of Canaan," or the descendants of Ham. "A servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren." (1) That a curse has seemed to rest on the nations of Hamitic origin is a *matter of fact.* This part of the prophecy is not a judgment from Heaven, but rather a prediction of what would be. The Canaanites were cursed with the most abominable idolatries and vices; Sodom and

the other cities of the plains were terrible examples. Phœnicia was early blotted out, and its great cities, Tyre and Sidon, destroyed. The fleeing Tyrians, who found a refuge in Carthage, were the victims of Roman vengeance. Joshua nearly annihilated the Canaanites. Egypt is black with the ruins of cities, temples, and pyramids. Africa is still the dark continent. A cloud has ever seemed to hang over the swarthy sons of Ham. (2) They were to be "servants of servants," or abject servants, to the other portions of the human race. This has been verified in all ages and countries. It was signally fulfilled when the Canaanites were made slaves to the Jewish people. It is a general fact that both the ancient and the modern nations obtained their slaves from this source.

2. "Blessed of Jehovah, my God, be Shem." "God will dwell in the tents of Shem," or, as the Chaldee of Onkelos has it, "God will make his glory to dwell in the tabernacles of Shem." (1) The descendants of Shem were blessed of Jehovah in that he providentially cared for them; committed to a portion of them the "oracles of God;" sent to them the Messiah; and among them, first of all, established the Kingdom of Heaven. (2) The Tabernacle and the Temple where God recorded his name, and where he manifested his glory, the divine worship which he ordained, and the preparation for the advent of the Messiah, were all entrusted to the Jews, a branch of the Semitic race.

3. "God shall enlarge Japheth." He had a more numerous *progeny*. He had seven sons, while Ham had four and Shem five. These races have always been the most prolific. They had the largest *territory*, and this has always been *enlarging* as these races have migrated and displaced other tribes. The Hamitic and Semitic peoples are inclined to stay in their ancient homes, but Japheth has wandered the

world over first in southeastern, then in central, and then in western Europe; then in the New World, and then the reflow into Asia and Africa. This enlargement is still going on in every sense—in numbers, territory, art, science, commerce, and governmental power.

There is no discount from the conclusiveness of this prophecy. It is very ancient, the language is unambiguous, it can have no other application, and it is in process of fulfilment before our eyes. It clearly testifies to the inspiration of Moses as well as to that of Noah, since Moses wrote the book of Genesis.

II. *Prophecy concerning Ishmael*, Genesis 16: 10–12 and 17: 20. Abraham occupies a conspicuous place as the founder of the Jewish nation, and as an example of faith in the one God. From him two very extraordinary nations descended, and concerning each there are some remarkable prophecies. That concerning Ishmael and his descendants presents the following points:

1. "Twelve princes shall he beget." In Gen. 25th Moses names these princes, and Eusebius, writing about A. D. 350, speaks of the twelve Arabian princes of his time.

2. "I will multiply thy descendants exceedingly" is the promise to Hagar, the mother of Ishmael. In the days of Joseph the Ishmaelites carried on an extensive trade with Egypt. The Nabatheans, Itureans, Arabs, and Saracens were Ishmaelites. The Saracens indeed became a "great nation,' gaining possession of nearly the whole civilized world, and holding this supremacy for more than three hundred years.

3. "And he will be a wild man," or a wild-ass man. Like the wild ass he was to be wild, fierce, savage, roaming the desert, and not submitting to the influences of civilization. This has always been the character of the Arabs. They still

roam the desert, and are as wild and untamable as in days of old.

4. "His hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him." The Arab has always lived by rapine and plunder. He has not been scrupulous in regard to whom he robbed. As a consequence, every man's hand has been against him.

5. "And he shall tabernacle in the presence of his brethren." The Arabs still dwell in tents. They have ever lived in the "presence of their brethren;" both in the sense of occupying the same country continually and in the sense of having all around them the same kindred nations—the descendants of Abraham and of Lot. Many efforts were made to subdue and displace them, but all alike failed. The Egyptians and the Assyrians, the Greeks and the Romans, Alexander and Pompey, were all unequal to the task of conquering them. For four thousand years the Ishmaelites have continued to verify this prophecy, and they seem destined to continue to do so to the end. Of other nations, some have perished and some have changed; this is an exception.

III. *Balaam's prophecy concerning Israel*, Numbers, chapters 23 and 24. Balaam was called to curse the people of Israel, but he was not able to do so. Instead of curses he pronounced blessings. His prophecy makes the following points:

1. "So the people shall dwell alone and shall not be reckoned among the nations."

2. Israel was to become a great people; "Who can count the dust of Jacob and the number of the fourth part of Israel?" To the same purport was the promise to Abraham.

3. Israel should become powerful; should be "a lion, a great lion."

4. There shall come a "star out of Jacob and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel;" an eminent and powerful king should appear.

5. This ruler should conquer Moab, Edom, and Amalek.

6. The Kenites should be preserved and become servants of the Jews till the later times.

7. Asshur should carry Israel into captivity.

8. Ships from the coasts of Chittim should afflict both Asshur and Israel.

9. Yet this invader from the coasts of Chittim should perish forever.

The last of these events was to occur in the remote future; for the prophet said, "Who shall live when God doeth this?"

Now, not one of these predictions has failed of fulfilment. They did dwell alone, alone in a country isolated from other nations, alone in their customs and religious institutions, alone in their refusal to mingle with other peoples, and alone they are until this day. Israel did become a great people. They gained signal victories over their enemies. David was a star of the first magnitude, and he swayed a powerful sceptre. He did conquer the Moabites, the Edomites, and the Amalekites; while the Kenites, a branch of the Midianites, were subdued and preserved. Assyria did carry into captivity first the Ten Tribes never to return, and then the two, Judah and Benjamin. Chittim was a son of Javan, and a grandson of Japheth, by whom the Isles of the Gentiles were peopled. From the shores of Chittim came the Greeks for the affliction of both Assyria and Eber, or the Hebrews. This Grecian power, which, under Alexander the Great, overran all the East, did perish forever. These predictions were made when, as yet, the Jews had not shown what were the tendencies of their national institutions, and when the world had little experience of the rise and downfall of nations,

and the fulfilment of these predictions reaches down to the present time.

IV. *The prophecy of Moses concerning the final overthrow of the Jewish nation*, Deut. 28th. This prophecy is most remarkable for its minuteness, for its being fulfilled five hundred years later than the close of Old Testament history and more than fifteen hundred years after it was recorded, and for the exactness of its fulfilment as testified by Josephus. An analysis of this prophecy gives the following results:

1. That the Lord would bring against the Jews a nation from afar, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth, a nation whose language the Jews would not understand.

2. That this nation should be of a fierce countenance and great ferocity, not caring for the person of the old nor showing mercy to the young.

3. That this fierce soldiery should besiege Judea and Jerasalem in all their gates till all their high and fenced walls should come down, and the last Jewish hope of safety be destroyed.

4. That in this siege the citizens should suffer unparalleled horrors; that a man's eye should be evil toward his child or the wife of his bosom; that the besieged would devour human flesh; that the tender and delicate woman who would not so much as set her foot upon the ground would secretly kill and consume her own child.

5. That great numbers of the Jews would perish in the siege.

6. That multitudes, till no purchasers should be found, would be carried into Egypt and sold into slavery.

7. That the Jews should be plucked from off the land which in the time of Moses they were about to possess.

8. That the conquered Jews should be removed and scattered throughout all the kingdoms of the earth.

9. That among these nations they should find no ease, neither should the soles of their feet have rest.

10. That they should be oppressed and despoiled evermore.

11. That they should become an astonishment, a proverb and a by-word among all nations.

12. That their plagues should be wonderful and of long continuance.

13. And yet, notwithstanding all this, when they should be in the land of their enemies, God would not cast them away. He would not abhor them, nor destroy them utterly.

So well known are the events which correspond to these predictions that a statement of them is almost unnecessary. The Romans are well described as a nation from afar, speaking a strange language, swift and rapacious as the eagles represented on their standards, stern as men of iron and fierce as tigers. One can easily credit Josephus when he says that Vespasian, who led the Romans in this last invasion, "slew all, man by man, the Romans showing mercy to no age, out of hatred to the nation, and remembrance of their former injuries." "They did not so much as spare young children, but every one at that time, snatching up many, and cast them down from the citadel." The pages of Josephus which describe the horrors of the siege are too painful for perusal; famine and crime cleared the streets before the entrance of the Romans; they ate the flesh of their sons and daughters. The tender and delicate mother, as Moses had said fifteen hundred years before, did secretly kill and partially consume her own child. Josephus gives a special instance of this, the rumor of which, spreading along the defences of the city, seemed to paralyze with horror both the beseiged and the

besiegers. War and pestilence and famine combined to destroy. The number slain was 1,240,490; and the prisoners, 99,200. They were carried into Egypt and offered for sale, till no purchasers, at any price, could be found, and the unsold portions of this miserable people died of famine or were slaughtered by their enemies. They were plucked from their own land and dispersed into all nations. In what country are they not found? And in what land are they not a proverb and a by-word? Where have they, since the murder of their Messiah, found ease or rest? In what land have they not been persecuted? Are not their plagues "wonderful and of long continuance?" Even in this year of grace, 1883, does not the daily press give evidence that these plagues have not abated, banished as they are from American hotels, murdered by Russian mobs, and still driven from country to country? Yet the Jews remain. There has been an end of the nations among which they have wandered, but God has not made an end of them. The Jewish people to-day, like a tree lightning-scathed, point to the Heavens as alike the source of these judgments and of the inspiration by which they were, so long before, and so minutely, declared.

V. *Prophecy concerning Babylon.* Is. 13: 19–22; Is. 14th; Jer. 50th. The prophecies to be considered refer to the condition of Babylon since the close of Old Testament history. Evidence from the fulfilment of prophecy is so abundant that only those about which there is no cavil need be selected.

1. It was to be entirely overthrown, as were Sodom and Gomorrah.

2. It should never be inhabited nor dwelt in from generation to generation.

3. The Arab should not pitch his tent there

4. The shepherds should not make their folds there.

5. Wild beasts of the desert should lie there; owls and doleful creatures should infest it.

6. It should become the possession of the bittern and of pools of water.

7. It should be a target for the nations; it should be for a spoil, and all who plundered it should be satisfied.

8. Her walls and foundations should be overturned, and the debris of her palaces should be cast into heaps.

9. The sower and the harvester should be cut off.

10. Those who passed by should be astonished at her plagues.

Babylon was founded 2234 B. C. It was the most splendid and permanent of ancient cities. Its walls, fifteen miles square, 350 feet high, and 87 feet thick; its hundred gates and towers; its hanging gardens and its palaces; the fertility of the valley of the Euphrates, yielding two hundred fold; and its military power, made it a remarkable city, and the capital of a remarkable empire. When these prophecies were written Babylon was in the height of its glory; this was more than six hundred years before our era. It showed no signs of decay, and no human sagacity could have foretold its fate. And yet, there stand the prophecies, and many centuries have been looking down upon its ruins. Like Sodom, it is utterly destroyed. From age to age it has not been inhabited. The Arab and the shepherd fear to go there. The valley is no longer fertile, no one sows or reaps, and pools of water have gathered where once stood its pleasant palaces. For hundreds of years, there the hunters sought the wild beasts, and there found doleful creatures. Its site is cast up in heaps. Volney and many since his day have expressed their astonishment at its wonderful desolation.

VI. *Prophecy concerning Nineveh.* Nahum and Zephaniah.

1. This great and flourishing city was to be destroyed.

2. It was to be captured when its rulers and defenders were drunken.

3. It was to be destroyed by water and fire providentially working with its enemies.

4. Destruction should not rise up the second time.

5. It should become a desolation and dry, like a wilderness or desert.

6. Flocks should lie down there.

7. Those who passed by should hiss and wag the head, in sympathy with the ruin which had mocked its former grandeur.

The doom and desolation of this city have often been recounted. All travellers and all readers know that not one word of this prophecy has failed. Nineveh has for many centuries been lying in utter desolation. It has never been rebuilt, and destruction has not risen up the second time. Diodorus records that it was captured by the Medes and Babylonians. They were assisted by the floods, which undermined and cast down a large portion of the walls, and by the fire, whose destructive work is evidenced at the present day by the blackened and charred remains which have been exhumed. The ancient historian also testifies that when the hour of doom arrived its defenders were occupied with revelry and drunkenness, and were wholly unable to cope with their enemies. Unlike Babylon it should become a dry wilderness, and over its site the flocks should wander and there find unmolested repose. Many who have passed these ruins have expressed their contempt for that earthly splendor which could end in such a night of century-brooding disaster.

VII. *Prophecy concerning Tyre.* This was a very ancient city. Situated on the Mediterranean Sea, at the head of navigation, between the then East and West, much of the commerce of the world passed through it. At the time of Isaiah and Ezekiel, who prophecied against it, there were no signs of decay, nor that the empire of commerce would move westward. Tyre was the Venice, the London, of the ancient world. The causes which built this metropolis seemed sufficient to ensure, not only perpetuity, but unlimited growth. These prophecies are typical of many in the Bible, since they present, in outline, the whole history of the city, and find their most impressive fulfilment in modern times.

1. The city was to be taken and destroyed by the Chaldeans. Is. 23 : 13; Ezek. 26 : 7–11. (1) It was to be taken by the Chaldeans, who were, at the time of the prophecy, an inconsiderable people. (2) Nebuchadnezzar, after a long and severe siege, was to effect its reduction. (3) Its inhabitants should pass over into the islands and countries adjoining, but should find no quiet settlement. (4) After seventy years the city should be rebuilt.

Now Tyrian history, as given by Menander, confirms all this. Shalmanaser, king of Assyria, made an unsuccessful attempt, but Nebuchadnezzar besieged the city for thirteen years, till, in the words of the prophecy, "every head was made bald and every shoulder was peeled." The Tyrians were a maritime people, and were able to escape in their ships. They sent forth colonies into Africa and Spain, but none of them were enduring. After seventy years Tyre was restored to its former prosperity; this was a reward to the Tyrians for the assistance they rendered the Persian monarchs in their wars with Greece.

2. Again Tyre was to be taken and destroyed. Is. 23 : 6; Ezek. 27 : 32; Zech. 9 : 3, 4. (1) It was to build for itself a

stronghold. (2) The ruins of Old Tyre were to be cast into the sea. (3) Fire should be employed to destroy it. (4) Its inhabitants were to be sold into slavery.

The fulfilment of these predictions is not doubtful. Alexander the Great was the second destroyer. New Tyre had been built on an island in the sea; it seemed impregnable. But Alexander, with the ruins and soil of Old Tyre, made a causeway in the sea, giving his soldiers access to the new city. Fire and sword fulfilled the divine decree. Quintius Curtius relates that fifteen thousand were saved in ships, and that thirty thousand were sold into slavery. Joel had predicted this enslavement, chap. 3 : 6, 7, 8.

3. The Tyrians were to forsake idolatry and accept the true God. Ps. 45 : 12; Zech. 9 : 1–7; Is. 23 : 18. Accordingly, the Tyrians accepted Christianity. Multitudes from Tyre, Sidon, and the sea-coast came to hear Jesus. Jesus taught and healed diseases in the coasts of Tyre and Sidon. Paul, in his last journey to Jerusalem, found a church there, and tarried with it seven days. Tyre, in the Diocletian persecution, furnished many confessors and martyrs. Eusebius declares that these prophecies were fulfilled in his time.

4. Finally, the city should be totally destroyed and become a place where fishermen should spread their nets. "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold I am against thee, O Tyrus, and I will cause many nations to come up against thee, as the sea causeth his waves to come up. And they shall destroy the walls of Tyrus and break down her towers; I will also scrape her dust from her, and make her like the top of a rock. It shall be a place for the spreading of nets in the midst of the sea; for I have spoken it, saith the Lord God." Ezek. 26 : 3. "Thou shalt be built no more." "I will make thee a terror, and thou shalt be no more; though thou be sought for, yet

shalt thou never be found again, saith the Lord God." Verses 14, 21.

It is needless to say that this is the present condition of Tyre. A traveler wrote many years ago: "This city, standing in the sea, upon a peninsula, promises at a distance something magnificent. But when you come to it, you find no similitude of that glory for which it was so renowned in the ancient times. On the north side it has an old Turkish ungarrisoned castle, besides which you see nothing here but a mere Babel of broken walls, pillars, vaults, etc., there being not so much as one entire house left; its present inhabitants are poor wretches, harboring themselves in the vaults, and subsisting chiefly upon fishing, who seem to be preserved in this place by divine Providence, as a visible argument how God has fulfilled his word concerning Tyre, viz.: that "it should be as the top of a rock, a place for fishers to dry their nets on."

VIII. *Prophecy concerning Egypt.* Is. 19:19–25; Ezek. chapters 30 and 29.

1. Egypt was to become desolate in the midst of desolations.

2. There should be no more a prince of Egypt; it was to be ruled by strangers.

3. It was to become the basest of kingdoms.

4. Idolatry was to be destroyed.

5. Yet, Egypt should be redeemed.

This once fertile and populous country has long been "desolate in the midst of desolations." The valley of the Nile is strewn with the monuments of its former glory—pyramids, temples, and cities; and in whatever direction one goes from this land of wonderful ruins he finds desolation—in the Desert of Sahara, in Ethiopia, in Arabia, in Palestine. Since 350 B. C. it has been ruled and oppressed successively

by the Persians, the Greeks under Alexander and the Ptolemies, the Romans, the Saracens, the Mamelukes, and the Turks. It has become the basest of kingdoms—the basest whether we consider its people, its rulers, its government, its barbarism in the midst of civilized nations, its poverty, or its abject vassalage to foreign powers. The idol has been destroyed in a remarkable way. How could the prophets, twelve hundred years before the rise of Mohammedanism, have known or conjectured the destruction of idolatry in any land except by the power of the Jewish or Christian religion? And yet the "False Prophet" was the agent employed to fulfil this prediction. There are also many signs that the redemption of Egypt is drawing near. There is a weakening of Turkish barbarism, and a growing power of Anglo-Saxon civilization. Egypt lies in the highway of modern commerce between Europe and Asia; it lies just where this broad stream of commerce must slacken its speed and leave rich deposits of modern wealth and civilization. The tides of emigration have reached the eastern base of the Rocky Mountains, and there will, in time, be a powerful ebb in this tide, when the East will, in turn, experience an overflow of the most restless and the most enlightened nations.

IX. *The prophecy of Daniel concerning the course of universal empire.* Dan. 2d chap. In the vision of Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel's interpretation there are the following prophetic particulars:

1. There should be *five* and only *five* universal kingdoms. These were to be the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Grecian, the Roman, and the Messiah's kingdom. They were to appear in this exact order. The fulfilment of this item is certain. A grander or more useful outline of history could not be given. One who does not know that here the

correspondence of prediction and history is perfect is ignorant of the simplest elements of history.

2. Daniel correctly predicted the *character* of these kingdoms. Babylon was represented by the "head of gold," the first, and the longest lived of them all. The Medo-Persian kingdom was inferior to the Babylonian; it was also rich in silver plate, shields, etc.; the arms of the image, moreover, represented the two national elements, Media and Persia. The Grecian was represented by the brass, and the soldiers of Alexander were called brazen-coated Greeks. The fourth kingdom was the Roman; the image represented its two-fold and its ten-fold divisions; its strength, as it was the iron kingdom; its weakness, for the iron was mingled with clay; and that in the days of this kingdom the kingdom of Heaven should be established. The fifth kingdom is characterized as the "Kingdom of Heaven," a title fitly describing the origin and nature of the Christian Dispensation.

5. The predictions concerning the *fifth kingdom* are wonderfully exact. (1) It should be small in its beginnings, for it was a "stone" cut out of the mountain. How well this represents the small beginning—John, Christ with his few disciples, the one Church at Jerusalem, so easily crushed by Jewish or Roman power. (2) The stone was cut out of the mountain without hands; what could more emphatically indicate its divine origin? So was it with this kingdom; angels, miracles, the Holy Spirit, inspired Apostles—these were the agencies employed. All earthly power opposed it; the power of God carried it forward. (3) The stone "smote" the image on the feet; what could better represent the aggressive nature of Christianity and the time when it began? (4) The stone "grew" and became a great mountain. Christianity is a growth in the world, rather than a revolution or a conquest; yet a growth such as the world had not

before seen. (5) This growing mountain filled the whole earth. Christianity by adaptation and expansion shows a strong tendency to become universal. (6) This kingdom was to render another universal empire impossible. Undoubtedly, the civilized world is now so large and so divided that there can not be another such empire. Christianity has been the chief agent in civilizing the whole world, and in rendering the nations independent and unconquerable.

X. *Prophecy of Daniel concerning the Papacy.* Dan. 7th.

1. The prophet first gives the relation of this peculiar power to the universal kingdoms and to the divisions of the Roman Empire. (1) He gives the same grand outline of world-wide empires as in chapter 2d: the lion, or Babylon; the bear with three ribs in its mouth—Medo-Persia with the conquered countries, Lydia, Babylonia, and Egypt; the leopard, with four wings and four heads—Grecia, stealthy and rapid, and, after the death of Alexander, divided into four parts; the beast, or monster, great and terrible, with its ten horns—the Roman Empire, which trampled down other kingdoms and was, by the inroads of barbarians, divided into ten kingdoms. These ten kingdoms as given by Machiavel, the Italian politician and historian, were the following: The Huns, the Ostrogoths, the Visigoths, the Franks, the Vandals, the Suevi and Alans, the Burgundians, the Heruli, the Angles and Saxons, and the Lombards. Three of the horns, or kingdoms, were plucked up, and the Little Horn of the Papacy came up in their place; these three kingdoms were those of the Vandals, Ostrogoths, and the Lombards.

2. The characteristics of the power represented by this Little Horn are minutely given: (1) It was to appear among the other horns—in Western Europe. (2) It was to be a little kingdom. (3) It was to be different from the others.

(4) Was to subdue three others. (5) It should have eyes like a man, indicating knowledge and sagacity. (6) It should utter blasphemies against the Most High. (7) It should be arrogant towards other nations. (8) It should change times and laws. (9) It should persecute the saints for one thousand two hundred and sixty years. (10) At the close of this time its dominion should be taken away. (11) It should be gradually destroyed.

This portraiture of the Papacy is so perfect that, to one acquainted with Papal history, not a word of explanation is necessary. The place, time, and manner of the rise of the Papacy, as a civil government, are as clear in prophecy as in history. It was a peculiar civil power, since it was politico-religious. It has ever been cunning, arrogant, and blasphemous. The Jesuits well illustrate its cunning; the Pope putting his foot on the necks of kings and laying whole nations under interdicts are examples of arrogance; its assuming to change sacred times and laws, its requiring that the pontiff should be addressed as Lord God the Pope, its claiming to be the Vicar of Christ on earth, and its claim of infallibility, are sufficient evidences of blasphemy. The principles of the Papal hierarchy, its history, and the bloody monuments still in existence—all give the same testimony, all declare the prophecy, in this particular, perfectly fulfilled. Inquisitorial chambers in Spain still preserve the instruments of torture, and the souls of martyrs under the altar are still asking for justice. If, with some, we reckon from the rise of the Papacy as a temporal power, A. D. 533, to the end of Roman Catholic persecution in A. D. 1793, the historic and prophetic times are the same. And the last item in this prophecy is now in process of fulfilment; for the Pope's temporal power is taken away, and it is destined, as any observer of the times can see, to be consumed "by the spirit

of the Savior's mouth and destroyed by the brightness of his coming."

XI. *Prophecy of Daniel concerning the rise of the Mahometan Dominion.* Dan., chap. 7.

1. As before, we have given the relation of this singular power to the nations among which, and out of which, it arose. The prophet sees two animals on the banks of the river Ulai. The ram represents the Persian power; the he-goat, with the notable horn between its eyes, represents the Grecian power as guided by Alexander for the conquest of Persia. The single horn is broken off, and four others come in its stead, symbolizing the death of Alexander and the four-fold division of his kingdom into Greece, Thrace, Syria, and Egypt. Out of one of these horns, in one of these divisions of Alexander's kingdom, grew this Little Horn, which represented the Mahometan power. So far, history is in accord with the prophecy.

2. The following are points in the prophecy: (1) It should rise not in Western Europe, but in a division of Alexander's Empire. (2) It should rise when the dominion of Greece had wholly passed away. (3) It was to be peculiar in appearance, in skill, and in its crimes. (4) It was to make war on the Holy Land. (5) It is to be broken without hands.

The Mahometan Dominion exactly fills this description. It agrees in time and place. It was unique, not being a civil power merely, but a religious superstition and a philosophy. At first it was small and weak. It advanced through its cunning, science, and literature, as well as through its military power and its peculiar religious influence. By its diplomacy and its offers of peace it gained many. It professed to understand dark sentences. It made special war on the Holy

Land, destroying thousands of church edifices and causing the daily worship to cease. And this great movement was worthy of prophetic statement, since it was destined to affect the church so powerfully, and since its prominent features would be so easily recognized.

XII. *The Seventy Weeks of Daniel.* Dan. 9 : 24–27. This prophecy gives the religious epochs in Jewish history for seventy weeks, or four hundred and ninety years, prophetic time, as required by many passages of the Scriptures.

1. Seventy weeks were determined for the people and the Holy City to finish their mission—to restrain sin, to cover sin with the typical blood of the Old Testament, to bring in everlasting righteousness or the gospel, to confirm the prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy, or the Messiah.

2. During the first seven weeks, or forty-nine years, Jerusalem should be rebuilt in troublous times.

3. From this time to Messiah the Prince should be threescore and two weeks, or four hundred and thirty-four years.

4. The Messiah should confirm the covenant for one week. In the midst of the week he should cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease. "*After* threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off."

5. Then the prince that should destroy the city and the sanctuary should come, and the end thereof should be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.

This time was to be reckoned from "the going forth of the decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem." The date of this decree was 457 B. C., when Artaxerxes commissioned Ezra to rebuild the city of Jerusalem. Just forty-nine years were occupied in this work, and they were troublous times. The second period begun 408 B. C. Four hundred and thirty-four

years will bring us to the year A. D. 26, the time, according to the corrected date of the Savior's birth, when he was announced as the Messiah and when his public ministry began. Three years and a half would bring us to the midst of the week in which the Messiah was cut off. Then there followed the destruction of Jerusalem, and, if we accept Josephus' account of the siege and slaughter, the end was with a flood, and a desolation came upon the land which has continued for eighteen centuries. History itself can not exceed the minuteness, the accuracy, and the impressiveness of this prophecy.

---

1. The prophecies discussed in the foregoing twelve sections cover a wide field. They comprise the prediction of more than a hundred specific facts. And yet these prophecies are only specimens of many others in the same Scriptures. The history of more than thirty different countries and cities, and of as many nations, occupied the prophetic writers. The examples adduced are only a part of the many prophecies concerning cities, countries, and nations, while the plan of this argument excludes from present consideration all the Messianic prophecies; but the prophecies relating to the Messiah and his kingdom are much the largest portion, since prophecy lies mainly in the line of religious development. Old Testament prophecy, therefore, is no insignificant phenomenon. It can not be ignored, but must be accounted for.

2. The foregoing prophecies are clear, unambiguous, and definite. If an exception here and there may be taken, still the great body of predictions is beyond cavil. Centuries lie between the predictions and the fulfilment, and in every case the agreement is perfect.

3. Note, also, the great variety of events predicted: The course of the three great divisions of the human race; the line of rising and falling universal empires; the fate of specific nations; the rise of great systems of religious error; the exact time of epochs and national catastrophes; the doom of the greatest cities of ancient times—Babylon, Nineveh, Tyre, and Jerusalem. And how different the destinies assigned! One nation is to dwell forever in the presence of its brethren, while another is to be scattered over the whole world. One city is not to be dwelt in from generation to generation; while another is to be trodden down by the Gentiles. The site of one is to become the possession of pools of water; on the site of another the flocks should find pasturage and rest; while a third should become a bare rock, and serve as a place where fishermen should spread their nets.

4. These predictions of unparalleled desolations were made when, as yet, the historian and philosopher could not speak as instructed by the lessons of experience. The world was then fresh and young. No Nile valley was then strewn with ruins, and no Euphrates glided among the remnants of perished monarchies. It is not demonstrated now, and certainly was not known then, that prosperity and desolation follow each other in successive waves.

5. Neither human sagacity, nor mathematical calculation, nor fortunate guessing, nor chance, nor an ingenious interpretation, can account for this remarkable train of prophecy. There was a great reason why the God who made man should reveal to our lost race a way of salvation; there is a sufficient reason why this revelation should be confirmed by prophecy, and, therefore, why "holy men of old should speak as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."

THE OLD TESTAMENT WRITERS WERE INSPIRED AS WELL AS TRUTHFUL.

I. PROPHECY OF NOAH.

1. *The curse upon the father of Canaan.*
2. *Blessing upon Shem.*
3. *The enlargement of Japhet.*

II. PROPHECY CONCERNING ISHMAEL.

1. *Five particulars.*
2. *Fulfilment of these particulars.*

III. BALAAM'S PROPHECY CONCERNING ISRAEL.

1. *Nine particulars.*
2. *Fulfilment.*

IV. PROPHECY OF MOSES CONCERNING THE JEWS.

1. *Thirteen specifications.*
2. *Fulfilment.*

V. PROPHECY CONCERNING BABYLON.

1. *Ten specifications.*
2. *Fulfilment.*

VI. PROPHECY CONCERNING NINEVEH.

1. *Seven specifications.*
2. *Fulfilment.*

VII. PROPHECY CONCERNING TYRE.

1. *To be destroyed by Chaldeans; three particulars.*
2. *To be destroyed a second time; four particulars.*

3. *The Tyrians were to forsake idolatry.*
4. *To become a place for spreading the nets of fishermen.*

VIII. PROPHECY CONCERNING EGYPT.

1. *Five specifications.*
2. *Fulfilment.*

IX. PROPHECY OF DANIEL CONCERNING UNIVERSAL EMPIRES.

1. *The succession—five in order.*
2. *Character of each; five particulars.*
3. *The fifth kingdom; six particulars.*

X. PROPHECY CONCERNING THE PAPACY.

1. *Its relation to other powers.*
2. *Its characteristics; eleven particulars.*

XI. PROPHECY CONCERNING MAHOMETANISM.

1. *Its relation to other powers.*
2. *Its characteristics; five particulars.*

XII. THE SEVENTY WEEKS OF DANIEL.

1. *Five specifications.*
2. *Fulfilment.*

CONCLUSION.

1. *Extent of these prophecies.*
2. *Their clearness and certainty.*
3. *Their great variety.*
4. *Many are predictions of unparalleled desolations.*
5. *Not to be accounted for except by inspiration.*

PROPOSITION THIRD.

THE WRITERS OF THE BIBLE LEFT ON RECORD A LONG LINE OF PROPHECIES CONCERNING THE MESSIAH AND HIS KINGDOM WHICH FIND EXACT FULFILMENT IN JESUS AND HIS RELIGION.

As *introductory* to the proof of this proposition it may be said that Jesus and his Apostles claimed that there were in the Old Testament many Messianic prophecies, and that all these prophecies were fulfilled in Jesus and his kingdom.

1. The *claim of Jesus* is clearly made in the following utterances: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me." "The Son of man goeth as it is written of him." "It is written of the Son of man, that he must suffer many things." "All things written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished." "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 enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses, and all the prophets he expounded unto them in *all* the Scriptures the things concerning himself." "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 said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead, and that repentance and remission of sins

should be preached unto all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

2. The *Apostolic claim* is equally definite. "Paul went in unto the Jews, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead." The Bereans were more noble than they of Thessalonica because the Bereans "searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so." Again, Paul "expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets." Before Agrippa, Paul affirmed that he said "none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come." "Apollos mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, shewing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ." Peter said, "To him give all the prophets witness." "Those things which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled." "Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel, and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold these days." "For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him." "And when they had fulfilled all that was written of him, they took him down from the tree and laid him in a sepulchre." These passages are decisive. Jesus *did* claim that the Messianic prophecies were fulfilled in him, and it was *customary* with the Apostles to prove that Jesus was the Christ from the Old Testament as well as by their own testimony.

3. All Christians, from the earliest days, have made the same claim, and have clearly seen, as declared by the angel to the Apostle John, that "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." The argument from these prophecies,

therefore, is not an after-thought; it is not a claim set up in modern days of which Jesus knew nothing; it is not an ingenious patch-work of ambiguous guesses and historic figments; it is not the result of a *modern discovery* that such a parallel can be made out.

4. This is a wonderful claim. What other leader of human thought—religionist, philosopher, or statesman—has dared to risk his reputation and success upon such an argument? Had Jesus been an impostor, this absurd claim would have defeated all his purposes, and overwhelmed his Apostles with disaster. And yet, that the Messiah should have the testimony of prophecy is in harmony with the whole scheme of Revelation; a scheme which began with the first sin and will end with the day of Judgment, and which required for its successful development the prescience, as well as the power, of God.

I. *The eternal purpose of God.* The passages which indicate the divine purpose are adduced, not because they are, strictly speaking, prophecies, but to render the Scriptural view of the Messiah, as presented here, complete.

1. The scheme of human salvation is a development of the divine love. It began in the heart of the Heavenly Father; "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

2. This love of God assumed the form of a divine purpose. This is the teaching of Paul, Ephesians 3 : 10, 11 : "That now, to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the *eternal purpose* which he purposed in Christ Jesus, our Lord." So fundamental and so firm was this divine purpose to offer salvation through the

Messiah that it is spoken of as an accomplished fact long before it was actually realized; Jesus is called the "*Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world.*"

3. The plan of salvation is self-consistent. From its beginning in the purpose of God its development went on steadily without a pause and without a backward step. The mission and sacrifice of Christ were not an after-thought. It was all seen from the beginning and provided for. Evidently, God from the first knew what kind of a being man would be; knew that man would sin and suffer; knew what he himself would do on account of human sin; knew that millions would believe in Christ; and knew that the result of all would be in harmony with the divine wisdom and glory. The proof that man's history will result to the highest happiness of the universe and to the glory of God is found in the *fact* that God made man and set in motion the wheels of human existence. This fact will remain, though the Bible be rejected. The unbeliever, as well as the believer, may be required to account for the present state of things; but the believer has the advantage, since in Christianity he has, at least, a partial solution of the problem. If the unbeliever says that had he been in God's place, at that beginning of all things, he would not have created a world like this and filled it with moral beings like man, all that can be said is that he and God differ on this subject.

II. *The divine promise of a Messiah.* As the day passes from the faint dawn to the noon-tide brightness, so this promise, obscure at first, passes into the clear light of prophecy and history. These promises were given long before the Messiah appeared, and hence have all the force of prophecy.

1. There was a promise coeval with the first sin. It is

found in the doom pronounced upon Satan, Gen. 3:15. "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." (1) That this passage applies to the Messiah is evident from the following considerations: (a) No other interpretation is given that seems reasonable. The prediction that enmity should exist between man and literal serpents would have been irrelevant, not according to the fact, and unworthy of the occasion; there are scores of other animals which men avoid and destroy as well as serpents. To interpret it as referring to enmity which should exist between Satan and the human family would be contrary to the fact, and if true it would be no special penalty inflicted upon Satan. (b) Undoubtedly, the curse was pronounced upon Satan and not upon the serpent whose form Satan had assumed; it was Satan's head that was to be crushed. (c) To understand, as some do, that the "seed," or descendants of the woman, refers to all mankind, is contrary to all usage, which traces the line of descent from the father and not from the mother. There is something peculiar and supernatural in the phrase, the "seed of the woman." (d) That this passage should find its fulfilment in the Christ is not improbable, since it is only one of several promises and prophecies which undeniably relate to him. (2) If this passage relates to the Messiah, then its meaning is plain. The Christ was to be made of a woman, to be born of a virgin, and hence to be the seed of the woman. As the woman was the first to sin, she was graciously permitted to give to the world a Savior. This Savior was to crush the head of Satan, which he has done in making a way of escape from sin and all its consequences. But Satan was to bruise the Messiah's heel, to inflict a wound, but not a fatal one; so Jesus was nailed to the cross, but raised from the dead.

(3) There are two facts which corroborate this view: (a) Eve, at the birth of her first-born, said, "I have gotten a man from the Lord," or "with the Lord," as Lange has it. Luther and others have thought that this is an expression of Eve's expectation of the Messiah. (b) Again, sacrifice was instituted, and Abel was instructed in respect to its meaning; for by *faith* he offered a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain. The interpretation given to this first promise harmonizes, therefore, with the context and the general tenor of Scripture.

2. The promise to Abraham, Gen. 12:3: "And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Paul, in the Galatian letter (3:16) explains this promise and applies it to the Christ: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." Jesus was a descendant of Abraham, and the Gospel is a remarkable fulfilment of the promise.

3. The promise to David, Jer. 23:5, 6. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is the name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness.

4. The promise to the Jewish people as recorded in Isaiah 9:6. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." The Messiah is the only one to whom such titles could have been applied.

5. The last promise of the Old Testament, Mal. 3:1. "And the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his

temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts."

This list of promises might be greatly extended; but these are enough to show how, in every age, the promise of the Messiah was kept in the Jewish mind and heart. In the light of these promises it is not a matter of wonder that the expectation of the Savior was so ardent and so general.

III. *The prophecy and fulfilment presented in Types and Antitypes.* A *type* is some material thing, an institution, an observance, or a person, having a definite use under the Old Testament economy, but also *designed* to picture, symbolize, or foreshadow some person or thing under the New Dispensation. It is not to be assumed that one thing is a type of another without Scripture warrant. But when the Scriptures assert the correspondence implied in type and antitype, when the one preceded the other by many hundred years, and when the correspondence is perfect in all the essential features, then we have all the force of fulfilled prophecy.

1. The offering of sacrifice was a type of Christ and his death. The Scriptures very clearly assert this proposition. "The blood of bulls and of goats could not take away sin." There was a remembrance of sins every year, and a continual laying-over of sins in an impressive Jewish ceremonial. Jesus was "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." All sacrifices looked toward the Messiah, and they all ceased when He was offered once for the sins of many. All along the ages the innocent victims, dying for the guilty, were so many pictures of the Christ who was to taste death for every man. No one can look back upon the Jewish sacrifice without perceiving its deep meaning. (1) As the man laid his hand on the head of the lamb and confessed his sins, and as the lamb died as a substitute for the guilty one,

the whole was an impressive illustration of the demerit and punishment of sin. (2) It presented the idea of substitution; the idea that the sufferings of the innocent might avail for the guilty. (3) It presented the intensity and the value of the Messiah's sufferings. All the sufferings of all the victims since time began may illustrate, so far as possible, the agonies of the garden and the cross, and also the immense cost of man's redemption.

2. Israel's redemption under Moses is a type of man's redemption under Christ. This is clearly taught in the tenth chapter of Corinthians. The items of correspondence are quite numerous. (1) The bondage in Egypt and the bondage in sin. (2) The mission of Moses and the mission of Christ. (3) The miracles in Egypt and the miracles in the life of Jesus. (4) Baptism into Moses and baptism into Christ. (5) The law given to Israel, and the Word of God given to the Christians. (6) The discipline of the wilderness and the discipline of life. (7) The literal Jordan and the Jordan of death. (8) The land of Canaan and the rest which remains for the people of God.

3. The Tabernacle and its worship were types of the church and its institutions. This is expressly declared, Heb. 8:4, 5. "For if he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law: who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the Tabernacle: for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern (type) showed thee in the mount." Why this careful instruction of Moses, why this command to make all things according to the pattern, and why the divine skill given to the artisans who constructed the Tabernacle and its furniture, Bezaleel and Aholiab, unless the Tabernacle was to be a picture a

prophecy, of higher spiritual things, a picture of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched and not man. It is not the purpose to trace minutely all the points of agreement between this type and the antitype, but rather only those broad, patent features which carry demonstration with them. (1) The Tabernacle represented the church and its relation to Heaven and Earth. (a) The Holy Place was a type of the church. The candle-stick with its seven lamps, or perfect light, was a symbol of the Scriptures; the Table of Shew-bread was a type of the Lord's-table, spread in every Christian congregation; and the incense rising from the Golden Altar symbolized the prayers of God's people. (b) The Holy of Holies represented Heaven; for there was the Ark of the Covenant, containing the tables of the law, and representing the throne of God which is the habitation of justice and judgment. There were the Cherubim bending over the Mercy-Seat, and there was the Shechinah of the divine presence. (c) The Court of the Tabernacle was a type of the world, from which sinners might come to the Altar of burnt offering, and pass through the Holy Place and beyond the Vail. (2) The religious rites performed in the Tabernacle symbolized the various steps in the progress of individual salvation. (a) The one who had sinned first came to the altar with his sacrifice. There he accepted the victim as a substitute for himself, confessed his guilt, and, while the sacrificed was consumed on the altar, his prayer for mercy ascended to Heaven. So the sinner must first come to the cross of Jesus, accept the Lamb of God as his substitute, confess his iniquities, and implore mercy. (b) Then the worshipper, by his representative, the priest, washed at the laver and passed into the Holy Place. In like manner, the penitent believer in Christ is baptized into Christ, into the body of Christ, or into the church. (c) In the Holy Place the priest enjoys the

light, eats of the bread of presence, and officiates at the Golden Altar. In the antitype, all Christians are priests unto God, to them the Bible is a source of light, and they gather about the table of the Lord. (d) There was but one way into the Holy of Holies; so, for all who have sinned the only way to Heaven lies through the church of the living God.

4. The rites performed on the Day of Atonement were typical of the atonement made by the Messiah. The tenth day of the seventh month, Tishri, was annually observed as a day of Atonement for the whole nation. It was the most solemn of all the sacred days. It was a day of great humiliation and affliction of soul on account of sin, and on this day alone did the High-Priest enter the Holy of Holies to officiate there. There seemed to be, on this day, a summing up of all the sins of the year, and a re-expression of the meaning of every Jewish sacrifice.

The typical nature of these rites is clearly asserted in the Hebrew letter, chapter 9: 11, 12, 24–26. "Christ being come, a High-Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made by 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." "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the High-Priest entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once, in the end of the world, hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself."

Type and antitype, in this case, correspond in the following

respects: (1) The High-Priest, first of all, laid aside his splendid robes and arrayed himself in plain linen garments; so Christ laid aside the glory which he had with the Father since the world began and clad himself in the plain linen garments of human nature. He took upon himself a body that might suffer, a life that might be poured out. (2) The Hight-Priest then offered a sacrifice for himself and for the people, a ram and a goat. Christ did not need to offer a sacrifice for himself, since he was holy, harmless, separate from sinners and made higher than the heavens; but he offered a sacrifice for the people; he offered himself for the sins of the world. (3) Next the High-Priest went into the Holy of Holies and sprinkled the blood of atonement seven times before the Mercy-Seat, and there as a mediator made intercession for the people. Christ, with his own blood, entered the Holy of Holies in the true tabernacle, and there made an atonement for man. As the Jewish High-Priest bore on his breast the names of the tribes of Israel, so our great High-Priest bears all our names on his heart, and as a mediator makes intercession for us. (4) When Aaron came out of the Holy of Holies he sent away the sin-laden scape-goat, and thus symbolized the remission, or sending away, of sins. So, after the ascension and coronation of Christ, the Holy Spirit came upon the waiting Apostles, and they began to preach remission of sins in the name of Jesus. The parallel is complete. As the stereotype plate corresponds to the printed page, word to word and letter to letter, so does the type to the antitype; nor can there be any more doubt of the divine prescience in the one case than of human skill in the other.

5. There were many specific types of the Messiah. There are types of Christ himself, as well as of his sacrifice, of the process of atonement, and of the church which he estab-

lished. (1) The Paschal Lamb was a type of Christ. Paul says, "For even Christ our passover is slain for us. Therefore, let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." Not a bone of the paschal lamb was broken; so was it with Christ. Israel was safe behind the blood of the paschal lamb which was sprinkled on their door-posts; we are safe behind the blood of Jesus, by which our hearts are sprinkled from an evil conscience. (2) The Manna was also typical of the Messiah. Jesus said to the Jews, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven; for the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world." (3) The smitten Rock from which water was given to the perishing Israelites was typical. "And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual meat; and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that same spiritual rock which followed them: and that Rock was Christ."—I. Cor. 10:2–4. The Messiah was to be bread to the starving, and living water to the dying. (4) Melchizedek was a representative of the Christ. Melchizedek was a king of righteousness, and the king of Salem, which is king of peace. He was a royal priest. He was not of a family of priests, and in respect to the limits of his priestly office was without beginning or end of days. So with Christ, who is called "the Prince of Peace" and "the Lord our righteousness." He was of the tribe of Judah, "of which tribe Moses says nothing concerning priesthood." He was also a king and priest at the same time. (5) Moses was a type of the Messiah. "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken."—Deut. 18:15.

Peter, as recorded in Acts 3 : 22, applies this prediction to Jesus. It is not difficult to name the chief points of likeness. (a) Moses delivered from the bondage in Egypt; Christ from the bondage of sin. (b) Moses was accredited by miracles as one authorized to deliver; so was Christ. (c) Moses gave the Law; Christ gave the Gospel. (d) Moses was the Mediator of the Old Covenant; and Christ was Mediator of the New Covenant.

Concerning this prophecy in types and symbols three remarks may be made. (a) *First*, these types and foreshadowings have their analogies in nature. The lowest fishes appearing in far-away geological times were true vertebrate animals, and sure prophecies of him who should hold "dominion over the fish of the sea, and the fowls of the air, and over whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas." (b) *Second*, though these types may not, standing alone, have the clearness and cogency of demonstration; yet it should be remembered that they are only a part of the vast scheme of Messianic prophecy; these prophecies exist as a matter of fact, and these typical representations are not, therefore, strange and unsupported. (c) *Third*, these types are very numerous; only the most prominent have been noticed here. The resemblances are clear-cut and striking. They are not far-fetched nor manufactured for the occasion. There are these types in the Old Testament, and here are their impressions, the antitypes, in the New Testament. Chance will not account for them. But if they were given by the divine appointment; if they were means by which the prophecies were increased in kind and force of demonstration; and if they support the Messiah's claims as well as illustrate his doctrine, then we have a reason for them and an adequate cause of their existence.

IV. *The Time of the Messiah's coming was clearly foretold.*

1. He was to come "in the last days," or in the last Dispensation. "And it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it."—Is. 2 : 2. "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions." "And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be delivered."—Joel 3 : 28. Peter, quoting this passage from Joel on the day of Pentecost, when it was first proclaimed that Jesus was both Lord and Christ, said, "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel."

2. He was to come during the fourth universal monarchy, or in the days of the Roman Empire. Daniel wrote, referring to the Roman Emperors, "In the days of these kings shall the God of Heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed."—Dan. 2 : 44. "And it came to pass in those days that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed."—Luke 2 : 1. It was about this time that Jesus was born. "Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea, and Herod being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip tetrarch of Iturea and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias the tetrarch of Abilene, Annas and Caiaphas being the high priests, the word of God came to John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness." The preaching of John was not far from the Crucifixion and the setting up of the kingdom. The fulfilment is unquestioned.

3. He was to come before Judah had ceased to be a distinct and ruling tribe. "The sceptre shall not depart from

Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be."—Gen. 49:10. The "sceptre" was the standard of the tribe of Judah and a symbol of the tribe itself. The "law-giver" was one who should enforce Jewish law. The "Shiloh," or the *one sent*, was the Messiah. This prophecy means, then, that before Judah should lose its tribal distinctness and a high-priest the Messiah should come. It is well known that Judah was the only tribe remaining in the days of Christ, as is indicated by the name Jew (from Judah), and that there was still a Jewish high-priest. Thirty-five years after the death of Christ both disappeared in the destruction of Jerusalem.

4. He was to come while the second temple was in existence. "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts."—Mal. 3:1. "And I will shake all nations, and the Desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts."—Hag. 2:7. This was spoken of the second temple. The "Messenger of the Covenant" and the "Desire of all Nations" evidently designate the Messiah. Nor can there be any question about the fulfilment; Christ was often in the Temple. He came suddenly and as suddenly disappeared; for his ministry lasted only three years and a half. It is the glory of the Temple, as of the Holy Land, that it was visited by the Angel of the Covenant in person.

5. The exact time when the Messiah should appear was given by Daniel, 9:25. "Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to *restore and to build Jerusalem*, unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be

seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks." According to Bible usage a day represents a year. The decree referred to was made 457 B. C. Beginning at this date, the 483 years will bring us down to 26 A. D., the exact time (allowing for the mistake of four years made by Dionysius Exiguous) when the Savior began his public life.

6. He made his appearance in the fulness of the time. The world was ready and waiting the Messiah's advent, Gal. 4:4. (1) It had been proved that the world by wisdom knew not God. The nations could not save themselves from idolatry. They sank lower and lower, notwithstanding Grecian and Roman civilization. (2) Religious ideas had been disseminated by the Jewish Scriptures—ideas of God, sin, sacrifice, and atonement. (3) The evidences contained in type and prophecy, in divine law and providential history, had also been given to the world. (4) The Jews were found in all parts of the Roman Empire. Wherever they had gone they had carried the Holy Scriptures and erected synagogues. The Jewish congregation, the synagogue, and the Scriptures, awaited the coming of a Paul or an Apollos who should convince his hearers that Jesus was the Christ. (5) It was a time of profound peace. The temple of Janus was closed for the second time in Roman history. (6) All nations were confederated as parts of the Empire, giving the missionaries of the cross access to all peoples. (7) While it was a time of great wickedness, yet among the statesmen and philosophers there was a growing distrust of the old religions.

As a star passes the meridian at the moment predicted by the astronomer, so the Messiah came in the fulness of prophetic time, and when the nations were ready to receive his law.

V. *The place of the Messiah's nativity was a matter of prophecy.*

"But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting"—Micah 5 : 2. (1) This statement is very specific. He was to be born in Bethlehem Ephratah, and not in Bethlehem of Galilee. The prediction can not apply to any merely human ruler, for his "goings forth were from of old, from everlasting." (2) The Jews applied this prediction to the Messiah. When Herod gathered the chief priests and scribes together and asked them where the Christ should be born, they replied, "In Bethlehem of Judea," and then quoted the passage from Micah, Matt. 2 : 4–6. (3) The fulfilment is clear. "Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea."—Matt. 2 : 1. Although Joseph and Mary lived in Nazareth, yet a peculiar political event brought them to Bethlehem at the time of his birth. If divine, he is fitly described as one whose goings forth were from everlasting. That his "goings forth" were of old is in full harmony with Christ's manifestation in Jewish history as the Messenger of the Covenant, as the Angel of Jehovah's presence.

VI. *The lineage of the Messiah was declared in the Jewish Scriptures.*

1. He was to be a descendant of *Abraham*. "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."—Gen. 12 : 3. Paul applies this promise to Christ, Gal. 3 : 14. He also asserts its fulfilment in Jesus; "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham."—Heb. 2 : 16.

2. He was to be of the tribe of *Judah*. In Gen. 49 : 10

it is implied that the Shiloh should be of this tribe, the same is implied in the prediction that out of Bethlehem of Judea should come the expected ruler. Mary was of this tribe, and Paul says, "For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah."—Heb. 7 : 14.

3. He was to be of the house of *David*. "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots; and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord."—Is. 11 : 1, 2. "And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious."—Is. 11 : 10. The house of David was to fall into decay. The stem was to die down to the ground, but some of the roots were to remain, and out of these roots was to spring up this righteous branch. The genealogies given in Matthew and Luke prove that Jesus was descended from David; while Paul, speaking of David, says, "Of this man's seed hath God, according to his promise, raised unto Israel a Savior, Jesus."—Acts 13 : 23.

4. The Messiah was to derive his human nature from *woman*. Of the seed of the woman it was said, "It shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise its heel." The fulfilment is found in the account of the parentage of Jesus, Matt. 1 : 18-25 and Luke 1 : 35. Also, "God sent forth his Son, made of a *woman*, made under the law to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons."—Gal. 4 : 4.

VII. *The Messiah was also to partake of the divine nature.*

1. He was to be from eternity. "Whose goings forth were from of old, from *everlasting*."—Micah 5 : 2. The

nature of Jesus corresponded to this prophecy. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God."—Jno. 1 : 1, 2. Jesus said, "Before Abraham was I am;" and Paul wrote in the introduction of the Hebrew letter, "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." "And thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands."

2. He is declared by the Psalmist to be the Son of God. "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee."—Ps. 2 : 7. Nor is this passage misapplied, for the whole psalm is Messianic. The fulfilment is found in the account of the Savior's birth, in the oracle from Heaven uttered at his baptism, and in his confession before the Sanhedrim.

3. He was to be equal with God. "Awake, O sword, against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my *fellow*, saith the Lord of hosts."—Zech. 13 : 7. Christ declared that he and the Father were one. Of Christ it is said, "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God."—Phil. 2 : 6. "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh."—I. Tim. 3 : 16.

VIII. *The character of the Messiah was minutely described by the prophets.*

1. His wisdom. "And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither r prove after the hearing of his ears: but with righteousness shall he judge the poor and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he

shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked."—Is. 11 : 1-4. The Sermon on the Mount, the parables, his knowledge of human nature, and, indeed, the whole scheme of Christianity, illustrate the wisdom of Jesus and verify this prophecy.

2. His obedience. "I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and I will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him."—Deut. 18 : 18. In harmony with this prediction, Jesus said, "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." Jno. 12 : 49. Again, "For all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you."—Jno. 15 : 15. And, again, "For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me."—Jno. 6 : 48. The prayer in Gethsemane breathed the same spirit of obedience; "Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless, not my will, but thine, be done."

3. His love of righteousness. In the 45th Psalm, which unquestionably deals with Christ and his kingdom, we have the following: "Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." His whole life was a warfare against sin. Hypocrisy and injustice aroused his indignation, and called forth his most scathing rebukes. He intensely loved those who were obedient to God. "For whosoever shall do the will of my Father who is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother."

4. His gentleness and tenderness. "He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench; he shall bring forth judgment unto

truth."—Is. 42 : 1-4. Many a passage in the life of Jesus would illustrate this prediction. His manner seems to have been quiet and unexciting. He did not teach in the streets of Jerusalem, but rather on the quiet shores of Galilee, on a mountain apart from the world, or in some desert place. He headed no sedition, and led no multitudes into the wilderness to perish. If he found one mangled like a broken reed, he forgave the sin and breathed courage into the despairing heart. To the woman of the city who washed his feet with her tears, and whose virtue was like the "smoking flax," or the wick of a lamp whose flame was about to expire, he spoke only words of kindness.

5. His compassion. "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn in Zion, to give unto them beauty for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness."—Is. 61 : 1-3. In the synagogue at Nazareth, Jesus read this prediction in Isaiah, and said, "This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears."—Luke 4 : 21. His tears at the grave of Lazarus, his weeping over the doomed City of Jerusalem, his feeding the thousands in the desert, his never turning away anyone unblessed, his whole life and his death, are but so many unanswerable proofs of his compassion. His death opened all the fountains of divine mercy and compassion. He then sent his Apostles to preach the Gospel to every creature. His words of mercy were for all peoples, and they are still echoing down the ages.

6. His piety. "Then said I, Lo I come; in the volume

of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea thy law is within my heart."—Ps. 40 : 7, 8. In Hebrews 10 : 7 this prophetic statement is applied to Christ. The whole tenor of Messianic hope and prophecy implies that the Christ would be perfect in his piety; that he would be immaculate where Adam sinned; that he would be a perfect example. Accordingly, piety was a noticeable characteristic of Jesus. He always honored the Sabbath and exhibited great reverence for the Scriptures. He observed the law of Moses, and directed others to do so. Not less than six times is it recorded of him that he gave thanks for food. He often spent the whole night in prayer. It was after a night of prayer that he chose his twelve Apostles. From his long prayer on the mountain-side he descended that he might walk out on the troubled sea and rescue his imperilled disciples. He prayed in Gethsemane. He prayed on the cross. He taught his disciples to pray. At the last passover he prayed not only for his Apostles, but also for all who should believe on him through their work. His obedience and submission to the divine will were perfect. Communion with the Father was his delight. His deepest cry of anguish was "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"

IX. *The main events in the life of Jesus were minutely and accurately predicted.*

1. A divinely appointed harbinger was to announce the Messiah's coming and introduce his public ministry. (a) "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in; behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts."—Mal. 3 : 1. John the Baptist was undoubtedly the "messenger" who should prepare the way, and Jesus was the

"Lord" who should unexpectedly come to his temple. This passage has always been so applied, and the parallel is complete. (b) This Harbinger was to come in the spirit and power of Elijah. "Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and notable day of the Lord: and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to the fathers, lest I come and smite the earth with a curse." In Luke 1 : 17 this prophecy is applied to Jesus. Of John the Baptist it was said, "And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord." Jesus himself made the same use of this prediction. "And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elijah truly shall first come and restore all things. But I say unto you that Elijah has come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed. Likewise shall the Son of man suffer many things. Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the Baptist." This is confirmed by the striking resemblance between Elijah and John. Their personal appearance, their stern denunciation of evil-doers, their call to reformation, and their comparative isolation and prominence, are so strikingly similar as to suggest this exchange of names. (c) This harbinger was to begin his preaching in the wilderness. "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God."—Is. 40 : 3. John the Baptist quotes this prediction in vindication of his ministry, and declares its literal fulfilment.

2. The Messiah was to be anointed, or consecrated, for his threefold office of prophet, priest, and king, by the Holy Spirit. "Behold my servant, whom I upheld; mine elect, in

whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles." At the baptism of Jesus the Holy Spirit descended upon him, Matt. 3:16. In the synagogue at Nazareth Jesus said, the "Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor."

3. The Messiah was to enter upon his ministry in Galilee, in the tribes of Zebulun and Naphtali. Isaiah 9:1 is translated by Hengstenberg as follows: "For darkness shall not be upon the land upon which there is distress; as the former time has dishonored the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali; so shall the time come to honor it, the region on the border of the sea, by the side of the Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles." "The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath a great light shined." That is, this land at the beginning of Babylonian oppression, at the time spoken of by Isaiah, was distressed and dishonored, but a time would come when this should be reversed, and it should be honored and illumined by the Messiah's teachings. In Matthew 4:12–16 it is written that Jesus fulfilled this prophecy by beginning his ministry in Galilee. It is plain that Jesus made Capernaum his home, and began his public teaching in that region; it was also a region noted for ignorance and moral darkness.

4. The Messiah was to confirm his mission by the working of miracles, and miracles of a particular kind. "Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing."—Is. 35:5, 6. This whole chapter is prophetic of gospel blessings, and there can be no reasonable claim that this passage is misapplied. The Savior's miracles are miracles of blessing, with one exception;

they were miracles of healing; and how often these very cases occur in the Gospels! The blind, the deaf, and the lame were special objects of the Savior's compassion.

5. In the words of Isaiah, chap. 53 : 3, the Messiah was to be "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief." How perfectly this prediction was fulfilled in Jesus! How full was his own life of sorrow—sorrow which culminated in the shame and suffering of the cross; and how fully he came into sympathy with the sorrows of others! He moved among the poor and the lowly. All homes and hearts were accessible to his more than human kindness. A divine healer of all diseases, his way was always thronged by multitudes of the suffering. He stood in the chamber of sickness, and wept and prayed at the grave of Lazarus. With much sadness he once said to one who would follow him, "The foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head."

6. The Messiah was to enter Jerusalem in triumph. "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion: shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold thy King cometh unto thee: he is just and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass."—Zech. 9: 9. In Matthew, the 21st chapter, we have recorded an accurate fulfilment of this prophecy. Jesus entered Jerusalem as a king; he was "just and having salvation;" he was lowly in the estimation of the people; and the manner of his entrance symbolized his character as the Prince of Peace.

7. The Messiah was to be rejected by the Jewish people. Isaiah, many centuries before, had said, "And when we shall see him, there is no beauty that we should desire him." "He is despised and rejected of men; and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised and we esteemed him not." —Is. 53: 1–3. The fulfilment is clear and certain. "He

came to his own, and his own received him not."—John 1:11. Pilate said to the Jewish rulers, "What shall I do then with Jesus who is called Christ? They all say unto him, Let him be crucified. And the governor said, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out the more, saying, Let him be crucified."—Matt. 27:22, 23.

X. *The betrayal and trial of the Messiah.* As we approach the closing scenes of Christ's life the prophecies become more minute and remarkable. A prophet stands at nearly every turn in the history of these interesting events, and, pointing to the Scriptures written centuries before, he says, "Thus it is written."

1. The betrayal. "So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver. And the Lord said unto me, Cast it unto the potter: a goodly price that I was prized at of them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and cast them to the potter in the house of the Lord." In the 27th chapter of Matthew this prediction is applied to Jesus. Though in Matthew this is quoted as from Jeremiah, and though it seems to refer to the prophet himself, yet it is a superficial view which sees here a misapplication of the Scriptures. The prediction is the same in whatever prophet found, and the whole scope of the chapter in Zechariah shows that the prophet personates the Messiah. "The comprehensive thought of this chapter is, therefore, Judaism, utterly corrupt and apostate, repelling the merciful efforts of her Redeemer to reclaim and save her, and thus bringing on herself dire destruction."—*Prof. Cowles.* In this prophecy there are the following points: (a) The distinct implication that the Messiah would be betrayed. (b) That he would be estimated at the price of a slave—thirty pieces of silver. (c) And that the money should be given to the potter in the house of the Lord.

In the light of the history we see Judas bargaining with the Jewish rulers; we see the money counted out to him—just thirty pieces; we see the betrayer, now tortured by remorse, casting down this money in the Temple; we see the priests agreeing not to put the money into the Temple treasury, since it is the price of blood, but to purchase with it the field of the potter as a burial place for strangers.

2. His demeanor when on trial. "He was oppressed and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth." This accords with the history as given by Matthew: "And the high priest arose, and said unto him, Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee? But Jesus held his peace." "And when he was accused of the chief priests and elders, he answered nothing." "And he answered him to never a word; insomuch that the governor marvelled greatly."

3. The Messiah when on trial was to suffer great abuse. "I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting."—Is. 50:6. This passage is fairly applicable to the Messiah, since nearly the whole chapter in which it stands refers to him. "Then did they spit in his face and buffeted him; and others smote him with the palms of their hands, saying, Prophesy unto us, thou Christ, Who smote thee?" —Matt. 26:67. Mark's record is to the same effect: "And some began to spit on him, and to cover his face, and to buffet him, and to say to him, Prophesy! and the servants did strike him with the palms of their hands."

XI. *The crucifixion and burial.*

1. The Messiah was to die under a judicial sentence and

not at the hands of a mob, nor by disease. "He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living; for the transgression of my people was he stricken."—Is. 53:8. The meaning is that he would be put to death by a legal arrest and judicial condemnation. The marginal reading is better than the text, but neither brings out the sense fully. This prediction was also exactly fulfilled in Jesus. He was arrested in the Garden of Gethsemane. His trial was conducted according to the forms of law, though with the utmost disregard of justice. Jews and Gentiles,—the whole world,—were concerned in his condemnation. In how many other ways Jesus might have perished! How often his enemies were ready to murder him! It should also be remembered that Jesus could not have controlled the circumstances leading to his death. His enemies did not understand the Scriptures, and fulfilled them in condemning him.

2. The Messiah was to die by crucifixion. "He shall be *cut off* out of the land of the living."—Is. 53:8. "And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be *cut off*, but not for himself."—Dan. 9:26. These passages indicate a violent death, but not the exact form. "For dogs have compassed me: the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet."—Ps. 22:16. This passage indicates the specific manner of his death. It was only in crucifixion that hands and feet were pierced. Nor is there any doubt about the Messianic character of the 22d Psalm; it can not apply to David except in part, while several of its verses are declared in the New Testament to be prophetic. The fulfilment none will question. Jesus was crucified. This was the more remarkable, because crucifixion was not a Jewish mode of punishment, and a false prophet would not have left such a prediction on record.

3. He was to be scourged preparatory to crucifixion. "I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair."—Is. 50:6. This was literally fulfilled: "Then released he Barabbas unto them; and when he had scourged Jesus, he delivered him to be crucified."

4. When crucified the soldiers were to part his garments among them and cast lots for his vesture. "They part my garments among them and cast lots upon my vesture."—Ps. 22:18. In perfect correspondence with this, we read in the history: "Then the soldiers, when they had crucified Jesus, took his garments, and made four parts, to every soldier a part: now the coat was without seam, woven from the top throughout. They said therefore among themselves, Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be."—John 19:23, 24. The prophecy is as definite, and almost as graphic, as the history.

5. The Messiah was to be numbered with transgressors "And he was numbered with the transgressors."—Is. 53:12. During his public ministry he was often classed with publicans and sinners; it was said by the rulers that he had a devil, and that he was a Samaritan. But this prophecy had a specific fulfilment in the crucifixion. In John's Gospel we read as follows: "And he bearing his cross went forth into a place called a place of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew Golgotha: where they crucified him, and two others with him, on either side one, and Jesus in the midst."—John 19:17, 18. "Then were there two thieves crucified with him, one on the right hand and another on the left."—Matt. 27:38.

6. The Messiah was to die in the midst of his enemies. "Be not far from me, for trouble is near; for there is none to help. Many bulls have compassed me; strong bulls of Bashan have beset me round. They gaped upon me with

their mouths, as a ravening and a roaring lion."—Ps. 22: 11. This prophecy vividly recalls the scene of the crucifixion; the three crosses and their writhing victims lifted above the motley, moving crowd; Roman officers and soldiers; Jewish priests and rulers; and a great multitude from the streets of Jerusalem, which, attracted by a triple public execution, had flowed through the gates and become a sea of degraded humanity raging around the cross. Though without fault and without sin, and though he was the greatest benefactor of mankind, he suffers as the vilest of criminals, and in the midst of his enemies. If angels from his native heaven were hovering near, still they were invisible to mortal eyes.

7. The Messiah was to perish amid cruel mockings. "But I am a worm, and no man; a reproach of man, and despised of the people. All they that see me laugh me to scorn: they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying, He trusted on the Lord that he would deliver him: let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him."—Ps. 22: 6–8. The corresponding historic passage is found in Matthew 27: 39–44. "And they that passed by him reviled him, wagging their heads and saying, Thou that destroyed the temple, and builded it in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross. Likewise also the chief priests mocking him with the scribes and elders, said, He saved others; himself he cannot save. If he be the king of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him. He trusted in God; let him deliver him now if he will have him: for he said, I am the Son of God. The thieves also, who were crucified with him, cast the same in his teeth."

8. In the words of the 34th psalm concerning the righteous man, "He keepeth all his bones; not one of them is broken," so the bones of Christ were not broken. It is written in John 19: 31 as follows: "The Jews therefore,

because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day (for that sabbath day was a high day) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away. Then came the soldiers and brake the legs of the first and of the other which was crucified with him. But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs." "For these things were done that the Scripture should be fulfilled. A bone of him shall not be broken." That there is no such verbatim passage in the prophets, proves that the writers of the Gospels did not suit a fabricated history to the prophecies. But this prediction is *substantially* found in the Old Testament history, not *written*, but *acted* every year. The paschal lamb was a type of Christ (I. Cor. 5 : 7), and as in the type, so in the antitype, not a bone was to be broken.

9. It was predicted that the Messiah should be pierced. "And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced." "They pierced my hands and my feet."—Zech. 12 : 10 and Psalm 22 : 16. These passages were fulfilled in the nailing of Jesus to the cross; but they have a specific fulfilment in another fact. "But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water." "And again another Scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they pierced."—John 19 : 34, 37. The passage in Zechariah has direct reference to the blessings of the gospel which should be accepted by the Jews both then and in the after time.

10. There was a remarkable prophecy fulfilled in the burial of Jesus. "And he made his grave with the wicked and with the rich in his death: because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth."—Is. 53:9.

A distinguished scholar translates a part of this verse as follows: "And his grave was appointed with the wicked, but he was with a rich man in his death." In this prediction there are two points, both of which were fulfilled in the burial of Jesus. (a) They intended to bury him with the wicked. This is evident from the history. Barabbas was preferred to Jesus; he was crucified between thieves; it was the purpose of wicked men to treat the dead Christ with continued abuse. (b) But Heaven had other designs, now that the great sacrifice had been made. "When the even was come, there came a rich man of Arimathea, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus' disciple: he went to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded the body to be delivered. And when Joseph had taken the body he wrapped it in a clean linen cloth, and laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre and departed."—Matt. 27:57–60. Nicodemus also assisted in the burial. "And there came also Nicodemus (which at the first came to Jesus by night) and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred-pound weight. Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews is to bury. Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid. There laid they Jesus therefore, because of the Jews' preparati n day; for the sepulchre was nigh at hand."—John 19:39–42. Truly, Jesus was with the *rich* in his death.

XII. *The resurrection, ascension and coronation of the Messiah.*

1. The Messiah was to rise from the dead. "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed

he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied."—Is. 53:10, 11.. Again, in the 16th Psalm we have the following: "For thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." Jesus himself said, "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify him; and the third day he shall rise again."—Matt. 20:18, 19. To what severer test could the claims of Jesus have been subjected? and what other religious teacher ever risked his success on his own resurrection from the dead? The history of Jesus' resurrection is known to everyone. The Apostle Peter applies these prophecies to Jesus. "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in Hades, neither did his flesh see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses."—Acts 2:29–32.

2. The ascension of the Messiah was also a subject of prophecy. "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive; thou hast received gifts for men; yea, even for the rebellious also, that the Lord might dwell among them."—Ps. 68:18. In this there are several points as fulfilled by the ascension of Jesus. (a) He ascended on high. (b) He "led captivity captive," since he conquered death and the grave which held in captivity the whole race of

man, and led them as "captives" in his triumphal progress toward Heaven. (c) He received and sent down upon his waiting disciples the Holy Spirit and all the blessings of the gospel. (d) These were gifts for the "rebellious," for those who rejected and crucified him. (e) And all this was that God might dwell among men, dwell in his church on earth.

Again, the approach of the Messiah to the Heavenly City is beautifully described in the 24th Psalm, where the accompanying angels are represented as shouting, "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in." These predictions have their counterpart in the New Testament. "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men."—Eph. 4:8. "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."—Phil. 2:9–11.

3. The coronation of the Messiah is foretold and described in Daniel 7:13, 14: "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Now, though we have no history of Jesus corresponding to this prophecy, yet all the honors predicted in this passage are claimed for Jesus by the Apostles. Jesus has all authority and power. He must *reign* till he has put all enemies under his feet. They speak of him as "the image of the invisible God, the first-

born of all creation," "in him were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and invisible, whether thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers." It pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell.

XIII. *Jesus fulfilled the Messianic prophecies concerning the kingdom that the Christ should establish.* It is still the purpose to use only those prophecies which have a clear fulfilment; prophecies, therefore, which have centuries lying between the prediction and the history. If some of the prophecies of Jesus himself concerning his kingdom shall be referred to here, they will be such as have a fulfilment in these remote times as well as in the earlier Christian ages.

1. The meaning of Jesus' death and its relation to his kingdom was a matter of prophecy. "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our 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."—Is. 53; 5, 6. "And he bore the sins of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."—Is. 53; 12. The New Testament teaches the same doctrine. Said Jesus on the night in which he was betrayed, "This is my body broken for you." "This is my blood of the New Testament shed for many for the remission of sins." Christ "by the grace of God tasted death for every man." "God commendeth his love toward us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us."

2. The offices which the Messiah should fill were predicted. He was to be a *king*. "Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion."—Ps. 2 : 6. Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power.—Ps. 110; 3. Said Christ,

"All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth."—Matt. 28 : 18. He was to be a *priest.* "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek."—Ps. 110 ; 4. He was to be a *prophet.* "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth ; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him."—Deut. 18 ; 18. This is quoted by Peter as fulfilled by Jesus, Acts 3 : 22. In the system of Christianity, Christ fills all these offices.

3. The gospel of the kingdom, as an accomplished fact, was to be first preached at Jerusalem. "And it shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills ; and all nations shall flow into it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob ; and he will teach us of his ways and we will walk in his paths : for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."—Is. 2 : 2, 3. The fulfilment is most certain. Jesus commanded his apostles to begin at Jerusalem, and there Peter preached the first gospel sermon ; there and then it was first announced that God had made that same Jesus both Lord and Christ. It was then that the law of pardon was proclaimed in the name of Christ.

4. The kingdom of Christ was to be inaugurated on earth with the baptism of the Holy Spirit. "And it shall come to pass in the last days that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions."—Joel 2 : 28. Peter declares that the coming of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost was a

fulfilment of this prediction. The Holy Spirit fell, in the same manner and with the same effects, upon the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius, the centurion; and so it came upon all flesh, on Jews and Gentiles alike.

5. The gospel of the kingdom of Christ was not to meet with a universal reception: and this was to be true of all ages. If many do not now receive it, Jesus said it would be so. If some Christians prove unworthy and fall away, this also is in fulfilment of prophecy. The parable of the sower teaches that the varying results, when the gospel is preached, depend upon the kind of persons who hear, the kind of soil into which falls the incorruptible seed of the kingdom; some are the beaten highway; some, the stony ground—the thin soil spread over the continuous rock; some, the thorny ground; and some, the good ground. Whenever the gospel is preached this prophecy is fulfilled before our eyes.

6. The preaching of the gospel was to cause division and persecution. Of this, the Savior often forewarned his disciples. When they languished in prison, or perished at the fangs of savage beasts, or the hands of the public executioner, their faith was sustained by the remembrance that Jesus said it would be so; said that those who killed them would often think they were doing God a service. When we read of bloody persecutions in ancient or modern times, or when we experience alienations and hatred on account of our religion, it is no surprise. Jesus said it would be so. Even those who oppose are manufacturing proof that this religion is divine.

7. The kingdom of Christ was to be one of peace and beneficence. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The *Prince of Peace*."—Is. 9: 6.

"And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them."—Is. 11 : 5, 6. Jesus himself said, My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews : but now is my kingdom not from hence."—Jno. 18 : 36.

The influence of this peaceful kingdom on the nations of the earth was, in a large measure, to secure the mitigation and suppression of war. "And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people : and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks : nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."—Is. 2 : 4. Christianity is to-day judging among the nations and rebuking many peoples. Its influence has always been for peace. If Christianity could hold a world-wide sway, as sometime it will, wars would cease from the earth.

8. The kingdom of Christ was to be the destruction of idolatry. "And the loftiness of man shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of man shall be made low : and the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day. *And the idols he shall utterly abolish.* In that day a man shall cast his idols of silver, and his idols of gold, which they made each one for himself to worship, to the moles and to the bats."—Is. 2 : 17, 18, 20. Wherever Christianity goes it exalts the one God, and abolishes all forms of idolatry. How rapidly the idols are falling! The area of religious and scientific light is widening, and soon another familiar prophecy will be verified, "For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."—Hab. 2 : 14.

9. The kingdom of the Messiah was to include the Gentiles. "And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth."—Is. 48 : 6. "And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising: Lift up thine eyes round about, and see: all they gather themselves together, they come to thee: thy sons shall come from far, and thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side. Then thou shalt see, and flow together, and thy heart shall fear and be enlarged; because the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee, the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee."—Is. 60 : 3–5. This is a prediction which never could have been dictated by Jewish bigotry and exclusiveness. It required a miracle, as well as the benign teachings and spirit of Jesus, to induce Peter to preach the gospel to the best Gentile on earth. To the Jew such a gospel was a mystery in every sense; it was not only a long-kept secret, but also an inexplicable extension of divine favor. And yet how perfect the fulfilment! The abundance of the sea is being converted to Christ. The command was to go and teach *all nations;* Christianity is found to be universal in its principles and tendencies.

10. The kingdom of the Messiah was to have a small beginning but a wonderful expansion. "And the stone that smote the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth."—Dan. 2 : 35. The parable of the Mustard Seed teaches the same lesson. The smallest of seeds becomes a tree in which the birds find a lodgment. To-day we see this prediction, in a large measure, fulfilled. The number of Christians has *more than double in the last eighty-four years.* Three-fourths of the governments of the world are under the

influence of Christian principles. Learning, wealth, and zeal abound in the Christian world. At the rate of progress exemplified in the nineteenth century the universality of Christianity is not far distant; and yet this rate of progress will be greatly accelerated.

11. The kingdom of the Messiah was to be the final dispensation in the religious development of mankind; there was to be nothing beyond which should supersede it; it was to stand forever. "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed. and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever."—Dan. 2 : 44. "On this rock will I build my church and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it."—Matt. 16 : 18. So far as science and reason can now see, this prophecy will prove to be the sober truth. There is to be an end of human history on the earth. Every man must die; the race itself must die. Science sees our earth, at last, a vast desolation still moving through the desolate regions of space, a vast cemetery where shall sleep all the generations of men. Christianity, if fully realized in the hearts and lives of men, would be perfection itself. Every departure from Christianity is a step, not forward, but backward to materialism, animalism, and barbarism. As time goes on the argument for Christianity will continue to grow stronger and stronger: men will have experienced more of its blessed results; the close correlation between the faculties of the soul and the provisions of the gospel will be more and more evident; other systems will have had their day and have perished from the philosophies of men; the scrolls of prophecy and history will have been completely unrolled side by side, and the demonstration will be more complete; it will be more clearly seen that Christ is our only

hope; the cycles of time will be nearly completed, and the dawn of the eternal day will have begun to brighten the eastern sky. As suns and systems move on because there is little to resist their sublime revolutions, so, for a similar reason, Christianity must move on to the end of time.

CONCLUSIVENESS OF THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES.

I. *The facts of Prophecy and History now presented and their wonderful agreement can neither be successfully questioned nor explained away.*

1. These *facts* can not reasonably be questioned. We have been examining a great phenomenon—the phenomenon of Messianic prophecy and history. We have been measuring the height of this pillar of fire and watching its changes of form as it has moved across the centuries, from the beginning to the end of time. We must be sure of the facts involved before we ask for the cause and the meaning of this phenomenon. (1) There lies the Old Testament; it is an open book. The prophecies quoted from its pages may be read and verified. They are most certainly there. (2) The facts of history are equally certain. The New Testament is proved to be genuine and credible. All the great facts involved in this argument are also recorded in accepted profane history. Moreover, these facts are admitted by a candid world; are admitted by the most persistent opponents of our religion. Besides, it is not a question of small criticism. Though an item may seem to straggle and fall out

of the line here and there, yet the great army of historic facts, in solid and massive column, still marches on. (3) The *fact* of the minute, essential, and, in most cases, perfect agreement, of these two classes of facts, is also most certain. The certitude of this agreement is attainable by all men. It is an abiding fact. It is accessible to all. It is not a fact far away in time or place; nor is it one that vanishes away while we are beholding it. This is a long line of prophecy, beginning with the purpose of God in the far past and ending with the full realization of that purpose. These prophecies are of great variety—promise, type, and specific statement. They pertain to every feature of the Messiah's character, mission, doctrine, and kingdom, and they are of *great number*. Nor can this fact of essential agreement be diminished by quibbles and adverse criticism. Though this and that may not be quite clear, or be set aside as not demonstrative, still the fact in all its meaning would remain.

2. This agreement of prophecy and history *can not be explained away*. Is this phenomenon only seeming? Is it the result of self-deception and illusion? Has it been manufactured by selecting isolated passages here and there from prophecy and history, and, by slight modifications, adapting them one to the other? Is it a trick, a sort of mental sleight-of-hand, which vanishes as a matter needing no explanation when the light is brought in? That this is not the case scarcely needs argument, if the facts themselves have been thoroughly studied; yet the following may be said:

(1) An examination of the prophecies adduced will show nothing of this kind. They are neither isolated nor far-fetched; but, on the other hand, they form a regular and logical series. They have not been skillfully adapted to each other; the unchanged quotations have only been brought together in the same paragraph. And certainly these facts

have been scanned and compared by too many scholars of talent, and for too long a time, to admit of any self-deception or illusion.

(2) These prophecies are an integral part of a great and self-consistent scheme of religion. The prophecy of a Savior began with the first sin, and is woven into the whole fabric of Revelation. It is but a manifestation of divine prescience, and it is as essential to a divine religion as the wisdom or the power of God. A prophecy having no connection with a system of beneficent truth and religion, or an isolated prediction, might indeed, so far as we can see, be true; but such are not the prophecies under consideration. These prophecies do not stand alone. They are but parts of a consistent whole.

(3) That this argument has not been manufactured by a dissection and rearrangement of the material will be evident from a study of some of the connected series of Messianic prophecies contained in the Scriptures. (a) The *prophecy of Daniel* concerning the universal kingdoms is such a series; Babylon, Medo-Persia, Grecia, and Rome, and the Kingdom of Heaven with its divine Priest and King. Each kingdom has its place, and the Kingdom of the Messiah is noted and assigned its true place. When this prophecy is applied to Jesus there is no violence done to the context, either by the writer or the interpreter. (b) The *second Psalm.* If we should ask, "Of whom did the Psalmist write this? of himself or of some other man?" this Psalm would be found without meaning except as it may refer to the Messiah. An analysis, in order, gives the following points: 1. The heathen and the people, the Gentiles and the Jews, "raged" against Christ, and thought in vain to destroy him. 2. Pilate and Herod, with the rulers of the Jews, took counsel against Christ, the Lord's anointed. 3. The Lord had them in

derision, since in crucifying Jesus they were fulfilling the Scriptures. 4. Jesus was raised from the dead and crowned. "I have set my King upon my holy Hill of Zion." "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." 5. The promise of the Gentiles as his inheritance and of a universal kingdom. 6. The warning not to reject this king. (c) *The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.* This chapter is an epitome of the Messiah's life and work. 1. He would not be attractive to the Jews. 2. He would be despised and rejected. 3. He would endure human sorrow and grief. 4. He would suffer for man's transgressions. 5. He would be silent when on trial. 6. He would die under a judicial sentence. 7. He would die by violence. 8. He would be numbered with transgressors. 9. He would be with the rich in his death. 10. When he should give his life an offering for sin he would prolong his days. 11. The gospel would prosper in his hands. 12. By his knowledge he would justify many. 13. He would triumph and divide the spoil. Indeed, there cannot be found anywhere a better synopsis of the great facts in the Savior's mission. (d) *Ezekiel's vision of the Holy Waters.*—Ezek. 47 : 1–12. This presents in beautiful symbol the rise and progress of Christianity. 1. It rises beneath the temple and the throne of God. 2. Its varying depth evidently represents the increasing depth and power of Christianity as it flowed through the different dispensations. 3. It represents the power of this religion to heal the maladies of sin. 4. The fishers on the banks of this river of life were the fishers of men, the missionaries of the cross. 5. Wherever this river goes it gives life to individuals and to nations. (e) *Isaiah*, from the 40th chapter to the end—sixteen chapters—is almost wholly Messianic. "He sees the author of redemption in various scenes—now as a sufferer, humble, poor, and persecuted; and now the more distant glories of the Messiah's

kingdom rise to view. He sees him raised up from the dead; his empire extend and spread among the Gentiles; kings and princes from all lands coming to lay their offerings at his feet; the distant tribes of men come bending before him, and his religion of peace and joy diffusing its blessings around the world."—(Barnes.)

II. *That the prophets were inspired, and that Jesus was the Messiah is the only solution of this problem.*

1. It can not be truthfully said that these prophecies concerning the Christ are history, that they were written after the events. This has been said, but how unjustly may be seen by the following facts: (1) The whole Old Testament was translated into the Greek language fully 280 before Christ. This Septuagint version is still highly prized. But the books of the Old Testament must have been regarded as sacred long before this version was made, for otherwise no such translation would have been made. (2) The language and style prove the Old Testament to be very ancient. (3) The Old Testament is itself reliable history, and from this and other sources the dates of the several books may be known within certain limits. Isaiah was written at least 650 years before our era; Daniel was written before the close of the seventy years' Babylonian captivity, and hence not later than 536 B. C. The Psalms of David were a thousand years old when Jesus suffered upon the cross and rose from the dead. The last book, Malachi, was four hundred years old when John the Baptist appeared as the one who should harbinger the Messiah's coming. (4) The events predicted concerning the Messiah took place at the beginning of the Christian age, and many of them which concern his kingdom are transpiring in our own time.

2. The events in the life of Jesus were not suited by the

actors in them to the demands of prophecy. (1) Most of these prophecies were not then understood, nor now are they understood except in the light of their fulfilment. If not understood, how could they, of design, have been fulfilled? The Kingdom of Christ was misunderstood. It was thought that it would be temporal and wholly of this world; that it would prevail against the Roman authorities, and restore to the Jews the dominion and the glory of Solomon. They thought Christ would be a worthy king of such a kingdom, and not a Galilean peasant, not a Nazarene. (2) These events were beyond human determination. Neither Jesus nor his disciples could have directed the betrayal, the trial, and the crucifixion. (3) They were events brought about, in good part, by those who neither knew nor cared for the Old Testament Scriptures. (4) Pilate and Herod, the soldiers and the rabble of Jerusalem, would not have cared to manufacture arguments against themselves by fulfilling the prophecies; and this was equally true of the Jewish rulers. (5) Certainly Jesus and his disciples would not have planned to fulfil predictions foreboding such dark calamities to themselves and their cause.

3. This argument of prophecy and history can not be the result of sagacious and fortunate conjecture. Nearly all such mere conjectures fail and go for nothing, not being even remembered. If the causes were seen at work, then the result might be declared beforehand with considerable accuracy. After the discovery of America, and after there was a knowledge of its vast extent and resources, it required no prophet to predict that this new world would be the seat of mighty empires, nor that it would have a rapid development. The astronomer is not a prophet because he tells us the exact moment when Venus, years hence, will pass across the disk of the sun; the cause is at work and may be meas-

ured. We have a better illustration of prophecy, or of political conjecture rather, in Napoleon's declaration that in fifty years Europe would be all Cossack, or republican. Nearly twice fifty years have sufficed to show how great the difference between mere conjecture and inspired prophecy. The events in the career of the Messiah were so minute, so specific, and so numerous as to preclude the supposition of conjecture, whether philosophical or political.

4. This agreement could not have been brought about by mathematical forecast. Mathematics deals with the abstract, and not with the concrete. It can not establish any fact that *has* taken place; much less one that *has not* been and may never be. This is so evident as to need no statement, except that no possible hypothesis may be omitted.

5. Nor can this agreement of prophecy and history be the result of chance. It is computed that there would have been a million chances to one, against the fulfilment of *only three* of the predicted events in the life of the Messiah—the *time* and *country* of his birth, and the *manner* of his death. In how many different countries he might have appeared, at how many different times, and by how many different forms of death he might have perished! When we take into account not *three* points of identity, but more than a *hundred* of them, the theory of chance becomes absurd.

6. As stated above, there is but one solution; the prophets were inspired and *Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God.*

PROPHECIES CONCERNING THE MESSIAH.

INTRODUCTION.

1. *Jesus claimed these prophecies.*
2. *The Apostles made the same claim.*
3. *All Christian writers have made it.*
4. *A wonderful claim.*

I. THE PURPOSE OF GOD.

1. *Christianity a development of divine love.*
2. *This love assumed the form of a purpose.*
3. *The plan self-consistent.*

II. THE PROMISE OF THE MESSIAH.

1. *The promise to the first sinner.*
2. *The promise to Abraham.*
3. *The promise to David.*
4. *The promise to the Jewish people.*
5. *The last promise in the Old Testament.*

III. PPOPHECY IN TYPE AND ANTITYPE.

1. *Sacrifice.*
2. *Israel's redemption; eight particulars.*
3. *The Tabernacle and the worship there; eleven particulars.*
4. *Specific types of the Messiah; nine instances.*

IV. THE TIME OF THE MESSIAH'S ADVENT.

1. *In the last days.*
2. *During the fourth Universal empire.*
3. *While Judah still remained.*
4. *While the Second Temple was standing.*
5. *The exact time as given by Daniel.*
6. *In the fulness of the times; seven particulars.*

V. THE PLACE OF THE MESSIAH'S NATIVITY.

VI. THE LINEAGE OF THE MESSIAH.

1. *A descendant of Abraham.*
2. *Of the Tribe of Judah.*
3. *Of the house of David.*
4. *To "be made of a woman."*

VII. THE MESSIAH TO BE DIVINE.

1. *From eternity.*
2. *Called the Son of God.*
3. *Equal with God.*

VIII. THE CHARACTER OF THE MESSIAH.

1. *His wisdom.*
2. *His obedience.*
3. *His love of righteousness.*
4. *His gentleness.*
5. *His compassion.*
6. *His piety.*

IX. MAIN EVENTS OF HIS LIFE.

1. *Preceded by a harbinger.*

2. *Was to be anointed by the Holy Spirit.*
3. *Begin his ministry in Zebulun.*
4. *Was to work miracles.*
5. *A man of sorrows.*
6. *To enter Jerusalem in triumph.*
7. *To be rejected by the Jews.*

X. THE BETRAYAL AND TRIAL OF THE MESSIAH.

1. *To be betrayed for thirty pieces of silver; three particulars.*
2. *To be silent when on trial.*
3. *To suffer great abuse.*

XI. THE CRUCIFIXION AND BURIAL.

1. *To die under a judicial sentence.*
2. *To die by crucifixion.*
3. *To be scourged.*
4. *His garments to be parted among the soldiers.*
5. *To be numbered with transgressors.*
6. *To die in the midst of his enemies.*
7. *To be mocked when on the cross.*
8. *Not a bone of him to be broken.*
9. *He should be pierced.*
10. *To be with the rich in his death.*

XII. THE RESURRECTION, ASCENSION AND CORONATION.

1. *To rise from the dead.*
2. *Was to ascend.*
3. *To be coronated Lord of lords.*

XIII. PROPHECIES CONCERNING MESSIAH'S KINGDOM.

1. *The meaning of his death.*
2. *To be a prophet, priest, and king.*
3. *To begin at Jerusalem.*
4. *To be inaugurated by the coming of the Holy Spirit.*
5. *Not to be accepted by all who should hear.*
6. *To cause divisions and persecutions.*
7. *A kingdom of peace.*
8. *To destroy idolatry.*
9. *It was to include the Gentiles.*
10. *To have a small beginning but a great expansion.*
11. *It was to be the final dispensation.*

CONCLUSIVENESS OF THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES.

I. THE FACTS AND THEIR AGREEMENT CAN NOT BE EXPLAINED AWAY.

1. *The facts of prophecy and history can not be questioned.*
2. *Their agreement can not be explained away.*

II. THAT THE PROPHETS WERE INSPIRED THE ONLY SOLUTION.

1. *These prophecies not written after the history.*
2. *They were not intentionally suited to the events.*
3. *The agreement not the result of conjecture*
4. *Not mathematical forecast.*
5. *Not the result of chance.*
6. *Inspiration the only solution.*

GENERAL SUMMARY.

It remains to give a general summary of the argument. It is assumed, to begin with, that there is a God, all-wise, all-powerful, and infinitely just and benevolent; that man exists as an intelligent, moral, and religious being; that nature exists as we know it; and that there are solid grounds of certitude for human knowledge to rest upon. The Proposition was stated and defined: "*Jesus is the Christ the Son of God.*" This proposition is not *impossible* or absurd, since an infinite God could manifest himself to man, could do so in the person of Christ, and could give adequate proof of this manifestation. Nor is it impossible for man to have certain knowledge that this has been done. The facts of Christianity may be among the most certain things of history. If certain kinds of testimony should have been false, it would be a greater miracle than any narrated in the Bible. The proposition is not *improbable*. Man *needs* a divine teacher and savior. God is strong enough and good enough to meet this greatest of all needs, and his being the author of our nature is a pledge that all its wants shall be supplied. The cause and the conditions exist and there is, therefore, a strong *probability* that the effect would follow, that God would hear and heed the cry of his children. There is the same probability that Jesus is the Savior; for the choice lies between Christianity and no religion. It is *not difficult* to believe that God has remembered us in mercy.

The fundamental facts of Christianity, as presented in the New Testament, are firmly established. The books of the

New Testament are *genuine*, and may be traced back to the hands of the Apostles. They are *credible*, or no history whatever is worthy of belief. The number of the witnesses for Jesus, their character, their honesty, their opportunity to know, and the impossibility of deception; the admission of heretics and adversaries; the evidence from profane writers; the improbability and impossibility of forgery; the agreement with profane history; the peculiar relation of the New Testament books to one another; the effects now in existence which originated in Bible facts as the only cause; and the divine spirit and power of Christianity itself—all combine to render the rejection of these testimonies impossible. The facts of the New Testament being credible, it follows, as a logical necessity, that Jesus was the Messiah and a divine Savior.

Jesus and his religion, as made known in the New Testament, are subjected to the tests of science and reason. Christianity and nature agree in their *methods*, thus vindicating their oneness of authorship. They agree in their *teaching:* they agree in the existence, personality, and attributes of God; they agree in the fact of Creation and in the order of creative epochs; they agree in the unity and antiquity of man; they agree in mental and moral science; and they agree in reference to the destiny of the earth and of man. Christianity is *adapted to human nature:* the Bible, as a revelation, is in the best form; it seeks to save man from sin in the only way possible; the revelation of God meets man's wants; the manifestation and sufferings of Christ were such as to secure an affectionate obedience on the part of man; the provisions of the gospel are such as to secure steadfastness in the Christian life and success in Christian work; the precepts and requirements of Christianity commend themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God. This

religion produces the most beneficent effects; it leads on to civilization, and is the religion that man needs; if not true, then a true religion would be injurious and impossible to man. Christianity is *superhuman:* its account of Creation; its unity; its prophecies; its sublime morality; its profound religious principles; its stupendous plan, comprehending time and eternity; its Jesus, a perfect man and a perfect manifestation of God, sinless, faultless, and divine; its triumph over the combined opposition of the Jewish nation and of the Roman Empire; the impossibility, on the supposition that Jesus was not what he claimed to be and hence in no sense the author of Christianity, that any one of his disciples could have devised such a grand scheme and made it successful—all concur in demonstrating the supernatural character of this religion. There are no insuperable objections. The author of such a system must have been divine. It is in the highest degree probable that the Heavenly Father *would* give man a Divine Savior from sin; the New Testament gives us great facts which show that he *has* done so; and the religion of which this Savior is the author agrees with the works of God, is adapted to the faculties of the human soul, and is the only religion possible to man—the only religion able to make him wise unto salvation. What stronger evidence could be demanded? What stronger evidence is possible?

That which is impossible with man is possible with God. Through the prescience of God the great facts of Christianity were declared many centuries before they actually transpired. The prophecies of the Old Testament more than double the evidence. The Old Testament writers are *reliable historians.* They wrote by the *inspiration* of God, for the Eastern world is written all over with the fulfilment of their prophecies: the valleys of the Euphrates, the Jordan, and the Nile; the morasses of Babylon, the pasture lands of Nineveh, the slopes

and hill-tops of Jerusalem, and the bare rock on which once stood Tyre, the mistress of the Mediterranean. The fate of the ancient nations can not be recounted without bearing testimony to the inspiration of the prophets: Arabs and Egyptians, Babylonians and Phœnicians, Greeks and Romans, all passed away in obedience to prophetic doom. The voice of prophecy was the voice of God.

These "holy men of old" bear testimony to the Messiahship and divinity of Jesus. We see him moving in the light of an inspired history written ages before his advent. By the prescience of the Holy Spirit his pathway was traced from Heaven to earth, from the manger of Bethlehem to the rock-hewn sepulcher of Joseph, and from the Mount of Olives to the throne of God!

COROLLARIES.

I. THE BOOKS OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS ARE CANONICAL.

II. THE BOOKS OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS WERE GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD.

THE CANON.

By the Canon is meant those books which should have authority among Christians as regulative of belief and conduct; those books which are justly regarded as sacred; those which come to us on divine authority.

1. That the Canonicity of these books is a necessary corollary, or deduction from the Proposition now demonstrated, is evident from the following considerations:

(1) *The supreme authority in religious matters belongs to Christ.* (a) He is of the divine nature and exercises all divine prerogatives. (b) He fills all the sacred offices whence all authority for such a purpose must emanate; for he is the Christ, the anointed prophet, priest, and king, for the human race. (c) In the light of this Proposition, the authority which Jesus claimed, and which the Apostles accord to him, must be admitted. Now, Jesus said, just before his ascension, and among his last and sublimest utterances, "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth." On the last Jewish Pentecost the Holy Spirit made proclama-

tion "that God had made that same Jesus both Lord and Christ." "And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence." If Christ has *all authority*, then there is no other authority except what may have been conferred by him.

(2) *Christ delegated this authority to his Apostles and to none else.* (a) He told them to wait at Jerusalem and not to enter on their mission till they were endued with power from on high; accordingly, they waited till they received the baptism of the Holy Spirit. He promised them that the Spirit should lead them into all truth, and should bring all things to their remembrance; it should take of the things of the Father and show these things to them; when brought before kings and governors, it should teach them what and how to speak. (b) He said to them, "He that heareth you heareth me." He assured them that what they bound or loosed on earth should be bound or loosed in Heaven. "Whosesoever sins," said he, "ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." He declared that they should sit—as lawgivers—on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. He not only gave them full authority to act as his embassadors in ordering his kingdom, but he also gave them the signs of their Apostleship,—the power to work miracles, and to confirm their divine wisdom and authority. (c) Nor was this authority given to any one else. The Apostles had no successors. Christ and the Apostles still occupy the throne themselves. Such authority was not given to the church in general, nor to any special congregation; it was given to no Pope, nor council, ecumenical or otherwise.

(3) The books, therefore, which Christ and the Apostles endorsed as Sacred Scriptures, and those also which are of

Apostolic authority, which were written or approved as such by the Apostles, are canonical.

(4) Nor is this method of reasoning a case of circular probation. Truthfulness and canonicity are not the same things. A book might be true, but not canonical, and most books are of this character. The books of the New Testament have been found to be genuine and credible, and from this it follows that Jesus was the Messiah. To say that these books are canonical is something more; it is to say that they are not only true but also of divine *authority* in religious matters.

2. *The books of the Old Testament are canonical.*

(1) The books of the Old Testament, in the days of Christ and the Apostles, were *the same as now.* When Christ and the Apostles spoke of "the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms;" or of the "Scriptures," or of the "Holy Scriptures," they referred to the same collection of books which we now have. (a) Josephus gives the following statement concerning what were the Jewish Scriptures: "For we have not myriads of books, discordant and conflicting, but only twenty-two books, containing the history of all time, which are justly believed to be divine. Of these, five belong to Moses, which contain both the laws and the tradition of the origin of man until his (Moses') death, a period little short of three thousand years. From the death of Moses until the reign of Artaxerxes, who was king of the Persians after Xerxes, the prophets after Moses wrote in thirteen books the events of their own times; the remaining four books contain hymns to God and practical duties to men. It is true our history has been written since Artaxerxes, very particularly, but has not been esteemed of like authority with the former by our forefathers because there has not been an exact succession of prophets since that time. And how firmly we

have given credit to these books of our own nation is evident by what we do, for, during so many ages as have already passed, no one has been so bold as either to add anything to them, to take anything from them, or to make any change in them, but it is become natural for all Jews, immediately from their very birth, to esteem these books to contain divine doctrines, and to persist in them, and, if occasion be, to die for them."—(*Against Apion, book* 1, *sec.* 8.) It is well known that the twenty-two books endorsed by Josephus are the same as our thirty-nine, since he reckoned the minor prophets as one book, Judges and Ruth as one, the two books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, as one each, Ezra and Nehemiah as one, and Jeremiah and Lamentations as one. It should also be remembered that this decisive testimony comes from the times of Christ and his Apostles. (b) Philo, the learned Jew of Alexandria, who was born 20 B. C., quotes the books of our Old Testament copiously, and none others, as sacred Scriptures. "There is no reason for supposing that Philo's canon differed from that of Josephus."—(*Harman.*) (c) The Septuagint version of the Old Testament is the one generally used in the days of Christ. The Apostles usually quote from it, rather than from the Hebrew; but the Septuagint contained the same books as our present Old Testament. (d) The Syriac Version, called the Peshito, contains both the Old and the New Testaments. This was made about 150 A. D. This was a translation from the original Hebrew, and the canon of the Old Testament was the same then as now. (e) Christ and the Apostles, who quote the Scriptures so often and so copiously, quoted our present books of the Old Testament and none others. This, of itself, is sufficient and unanswerable evidence that the "Scriptures" of Christ and the Apostles were our books of the Old Testament.

(2) Christ and the Apostles *endorsed these books as canonical,*

as sacred and authoritative in religious matters. (a) They often endorse the Old Testament as a whole. One Apostle calls it the "Holy Scriptures" and declares that it was written by inspiration of God. Jesus recognized the threefold division common in his day—the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms—including all the Scriptures, and declared that what they said concerning himself must be fulfilled. The Savior always honored these Scriptures as being of divine authority. (b) They invariably quote the separate authors as speaking by the Holy Spirit, and as giving to the world the word of God. They not only endorse the Old Testament as a whole, but also its separate portions. (c) They appeal to these books continually as an authoritative source of the premises used in their arguments. (d) The Greek concordance shows that Christ and the Apostles used the words "Scripture" and "Scriptures," as designating the Old Testament, not less than *fifty times*, and always in such a way as to imply the sacredness and authority of these books. They use the word "written" and the words "it is written," as referring to the Scriptures, fully *a hundred times* by actual count.

The questions when, where, and by whom, the books of the Old Testament were written, can not affect this other question of their canonicity. Nor does it matter how each book was made up—whether *de novo* or from pre-existing documents; nor how these materials were combined; nor how many times, and by whom, or when, these books may have been re-edited and transcribed. If Christ and the Apostles assert their divine authority, it is enough; we can not go back of their decision.

3. *The books of the New Testament are canonical.*

(1) Since Christ gave to his Apostles full authority, and commissioned them to preach the gospel to every creature,

and to teach those who should accept this gospel all that he had commanded them; and, since he was then taken up from them, the canon of the New Testament must be established on the authority of the Apostles. It is simply the question whether these books come to us on Apostolic authority—whether they were written by the Apostles or approved by them as authoritative.

(2) There should be a sharp distinction made between the canonicity of a New Testament book and the knowledge that it is canonical. If a religious book was written by an Apostle, or approved by one as authoritative, it *was* canonical whether known to be so or not. If hidden away and unknown to any individual or any church, it had the same character and authority as if it were well known and generally accepted. If a new book written by an Apostle should be found it would be canonical, and if one of the books of the New Testament should be found *not* to be of Apostolic authority it would *not* be canonical. *Second Peter* was canonical all the time, no matter how long it was before it was generally known to the church. The New Testament canon always did consist of these books which are of Apostolic authority, and it always will consist of these, whether they are known as such or not.

(3) The idea, therefore, is absurd that a book could be made canonical or not canonical by a vote of a council. A vote could not change the *authorship* of a book. The question of authorship is one of fact, and not of legislation; and this fact is to be determined by proper evidence, and not by an arbitrary vote. Neither the Council of Laodicea nor the Third Council of Carthage ever undertook so absurd a thing as to make or unmake a canonical book.

(4) The question whether a book is of Apostolic authority, or canonical, was decided in ancient times, as it must be

now, on proper evidence; and the evidence for the authorship of a New Testament book must be the same, *in kind*, as that for any other book, viz.: the character of the book as related to the supposed author, and the testimony of those who had the opportunity, and who were under obligations, to know its origin. Concerning the evidence for the books under consideration, the following points should be noted: (a) These books, together constituting the canon of the New Testament, were gradually produced; some were written near the middle, and some near the close, of the first Christian century. While the Apostles were still living, and the common oral gospel was still in the memories of Christians, there was not the same need of written statements; this need was not very pressing while as yet there were no controversies in the church; or, if there were, while an appeal might be made to the Apostles themselves. These books were produced as real occasions called them forth. We should not expect, therefore, to find any *very early* catalogue of these books; such a perfect definition of the canon was not possible till after the books themselves were written. (b) Again, an acquaintance with these books and the evidence of their Apostolic origin must have been attained very slowly by individuals and by the church in general. Then a new book was not announced in the daily press, nor reviewed in literary and religious periodicals. People of neighboring countries did not intermingle as they now do. These books at first existed as single copies, and these copies were widely distributed, being addressed to individual persons in many cases and to particular churches. Though multiplied and distributed with zeal, yet the progress of this work must have been very slow. (c) For some time a book might be known in one part of the Christian world, but not in another; some might be regarded for a time as authoritative by the eastern

churches, and not accepted, though not rejected, by the western; and this would imply no discredit to the books, nor any deficiency in the evidence; nor yet, that the churches were discordant and influenced by local creeds and practices. (d) Under such circumstances it would be natural that some books should be held in doubt; especially those written by authors least known and least prolific, and, therefore, the most peculiar, and those long held as private possessions. It might also occur that a book should be known to be of Apostolic authority, though by which of the Apostles it was written or authorized might not be absolutely certain. (e) The slowness in coming to a decision relative to some of the books, and the doubts entertained by some writers, are characteristic of intelligent, conscientious, and Christian men. They patiently waited for evidence, sifted the testimony in the case of each book with great thoroughness, and came to a conscientious conclusion.

(5) Now the evidence for the canon of the New Testament is just such as we should judge, from all the circumstances, it would be. (a) Of the twenty-seven books of the New Testament *twenty* have been received as of Apostolic origin and authority by Christian scholars and churches of all ages. There is no valid dissent from this statement. They were so received on the testimony of those who knew their origin and authority—the testimony of the early Christian Fathers and of the primitive churches. In the first part of this treatise it was proved that the New Testament contains the testimony for Christ as the original witnesses gave it to the world. It was shown that these books were *genuine*, *uncorrupted*, and *credible*. It follows from the truth of the main Proposition thas *these* books are canonical. It should be remembered that these unquestioned books contain the great facts of Christianity, and fully determine what it is in its doctrines

and institutions. They also furnish a standard by which we may judge of the internal evidence of canonicity furnished by the remaining books. (b) The seven books not so early agreed upon were the following: Hebrews, Revelation, James, Jude, Second John, Third John, and Second Peter. The evidence for these books stands as follows: 1° Each of these books was received as authoritative by a large and respectable portion of the early Christian Fathers and churches; and this portion was, in general, composed of those who were in a situation to know about them. The *Syrian version*, made A. D. 150, contained Hebrews and James. The *Old Latin version*, of about the same age, had all the New Testament except James and Second Peter. The *Muratori Canon* numbers Revelation and Second John among sacred books. *Tertullian* accepted Hebrews, Revelation, James, and Jude. There never was a time when these books were wholly rejected. 2° The state of doubt concerning these books at length passed away, and the Apostolic authority of these books was universally recognized. Isolated critics, in ancient or modern times, are no exception to this statement, since their positions have usually been taken on account of hostility to Christianity, or to some doctrine which does not harmonize with the critic's peculiar theological views. "From the close of the second century the history of the Canon is simple, and its proof clear. It is allowed even by those who have reduced the genuine Apostolic works to the narrowest limits that from the time of Irenæus the New Testament was composed essentially of the same books which we receive at present, and that they were regarded with the same reverence as is now shown them."—(Westcott.) Jerome accepted the New Testament as it now stands. At the Council of Laodicea, about 350 A. D., and at the Third Synod of Carthage, A. D. 397, the New Testament Canon

was such as now. The East and the West came to a perfect agreement in regard to it; and this universal consent was not questioned till modern discussions arose. 3° The internal character fully accords with this decision. The accepted books of Paul, Peter, and John form a standard of judgment for some of them. The Epistles of James and Jude have nothing in them contradictory to their canonicity. The doctrine of these books harmonizes with the general facts and principles of Christianity, and the style is worthy of their high origin and authority.

INSPIRATION.

In proportion as men turn to the Bible as the source of religious doctrine and authority, in that proportion do they desire to know in what sense it is the word of God—in what sense it is inspired. After it has been demonstrated that Christianity is of divine origin, and that the Bible contains a revelation from Heaven, such a theory of inspiration may be adopted as will render this revelation practically worthless. In the progress of religious thought great subjects often need reconsideration and restatement. Every Christian parent, every Sunday-school teacher, and every preacher, desires to have consistent, scientific, defensible, and scriptural views on this subject; we desire to see and feel the rock on which we are building.

Inspiration is not only a subject of acknowledged importance, but candor requires the admission that it is also one of very great difficulty. One who does not see and duly

appreciate these difficulties is unfitted for this discussion, and the discussion itself is useless unless it is conducted with the purpose to show how these discords disappear in the harmony of a true system. The following is a brief conspectus of these difficulties: (1) If the Bible is assumed to be all inspired, the words as well as the thoughts, we find it hard to defend this position; there are too many inaccuracies, it is said; too many trivial statements; the style of the different writers is too variant; in many cases there was no need of such inspiration; and in some portions it is wholly disclaimed. (2) If it is maintained that none of the Bible is inspired, then it sinks to the level of all other human productions; and even below this level, becoming self-contradictory and mendacious, since many portions and writers of the Bible claim this divine assistance. (3) If we say that some of the Bible is inspired and some not, then who shall draw the line, and to draw such a line would not inspiration be requisite? If the divine and the human, the food and the poison, are mingled, is not the compound useless and even dangerous? (4) Again, is inspiration a natural or a supernatural gift? Were Homer and Shakespeare inspired as well as Isaiah, and Calvin as well as Paul? (5) Still further, what would be adequate proof of inspiration? Shall it be the nature of the things written, a superhuman sublimity in the style, the testimony of the ancient church, or the testimony of the writers themselves—any or all of these? (6) Finally, would inspiration secure the writers of the Bible against all possible error, or would it be sufficient if they were secured from error in reference to the one great purpose of revelation, the making of men "wise unto salvation?" Surely this array of difficulties is sufficient to make one cautious in speaking and writing on this subject; sufficient to make one modest in stating his own opinions and in criticising the opinions of

others. Indeed, there is no subject on which one is in more danger of saying unwise and unwarranted things; no subject with regard to which we more frequently pray that Christianity may not suffer in the house of its friends.

I. First of all, it is needful to form a definite idea of the question under discussion. Stated in Bible language it is this: *Were the Holy Scriptures given by Inspiration of God?* This question should be carefully distinguished from several others with which it is liable to be confounded.

1. From the question, whether Christianity is supernatural and of divine authority. Inspiration concerns the *how* and not the *what.* When we have brought up our evidences and proved that Christianity is of God, inspiration is still another and a subsequent question. Indeed, if it were denied that any part of the Bible is inspired, still Christianity might remain. We might lose some arguments, yet enough might remain to justify our faith in Christ. The writers of ancient history were not inspired, and yet the great facts of history are most certain. To say the least, Bible history is not less reliable than any other. Besides, we are wont to corroborate sacred history by the testimony of profane, uninspired writers. Uninspired Scriptures may, therefore, have great weight. The question of inspiration does not involve everything. "What think ye of the Christ?" is more fundamental than "What think ye of inspiration?" We are not discussing the divine origin of Christianity.

2. From the question whether the original writers of the Bible—whether the *men*—were inspired? They might have been inspired to *know*, but not to *write*, or to write and not to know, as was evidently the fact in some instances. It is true, the fact of inspired men may lie very near the other fact

of inspired books, and that the one may be a reason for the other, and yet these two facts are different.

3. Especially must this question be discriminated from that of *revelation*. How the original writers of the Bible learned or obtained the things they wrote, how the revelation was made to *them*, is one thing; but with what assistance they wrote, or how this revelation was made known to *us*, is quite a different thing. This will be the more evident if we consider the various sources whence the material of the Bible was obtained. These sources were two, the human and the divine. The *human sources* of the things given in the Bible are the following: (1) The writer himself. Here we place what the writer derived from four sources—consciousness, intuition, experience, and reason. *Consciousness* gave him a knowledge of his own spirit; its nature to some extent; its states and activities. This knowledge of himself was a knowledge also of the human mind in general, and the means of understanding, so far as possible to man, the divine nature and spiritual activity. Hence he derived his ideas of existence, the superiority of mind, sin and sorrow, innocence and peace, love and hate, and all the yearnings of the soul. This knowledge runs all through the Bible, sometimes as a distinct stream, but usually flowing into and mingling with others. *Intuition* gave him certain fundamental ideas and truths. These writers were men, and possessed, like other men, that stock of original knowledge which is denominated "common sense," without which they would have been fools and incapable of any intellectual progress. From this source they derived their ideas of right and wrong, their belief that men should do right, and the first premises in all their reasonings. *Experience* furnished whatever memory might recall of what they had seen and felt. This is a prolific source of Bible material; the history written by Moses, the gospels of

Matthew and John in good part, and a large part of Acts, are examples. *Reason* is here used as a general term for that mental activity by which the elements of original knowledge are compared and combined and thus new forms of knowledge produced. This includes the logical process by which, through two propositions properly related, the mind perceives a third truth; the process of classification by which general notions are formed; and the creative process over which the imagination presides, which furnishes new things and a distinct kind of knowledge. The proverbs of Solomon, the poetry of David, the drama of Job and Solomon's Song, the imagery of the prophets, the moral and social truths of large portions of the Bible, are all in some measure the product of reason. (2) A second human source is the testimony of other men. Mark and Luke undoubtedly obtained many things from the Apostolic preaching, and from their intimate association with Paul and other Apostles. (3) A third source is the documents of various kinds to which the writers of the Bible had access. Moses may have used such sources of history: for example, the genealogical tables of Genesis and the law copied from the tables of stone. The books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles give evidence, more or less clear, of having been made up from pre-existing annals. The genealogy of Jesus was evidently taken from Jewish records. It is no uncommon or remarkable fact that many portions of the Scriptures may be traced to former writings.

The *divine sources* of the material of the Bible are even more various. Nearly all the facts in the case are ignored by one who supposes that inspiration was the only method of divine communication. (1) God himself spoke from the heavens. The instances are few, but impressive; from the smoking and trembling summit of Sinai; from the bowed heavens when Jesus was baptized; and from the "excellent glory" which

canopied the Mount of Transfiguration. The Law, and the oracle, "This is my beloved Son; hear ye Him," were worthy of this divine utterance. (2) The teachings, character, and example of Jesus are another source. The Son of God was sent into the world to make a great revelation to man. A large portion of the gospel is what Jesus did and taught. (3) A third divine source is the ministration of angels. Angels visited Abraham, explained the visions of Daniel, announced the birth of the Christ, and explained the symbols of the Apocalypse. (4) Another source was the dream and the vision; the presentation of a scene in the sleeping or the waking state of the prophet. Memory recalled what was seen and heard, and the writer gave it permanent record. (5) Inspiration was another source, and the last in this analysis. By a direct influence of the Divine Spirit upon the human spirit superhuman knowledge was conveyed to man. In dreams and visions this must have been a part of the process; since a spiritual influence was needed that the dream or vision might appear, and for its correct interpretation either at the time or after. In this way the facts of the Creation were given to Moses, the purposes of the Divine Mind, and the many predictions of the prophets. These five methods are sufficient to illustrate Paul's statement: "God, who at sundry times and in *divers manners* spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." This analysis shows that the methods of revelation were many and that inspiration, as a means of knowledge, was only one of these methods.

These by-paths into which the discussion might wander having been guarded, we now return to the single question, "Were the Holy Scriptures given by inspiration?" Were they *written* with or without the guidance of the Holy Spirit?

Were the writers influenced by the Holy Spirit in respect to what and how they should write?

II. Our next duty is a clear definition of the two main terms in this question, viz.: *Holy Scriptures* and *Inspiration.* Before entering upon the proof of any proposition we need to know exactly what is affirmed, and concerning what the affirmation is made. Be it remembered, however, that the definitions of these terms here given are intended to be definitive only of the sense in which the affirmation will be made, that "The Holy Scriptures were given by Inspiration of God," and preliminary to the full establishment of their meaning.

1. By the "*Holy Scriptures*" we understand the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament and the twenty-seven books of the New. These books are regarded by the whole Christian world as of divine authority. All errors of transcription, all interpolations, and all apocryphal portions, are excluded as forming no part of the Holy Scriptures. Biblical criticism has now so perfectly determined and expunged these errors that we have the Scriptures as they were left by the original writers; it is not, therefore, a logical requirement that the term "Holy Scriptures" should be restricted to the original autographs. If it be said that there may be a question as to what books are to be classed as Holy Scriptures, as to what books are canonical, we reply that this question has been decided, and decided upon its merits. In the days of Christ and his Apostles the Jewish Scriptures were known as the Sacred Scriptures, and were quoted and endorsed by them as such. Nor is there any doubt about these Scriptures being the same as our canonical books of the Old Testament. The books of the New Testament were accepted by the Apostolic Church as of divine authority. Before the close of the

second century there was an essential agreement in regard to the New Testament canon. Behind this decision we can not go. If it can be shown that any book, or any portion of any book, was not regarded as sacred, and that it has no just claim to this high honor, why then it must be excluded from the Holy Scriptures, and then I affirm nothing concerning its inspiration.

2. *Inspiration*, in its most general sense, denotes a divine and miraculous illumination and guidance of the human mind. As applied to the Holy Scriptures, the word inspiration is used to denote that divine and miraculous illumination and guidance which enabled their original writers to select from the store-house of their knowledge the proper material and correctly to embody the same in human language. If this is true of the Bible, then, in an important sense, it is the Word of God, a revelation of His will, and able to make men wise unto salvation. The law of parsimony requires that we shall not assign to any phenomenon a higher cause than may be needful to produce it. Inspiration as here defined is an adequate cause for the fact and form of the Bible, while if taken in any lower sense the Scriptures would be shorn of all divine authority, and human fallibility would attach to all their utterances. It will be observed that in this definition of inspiration there is no effort to determine the ratio of the divine to the human, no exact measuring of the divine influence, and no statement of the kind and degree of certitude which belongs to different portions of the Bible. We must not make our theory of inspiration more rigid than the facts. We must not seek uniformity where God has placed wide diversity. One says that the parables of Jesus were always for the illustration of his doctrine; another, that they were for the obscuration of his teachings in order that the unworthy might not understand; and still another, that

they were for present obscuration but future illumination. Evidently none of these are right, since the parable was sometimes for the one purpose and sometimes for the other. So we shall err if we say that inspiration was always of this degree or that. It varied with the changing circumstances of the writer's knowledge and skill, and with the nature of the truth to be conveyed. Sometimes the divine was the chief factor, sometimes the human, and sometimes they were nearly equal. It gave now the thought only, now the words only which the prophet did not understand, and now both thought and language; now the argument turns upon the exact word, and now it is gathered from the drift of the thought. In one place the utmost certainty is required, and the oath of God is added for confirmation; and in another place a fact is given as found recorded in a loose and inaccurate, uninspired document, yet given as found in that document. With these preliminary definitions in our hands, we now come to our proposition.

III. THE HOLY SCRIPTURES WERE GIVEN BY INSPIRATION OF GOD.

1. The first argument for this proposition is found in *its possibility*, in the fact that inspiration takes place in harmony with and through a *law of mind*. Disguise it as we may, the underlying, and often unconscious, reason why inspiration is rejected or lowered till it is only a kind of genius is to be found in the notion that it is unnatural and impossible. But to concede such a position is to give up everything; for the very idea of a *revelation* is that of a miracle. Those who *on this ground* begin to explain away any miracle are logically bound to go on till all is lost. To yield one is to give the tiger a taste of blood, the life-blood of Christianity. Those who are tempted in this direction should remember that if all

the Bible miracles were given up the fact of miracles would still remain in nature and science; the creation of the material universe and the manifestation of thought in every part, the production of life on this fire-purified globe, but not from antecedent life, and the creation of the human soul bearing the name and image of its Maker. It seems to be a fact that mind can act upon mind without using the special senses as a medium. In harmony with this law it was possible for wicked spirits to take possession of the human mind, and hence the New Testament account of demoniacs. Satanic influence is recognized in the Bible. The origin of thoughts and feelings is often shrouded in mystery. Sir William Hamilton supposes an unconscious mental activity; some scientists, an "unconscious cerebration;" and a recent theological writer, in the Princeton Review, a "hidden heart," "desperately wicked," concerning which the question is asked, "Who can know it?" The spiritual gifts of Apostolic days, the baptism in the Spirit, and the gift of the Spirit, promised to all those who obey the Gospel, are kindred facts. Inspiration is among the "all things" possible with God, but it seems the more possible in the light of these kindred facts, and when we have found an open pathway of approach.

It may be asked how there was any necessity that the Scriptures should be written by inspiration, since it is by a fallible transcription and transmission that they are handed down to us, and by an equally fallible interpretation that their truths are to be brought home to the understanding and conscience. Between God and the conscience there are four agencies: the Holy Spirit, the original writer, the transcriber, and the interpreter; now, it is said, why not move the point where infallibility ceases and fallibility begins one degree nearer God? Why not the original writer uninspired as well as the transcriber and the interpreter? In answer it may be

said: (1) That interpretation by inspiration implies an absurdity, since such interpretation would be the possession of all men and therefore natural, while inspiration, as above defined, is miraculous; and further, interpretation by so-called inspiration would open a wide door for all manner of fanaticism. (2) That error in transcription is sufficiently guarded by the number and wide diffusion of manuscripts made by different scribes. (3) That the space between God and man is infinite and the expression of divine thoughts in human language exceedingly difficult, and that this transition needed the highest assurance of truthfulness. (4) And that the inspiration of the Scriptures is like the great seal of state, giving assurance that they speak with divine authority; without this, we have only the word of man; with it, the word of God.

2. The next argument is derived from the *nature of the things written.* A perfect analysis and presentation of this argument would require more space than can be given in this place. The following points must suffice: (1) *First*, there are passages and long lines of prophecy which the writers themselves did not understand. As Peter did not understand his own language when he said, "The promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off," needing a miracle in after years to make it plain; so the prophets often did not understand the meaning of what they wrote. They could not, any more than we, comprehend a prophecy except in the light of its fulfilment. They could not comprehend a prediction isolated and out of all relation to the great scheme of prophetic testimony. Hence it is but natural that an Apostle should say that they "searched what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." Since they did not

comprehend the thought, they must have *written* by inspiration. (2) *Second*, there are, undoubtedly, portions of the Bible so abstract and spiritual as not to admit of revelation except by the use of words. If the sacred writers were inspired to know these things they were also inspired to know the words which alone could reveal them, and hence to write them. Paul illustrated this when he says: "Eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit." "Which things we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth." (3) *Third*, the evident restraint under which the sacred penmen wrote indicates the guidance of inspiration. The Bible is quite as remarkable for its silence on many subjects as for its great revelations. There is no effort to explain what is too high for the human understanding. There is no gratification of mere curiosity or wonder. There is no going beyond the limits assigned to the one purpose of the whole. This is seen to be superhuman when we consider how intense is the desire to know the unseen, how readily false prophets yield to this desire, and how many things of intensest interest the sacred writers might have written, but concerning which they are silent. For example, how much the evangelists might have written about the childhood and youth of Jesus, and how eagerly the apocryphal gospels have filled this blank. This was a restraint, an inspiration in the *writing*, and not in the knowing. (4) *Again*, the marvelous unity of the Bible implies a oneness of authorship, and hence its inspiration. Just as the variety of style, time, and country indicate a variety of writers, so does this unity of thought, plan, and language, in some respects, indicate the one spiritual illumination and guidance. Forty different writers, in various

countries, during sixteen centuries, and under varying circumstances of civilization, freedom, and tribal prejudice, produce sixty-six treatises, in differing languages and on many subjects, prose and poetry, history and philosophy, law and morals, and yet they all unite in presenting one grand system of religion; a system beginning with the Creation and ending with the consummation of human history. "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." This unity is so remarkable that chance is out of the question. It proves a divine guidance; and the guidance must have been in the selection of the material and in the writing. Moreover, this proof is one which includes the whole Bible. (5) *Another evidence* is found in the progressive development of Christianity as presented in the Bible. This progress of revelation is not a progress manufactured by an arbitrary arrangement of the books; it is a progress determined by the march of Jewish history and by the stern procession of the centuries. Besides, this progress was not recognized by the original writers, nor a subject of discussion in the earlier days. It is only in modern times that such a book has been written as "The Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament." This progress is so real and so important that unless it is regarded there can be no correct interpretation and construction of Christian doctrine. The proof that the world by wisdom knew not God; the preparation and discipline of a people to whom the oracles of God could be committed; the revelation of God as self-existent, almighty, just, holy, and merciful; the development of Messianic testimony in type and prophecy; the gospels presenting the Christ in the fulness of the times, and the fundamental principles of Christianity; the gradual unfolding of the Gospel in the Acts, and of conversion as required of various classes; the training of individuals and of churches; and the final triumph of the Church as portrayed in the

Revelation of the Apostle John—all these present but a brief sketch of a progress which would require a volume for its full development. This orderly progress had to do, not only with the revelations made from time to time to the sacred writers, but especially with the *writing of the books*, for it is in these books that this order appears. These orderly stages of progress, through the ages of Christian development, are the foot-steps of God, indicating the presence and guidance of the Divine Spirit.

3. A third argument for the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures is found in the miraculous endowments, in the *inspiration of the men* who wrote them. (1) That most of the sacred writers were inspired men is *perfectly certain*, and that *all* of them were admits of but little doubt. Moses was an inspired man. How else could he have known the facts of Creation, facts reaching back into a far past geological time? How else could he have produced the "Ten Commandments," a profound summary of all moral and civil law? How else have predicted the fortunes of the Jewish nations and of their capital city? And how else could he have so ordained the Jewish worship as to make it foreshadow and illustrate the institutions of Christianity? The author of the book of Job was inspired, as evidenced by the superhuman sublimity of his style and by his solution of the Problem of Evil—a solution which must remain the best possible to man till the end of time. The prophets were inspired, as the fulfilment of their predictions abundantly proves. The Apostles and evangelists were inspired as indicated by the promise of Christ, the baptism in the Holy Spirit, the gifts of the Spirit, and the character of their writings. The inspiration of these implies the inspiration of all the rest, since they were all employed in the development of a supernatural religion, and all alike needed this divine aid. Nor is this a

specimen of circular probation, for it is admitted in this discussion that Christianity is of God, and that its great facts are in the highest degree credible; the only question here considered is that of *how the Scriptures were written.* (2) Now if the sacred writers were inspired *men* as proved by what they wrote, then their *writings* must also have been inspired. If a mathematical genius should write a mathematical work, we should regard his book as the result of his mathematical genius; so if an inspired man should write a religious book, we would regard this *book* as the product of inspiration. Surely inspiration was not a divine assistance so spasmodically and unreasonably bestowed as to be present that the one inspired man might know but absent when he would write this knowledge for the benefit of all mankind. If the writers of the Bible were inspired it is exceedingly improbable, and even absurd, that their writings should not be.

4. The fourth argument is the *testimony of the writers* themselves. If a writer, otherwise known to be credible, is believed when he states the circumstances of his writing and the assistance with which he writes, the same credence may be given to the sacred writers. Their writings give evidence that they were holy men of old and that God was with them, making known his truth and revealing the past and the future of his providence. If Isaiah and Zechariah, if Paul and Peter, can be believed on such a subject, it would be well to receive their testimony. We have room for only a few passages as examples of hundreds which might be given: "David, the son of Jesse, said, and the man who was raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet psalmist of Israel, said, *The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word was in my tongue.*"—II. Samuel, 23: 1, 2. This must refer to the Psalms of David. Isaiah demands attention

to his written prophecy in these words, "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, *for the Lord hath spoken.*"—Is. 1 : 1, 2. So in the following instances the prophets declare that their writings are the *word of the Lord:* "Hear ye and give ear: for the Lord hath spoken."—Jeremiah. "The word of the Lord came expressly unto Ezekiel, the priest." "The word of the Lord that came to Joel, the son of Pethuel." "The vision of Obadiah. Thus saith the Lord God concerning Israel." "The word of the Lord which came unto Zephaniah, the son of Cushi." "In the eighth month, in the second year of Darius, came the word of the Lord unto Zechariah, the son of Barachiah, the son of Iddo, the prophet." "The burden of the word of the Lord to Israel by Malachi." Paul wrote in the Roman letter, having reference to that letter: "I say the truth in Christ. I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness *in the Holy Spirit.*" And again, in the First Corinthian epistle, referring directly to his writing, and vouching for all the Apostles, in a passage already quoted, he said, "Which things we speak not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Spirit teacheth, comparing spiritual things with spiritual."

5. Our final argument is the *testimony of Christ and his Apostles.* An independent beginning, a *pou sto,* for this argument is found in Christianity as a historical fact, in the divine wisdom and the "all-authority" of Jesus the Christ. In this, as in other matters, the truth can be seen in its true relations only as we look out upon it from the divinity of Jesus as the central sun of the Christian system. Even the admissions of unbelief furnish solid ground on which we may build. Leckey, in his History of Morality, says (vol. ii., p. 8):

"It was reserved for Christianity to present to the world an ideal character which, through all the changes of eighteen

centuries, has filled the hearts of men with an impassioned love, and has shown itself capable of acting on all ages, nations, temperaments, and conditions; has not only been the highest pattern of virtue, but the highest incentive to its practice, and has exerted so deep an influence that it may be truly said that the simple record of three short years of active life has done more to regenerate and to soften mankind than all the disquisitions of philosophers and than all the exhortations of moralists. This has been indeed the well-spring of whatever is best and purest in the Christian life. Amid all the sins and failings, amid all the priestcraft, the persecutions and fanaticism, which have defaced the church, it has preserved in the character and example of its Founder an enduring principle of regeneration."

But to the Christian who adds to this testimony the belief that Jesus was "the Christ, the Son of God," there can be no authority greater, no foundation more firm. (1) Christ had all authority in Heaven and in earth. (2) He did not himself organize his kingdom, but gave to his Apostles all authority for this purpose. He said to them, "Whosoever heareth you heareth me: and whosoever heareth me, heareth him that sent me." "Whosoever will not receive you nor hear your words," it "shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment." He said, "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." Again he said to them, "All power is given unto me in Heaven and in earth. Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway even unto the end of the world." In this last recorded interview he said, "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you, and ye

shall be my witnesses, both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." In the words of another, "These are remarkable declarations. In terms the most complete and unqualified they confer power to speak and act in Christ's name, and to be his witnesses, to organize, legislate, and even forgive sins, and that, too, because of the aid of the Holy Spirit and his own perpetual presence. They contain all that is essential to a valid theory of full divine guidance and authority." (3) In order that the Apostles might have his power and authority Christ gave them the Holy Spirit to guide them infallibly in their communications. Christ *promised* them the baptism in the Holy Spirit. They were to wait at Jerusalem till they were endued with power from on high. When the day of Pentecost was fully come the Holy Spirit *came upon them*, giving them inspired utterance. It was to bring all things to their remembrance; to lead them into all truth; to take of the things of the Father and show them unto them; and to give them the what and the how of their defence when brought before kings and governors. (4) As correlated with these promises and their fulfilment, the Apostles constantly claim and assert this divine authority and guidance. John declares that the Apocalypse was a communication "in the Spirit," and closes with a solemn curse on the man who should add or take away. Peter spoke like his Master, "as one having authority," when, in his first sermon, he laid down the conditions of salvation. He asserts that the things testified beforehand by the Spirit of Christ in the prophets are "now reported by them who have preached the gospel with the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven." Paul declares that the Gospel which he preached was not after man, nor received from men, but made known by the revelation of Jesus Christ. They claim for their teachings divine authority:

"For ye know what commandments we gave you by the Lord Jesus." "He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not man but God, who hath given unto us his Holy Spirit." "Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ;" and because Paul commanded with the authority of Christ himself, he added: "And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man and have no company with him." (5) Still further, spiritual gifts were bestowed by the laying on of Apostolic hands. Paul gives the following enumeration of these gifts: miraculous wisdom, knowledge, faith, power to heal, working of miracles, prophecy, discerning spirits, divers kinds of tongues, and the interpretation of tongues. These gifts were certainly bestowed upon Timothy, Barnabas, Philip, Silas, and Judas, and, without doubt, also upon Mark and Luke.

From these premises it follows, with all certainty, that the Apostles and evangelists spoke with *complete and absolute divine authority*, and, that they might do so without error, they were *assisted and guided by the Holy Spirit.*

From this height of argument we can now see the truth of two important corollaries which cover the whole ground in question:

First, the New Testament Scriptures were written by inspiration. They are clothed with the authority of Heaven, and were written, according to the promise of Christ, by inspired men.

Second, the Old Testament Scriptures were given by inspiration of God; for this is the plain teaching of Christ and his inspired Apostles. Jesus read the Holy Scriptures with reverence and expounded them as a revelation of the divine will. "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law of the Prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one

jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them: for this is the Law and the Prophets." "Ye do err, not understanding the Scripture nor the power of God." "On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets." "How then doth David in Spirit call him Lord." "If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." "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." "Search the Scriptures: for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me." "And the Scriptures can not be broken." The Scriptures in the days of Christ were the same as our thirty-nine books of the Old Testament, and these books were classified as the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms. It should also be remembered that this endorsement of the Savior has reference not to the *men* who wrote, but to the *Scriptures* which they produced. The Apostolic endorsement is given in many ways, but only two conspicuous passages will be quoted. "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scriptures came from private interpretation; for the prophecy came not at any time by the will of man; but holy men of old spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."—II. Peter 1 : 20, 21. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God; and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."—II. Timothy 3 : 15–17. The common version of this passage is an honest and grammatical translation of the original. But if we render with the New Version, "All Scripture given by inspiration," the endorsement is equally

strong. Timothy is exhorted to continue in the things which he had learned.—Verse 14. He is to do this for two reasons: *first*, "knowing of whom thou hast learned them," evidently the inspired Apostles; *second*, "And that from a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus;" and the holy Scriptures are able to do this because, "All Scripture given by inspiration of God is profitable." The reasons for Timothy's continuance were the same as for ours —the authority of the Apostles and the inspiration of the Scriptures.

IV. The fourth and last division of this discussion is devoted to the verification of the foregoing definitions and conclusions. When we have demonstrated a rule in applied mathematics, our reasoning is confirmed if we find the rule to work well in actual practice; so the above views will be confirmed if they are found to harmonize with all Bible facts.

1. The definition of Holy Scriptures already given has been found adequate for this discussion; but it can now be made more general and absolute. Holy Scriptures are inspired Scriptures. Scriptures are to be received or rejected according to this test, and such was the rule in making up the Sacred Canon.

2. The preliminary definition of inspiration can now be confirmed, since we have determined the length and breadth of its provinces and the facts it must cover. It permits a varying ratio of the divine to the human, and this is also indicated by the facts. It provides for the human element in the Scriptures, leaving the writer to his own style and knowledge so far as possible, and permitting the use of other men's testimony and of former documents. It accounts for the divine element as exhibited in the unity of purpose, the

choice of exact words in many instances, and the superhuman doctrines and revelations. It makes room for literary infirmities, as well as for the things which eye had not seen, nor ear heard, nor the human mind conceived. It admits of the free play of all mental faculties and tastes, with, possibly, a perfect unconsciousness of the divine supervision which guided in the selection of material and arrangement.

3. The proposition that the Holy Scriptures were given by inspiration is confirmed when we find no inharmonious or contradictory facts. (a) There is nothing adverse in the form of the Bible. Given for the guidance of human beings it had to be in human language. Man can not use the dictionary and grammar of angels. That the Bible should have great variety of style, that it should sweep through the whole literary gamut, from historic annals to the sublimest poetry, and that it should be the scholar's task to gather up and classify its great truths, are points of excellence rather than defects. (b) There are no portions unworthy of so high a source. Nature has her monotonous plains and her mountain scenery of surpassing grandeur; her leaden skies and her glorious sunsets; so is it in the Bible. Human nature and history had to be portrayed as they were. Portions of seeming insignificance are of great meaning on account of their relation to higher things. History and revelation were developed side by side, and many a link is thrown across with no other purpose than to bind them together. (c) There are no insuperable inconsistencies and oppositions. Deduct from the sum of alleged contradictions all those arising from errors in copying, interpolations, suppressions, mis-translations, ignorance of history, custom and science, the infirmities of the mind and the moral corruption of the heart—all difficulties of our own manufacture—and what would be left to antagonize inspiration? Now, when there is scarcely a

cloud in the sky, when true scholarship has cleared away nearly every difficulty, and when there is no need of hasty conclusions, it is no time for Christian defenders to become weak-kneed and to begin stammering forth their confessions of Bible errors in behalf of prophets and Apostles.

Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should inspire the Holy Scriptures? Are they not worthy of such an origin! The Bible has withstood the assaults of eighteen centuries and the battle has only made it stronger and more enduring. "The word of God is sharper than a two-edged sword, piercing to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, joint and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." As nothing else can, it stimulates thought, creates science, and builds schools and colleges. It produces self-denial and philanthropic devotion, filling civilized lands with asylums and heathen lands with missions. Destroy the literature it has produced, and the libraries of the world would be in ruins. Abolish its influences on the imagination, and a dark night would eclipse the glories of sculpture and architecture, of painting and poetry. Silence its voice from heaven, and despair and death will go hand in hand through the earth. It is the word of God. Let the child be taught it, leaning upon its mother's knee. Let the youth treasure its blessed promises that when the night of age comes, they may light his trembling steps through the dark valley and shadow of death. Teach it in the Sunday-school, preach it from the pulpit, translate it into all languages and send it into all lands; for, "the word of the Lord liveth and abideth forever."

INDEX.

A

ABEL, faith of, 310.
ABRAHAM, founder of the Jewish nation, 205; deception of, 276; rescuing Lot, 266; promise to, 310; progenitor of Jesus, 321.
ADAPTATION of Christianity to human nature, superhuman, 203.
ADVENT of the Messiah in the fulness of the times, 320.
ADVERSARIES of Christianity, testimony to genuineness, 54; Julian, 54; Hierocles, 55; Porphyry, 55; Celsus, 55.
AFFECTIONS, Christianity adapted to, 189.
ALEXANDER, the Great, his siege of Tyre, 293.
ANTIQUITY of the earth, 153; of man, 158.
APOSTLES, claim of Messianic prophecies, 306; authority of, 360; were inspired, 382.
APOSTOLIC FATHERS, 51; testimony to genuineness of N. T., 52.
ARABS, unconquered, 285.
ARARAT, Mount, 164.
ARGUMENT, from design, 128, 130.
ARISTOTLE, his belief in God, 132.
ASCENSION of Christ, 337.
ASIA, Western, the early home of man, 158.
ASSYRIA, aggressions on Israel, 273; afflicted by the Greeks, 286.
ATHENAGORAS, on genuineness of N. T., 44.
ATHENS, Paul at, 207.
ATHEISM, it cannot be proved, 10, 24; beset with all the difficulties of theism, 134; peculiar difficulties of, 136.
ATHEIST, professes to be smarter than God, 131; assigns an inadequate cause, 136; founds on assumptions, 136; makes chance the world-builder, 137.
ATOM, what is it? 147.
ATTRIBUTES of God, 140; cannot exist in the abstract, 140.
ATONEMENT, ground of, 184; Superhuman philosophy of, 204; Day of, 314.
AUGUSTINE, 40; catalogue of N. T. books, 40.

B

BABYLON, prophecy concerning, 289; glory of, 290.
BABYLONIA, aggressions on Israel, 273.
BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY, object of, 180.
BALAAM, prophecy of, 285.
BARNABAS, Epistle of, 51; testimony for genuineness of N. T., 51.
BASILIDES, 50.
BAUR, admissions of, 70.
BELIEF, limitations of, 13; grounds of, 11.
BETHLEHEM, 321.
BIBLE, the best form of revelations, 172; literary form, 175; nine-tenths need no proof, 178; unity, 201.
BONDAGE in Egypt, 267, 268.
BOOKS of O. T., canonical, 363; of N. T. canonical, 364.
BURIAL of Jesus, 332.

C

CANAAN, 282.
CANON, 360.
CANONICITY defined, 361.
CARBONIFEROUS PERIOD, not the third Mosaic day, 151.
CARTHAGE, council of, 368.
CATALOGUES of N. T. books, 40.
CAUSATION, intelligent, defined, 128; marks of in nature, 129.
CELSUS, 55; testimony to credibility of N. T., 84.
CHALDEANS, at siege of Tyre, 292.
CHANCE, does not account for the universe, 137.
CHARACTER of the Messiah, 323.
CHITTIM, ships of, 286.
CHRIST, word defined, 19; no other Savior, 31; his life not difficult to write, 66; an impostor or the Messiah, 98; manifestation such as it needed to be, 182; opposition to Jewish sects, 183; secures man's love, 183.
CHRISTIANITY, facts not in the far past, 27; time and place of origin propitious, 27; not quietly introduced, 27; this religion or none, 32; no other account of origin, 71; slow in development, 112; blessings not universal, 112; agrees with nature in teachings, 124; agrees with mental science, 166; adapted to human nature, 172; as a remedial system adapted to the mind, 179; adapted to the intellect, 188; adapted to the sensibilities, 189; to the will, 190; to man as a social being, 190; a universal religion, 192; confirmed by centuries of trial, 193; always does good, 193; relation to social evils, 195; superhuman, 200; its purpose superhuman, 205; not an outgrowth of human nature, 199; not like other religions, 237; to be final, 344.
CIVILIZATION, the earliest, 264; an effect of Christianity, 88; promoted by Christianity, 196.
CLAUDIUS APOLLINARIS, testimony to genuineness of N. T., 44.
CLEMENT of Rome, 51.
CLEMENT of Alexandria, 42.
COINCIDENCES, between Gospels and Acts, 89.
CONCLUSIVENESS of Messianic prophecies, 345.
CONSCIENCE, science and Bible concerning, 167.
CONSCIOUSNESS, defined, 9; testimony to be received, 9; facts given by, 9; a ground of belief, 11.
CONTRAST of Christianity with other religions, 238.
CONVERSION, rational, 184, 186; false views of, 231.
COROLLARIES, 360.
COSMOGONY of Buddhism, 239.
CREATION, agreement of Bible and science, 147; stages of, 148; of man, 150; Mosaic account supernatural, 201.
CREDIBILITY of N. T., 64; sustained by profane history, 81.
CRITERIA, of historic truthfulness, 26; of prophecy, 260; of spuriousness, 38.
CRUCIFIXION of Jesus, 331.
CYRENIUS, the taxing in his day, 94.

D

DANA, Prof., on place of man's origin, 157.
DANIEL, prophecy of universal kingdoms, 295; the Papacy, 297; Mahometanism, 299; seventy weeks of, 300; time of Messiah's advent, 318 coronation of Christ, 338.

DARWINISM, it accounts for varieties of mankind, 157.
DAVIDSON, Samuel, on "various readings," 61.
DAVID, Bible account of wars confirmed, 271; promise of the Messiah, 310; a progenitor of the Messiah, 322.
DAY of atonement, 314.
DAYS of Creation, long periods, 153.
DEMONSTRATION, plan of, 33.
DIOGNETUS, letter to, 50.
DIONYSIUS, Bishop of Corinth, 44.
DISCIPLES, few and poor, 208.
DIUS, on David and Hiram, 272; Solomon, 273.
DRAPER, Dr., Conflict of Religion and Science, 235.
DUALISM, 125.

EBIONITES, 53.
ECCLESIASTES, 275.
EGYPT, bondage in, 180; customs correctly given, 267; prophecy concerning, 294.
EICHORN, theory of older documents, 79.
ELECTION, unscriptural views of, 230.
ELIJAH, fed by ravens, 277; translation, 278.
ENOCH, translation of, 278.
ETHER, resistance of, 166.
ETHNIC AFFINITIES, Moses and science, 263.
ETHICS, agreement with Christianity, 167.
EUSEBIUS, catalogue of N. T. books, 40; sustains three points, 40; reference to Tatian's Harmony, 45; Ishmaelitish princes, 283; conversion of the Tyrians, 293.
EVANGELISTS, the, conspiracy to deceive absurd, 67; character of, 68.
EVOLUTION, it does not dispense with miracles, 111; enlarges the field of design, 133; agrees that man was last created, 152; free to discover how God created, 156; implies a time when the animal became man, 160; Christianity only one religion of a series, 273.
EZEKIEL, vision of Holy waters, 348.

F

FAITH, reasonableness as a means of conversion, 187; no ground of objection, 225.
FALSE VIEWS, of inspiration and purpose of revelation, 228; of perfection of revelation, 230; of conversion, 231; of eternal punishment, 232; of interpretation, 233.
FINITE, the, suggests the infinite, 134.
FIRMAMENT, or expanse, 150.
FLOOD, the, not universal, 163; probable in the light of science, 164; questions concerning, 277.

G

GENESIS, first chapter of, 148; confirmation of chap. 14, 266; comment on chap. 3:15, 309.
GENEALOGY, Genesis 10th, 262.
GIBBON, on the origin of Christianity, 213.
GLACIAL ERA, not long ago, 159.
GNOSTICS, 53.

God, existence a postulate, 10; existence universally believed, 10; existence known just as we know that of our fellow-men, 11; his power and goodness render revelation probable, 30; works end in mystery, 117; evidence of existence patent to all, 131; revealed gradually, 180; his severity, 117; his purpose in salvation, 307; not to be accounted for, 135; in him no marks of design, 135; personal, 138; unity of, 140; attributes, 140.
Gospel, the. commands reasonable, 178; to begin at Jerusalem, 340.
Gospels, differences and concordances, 77; theory that one was copied from another, 79; theory of original, but perished documents, 79; concordances and differences accounted for, 80.
Greenleaf, Simon, on ancient documents, 39.

H

Ham, descendants of to be oppressed, 283.
Harmonies, of the Gospels, 45; quotations from, 47.
Hebrews, 368.
Hecateus, on the Exodus, 267.
Hegesippus, on credibility of N. T., 84.
Heracleon, 54.
Heretical Sects, testimony to genuineness of N. T., 52; Ebionites, 53; Gnostics, 53; heretical writers, 54.
Hermas, 51.
Hierocles, 55.
Hiram, king, 273.
History, profane, its corroboration of N. T. history, 91; Joshua to Samuel, 271.
Holy of Holies, a type of Heaven, 313.
Holy Place, a type of the church, 313.
Holy Spirit, baptism of, 340.
Holy Scriptures, defined, 375; proof of inspiration, 377.
Human Nature, portraiture of, 275.
Hume, David, objections to miracles, 25.

I

Idolatry, to be destroyed, 342.
Ignatius, 51.
Immortality of man, 161.
Inspiration, false views of, 228; full discussion of, 369; difficulties of, 370; characteristics of, 371; defined, 376; possible, 377; why needed, 378; proof of, 377; not incredible, 391.
Integrity, of N. T., 56.
Introduction, 9–32.
Intellect, Christianity adapted to, 188.
Interpretation, false methods of, 233.
Irenæus, 43.
Isaiah, chapter 53, 348.
Ishmael, prophecy concerning, 284.

J

James, epistle of, 368.
Japheth, to be enlarged, 283.
Jasper, book of, 277.

JERUSALEM, siege of by Romans, 287; decree of Cyrus to rebuild, 300; entrance into by Jesus, 329; gospel to begin at, 340.
JESUS, supernatural, 100; unconscious of fraud, 101; his divinity in harmony with the grandeur of Christianity, 102; conception of such a being superhuman, 203; if not divine an impostor, 213; if not divine, not the author of Christianity, 213; events of life predicted, 326; his piety, 325; his harbinger, 326; rejected by the Jews, 329; crucifixion, 332; burial, 331; a bone of him not broken, 334; to be pierced, 335.
JEWS, predicted fate of, 287; persecuted, 289; promise of the Messiah to, 310; rejection of Jesus, 328.
JOB, book of design, 275.
JOHN, the Baptist, 326.
JOURNEY of Israelites from Egypt to Sinai, 269.
JOSEPHUS, credibility of N. T., 81; reference to Jesus, 288; O. T. canon, 362; Solomon's reign, 273; siege of Jerusalem, 288.
JOSHUA, stopping the sun, 277.
JUDAH, tribe of, to remain till Christ, 318.
JUDE, epistle of, 368.
JULIAN, the emperor, 54.
JUSTIN MARTYR, 46; objections to his testimony, 47; sum of his testimony, 49.

K

KEITH, on quotations from N. T. by Origen, 40.
KENITES, to be preserved, 286.
KINGDOM, of Christ, conception of superhuman, 203; feeble beginning, 207; prediction of, 296, 339; one of peace, 341; to include the Gentiles, 343.
KLEIN, Rev. F., 273.
KNOWLEDGE, grounds of certainty, 108.

L

LAW of Parsimony, 125.
LAODICEA, council of, 368.
LE CONTE, on antiquity of man, 160.
LESLIE, method with Deist, 87.
LIFE, began in the sea, 150; vegetable before animal, 152.
LIGHT, created where darkness was, 147.
LITTLE HORN, of the Papacy, 297; of Mahometanism, 299.
LOVE, law of production, 184.

M

MAN, need of divine aid, 29; subject to moral government, 131; thinks as God does, 139; a religious being, 179; creation of, 152; dual nature of, 155; place of origin, 157; antiquity of, 158; ancient man as intellectual as now, 159; immortality of, 161; made in God's image, 156; threefold division of faculties, 166.
MANNA, a type of Christ, 316.
MANUSCRIPTS, the three great, 40.
MARSH, Bishop, theory of original N. T. documents, 79.
MASTODON, not long extinct, 159.
MATTER, inferior to mind, 126; an effect rather than mind, 135; creation of, not absurd, 147.
MATERIALISM, 124.

MEANS of grace, 187.
MEDO-PERSIA, 297.
MELCHIZEDEK, a type of Christ, 316.
MEMORY, a ground of belief, 12.
MENANDER, 273; on siege of Tyre, 293; Hiram and David, 272.
MANETHO, 267.
MENTAL SCIENCE, agreement with Christianity, 166.
MESSENGER, of the covenant, 319.
MESSIAH, character of, 323; his three-fold office, 327, 339; beginning of ministry, 328; defined, 19; preparation for, 181; place of birth, 321; lineage of, 321; divine nature, 322; promises of, 308; time of advent predicted, 318.
MICHAELIS, on "various readings," 61.
MIND, superior to matter, 126; not matter, 127; made in God's name, 156; three-fold division of faculties, 166.
MILL, Dr., concerning Eusebius, 41.
MILL, John Stuart, on Theism, 132.
MIRACLES, defined, 22; cannot be proved impossible, 22; similar to man's power over nature, 24; can be proved, 25; Hume's objection to, 25; scientific facts more wonderful, 26; water made wine and the resurrection of Jesus, 65; nature and revelation both began in miracles, 111; character of Christ's miracles, 183, 328; evidence for not like that for false miracles, 242; purpose of, 243; worthy of a divine source, 244; an inseparable part of Christianity, 244; miracles of Romanism, 246; miracles of O. T., 276.
MOABITE-STONE, 273.
MORAL-EVIL, 218.
MORAL-GOVERNMENT, that of nature and the Bible alike, 113; implies a moral-governor, 130.
MORAL-REASONING, conclusiveness, 14; influenced by feelings, 15.
MOSES, sin of, 276; prophecy concerning the Jews, 287.
MOSAIC LAW, 275.
MURATORI CANON, the, 44; evidence for N. T., 45.
MYSTERY in Christianity, 226.

N

NATURE AND REVELATION, both systems of means, 114; both remedial, 115; both mediatorial, 115; kind and limit of knowledge in each, 116; both contain mysteries, 116; both unsystematic, 117; both require humility and patience, 118; developed according to the same law, 120; both had long periods of development, 121; agree concerning man's nature, 155.
NEBUCHADNEZZAR, siege of Tyre, 292.
NEBULAR HYPOTHESIS, teaches the growth and decay of worlds, 165.
NEW TESTAMENT, genuineness of, 37; not a forgery, 58; its facts and existing facts related as cause and effect, 85.
NIMROD, his kingdom, 264.
NINEVEH, of Cushite origin, 265; prophecy concerning, 291.
NOAH, grand-sons gave names to countries, 262; prophecy of, 282.
NOACHIAN DELUGE, 163.
NORTON, on number of Christians and copies of the Gospels in second century, 46; concerning Gnostics, 53.

O

OBJECTIONS, discussion of, 216; against nature as well, 216; Christianity slow and partial, 220; to the Atonement, 224; Christianity depends on faith, 225; mysterious, 226; objections to the evidence, 234; supposed oppositions of science, 234; cause of wars, 236; Christianity one of a series of religions, 237; "just like other religions," 237; "false miracles are as well attested," 241; force of unanswered objections, 248.
OLD TESTAMENT, morality of, 167; writers of reliable, 262; canonical, 362.
OMRI, 273.
ORIGEN, 41.

P

PALEY, his Horæ Paulinæ, 89.
PANTHEISM, 124.
PAPIAS, 49; on genuineness of N. T., 49.
PAPACY, the, Daniel's prediction of, 297; characteristics of, 298.
PASCHAL Lamb, a type of Christ, 316.
PAUL, the Apostle, voyage and ship-wreck, 91.
PERFECTION of revelation, false views of, 230.
PERSECUTION, of early Christians, 209.
PERSONALITY, the divine, 138.
PETER, Second Epistle, chapter 1: 20, 388.
PHILOSOPHERS, the greatest have been Theists, 131.
PLAN of argument from O. T., 261.
PLINY, testimony to sufferings of Christians, 69; letters to Trojan, 83; points in testimony, 84.
POLYCARP, 52.
POLYGAMY, 169.
PORPHYRY, 55; evidence for N. T., 84.
POSITIVEISM, nature of, 237.
POSTULATES, 9.
PRAYER-MEETING, a remarkable phenomenon, 195.
PROOF of Christianity, how made stronger, 258.
PROMISES, to the woman, 108; to Abraham, 310; to David, 310; to the Jews, 310.
PROPHECY, facts of, undeniable, 345; not to be explained away, 346; long series of, 347; not result of political sagacity, 350; not mathematical forecast, 351; not chance, 351; criteria of, 260; claimed by Jesus, 305; claimed by apostles, 306; advantage of, 259; Messianic, 305; in type, 311, 317.
PROPOSITION, the, 17; reasons for form chosen, 17; defined, 19; announced as such, 17; preliminary view of, 22; not absurd, 22; not improbable, 28.
PTOLEMY, 54.
PUL, an Assyrian king, 274.
PUNISHMENT, eternal, false views of, 233.
PURPOSE of God, 310.

R

RAINBOW, the, not created just after the flood, 164.
REASON, its relation to faith, 108; sanctions revelation, 176.
REASONING, a ground of belief, 12.

RENAN, admission of genuineness of N. T., 38; admission of credibility of N. T., 70; Life of Jesus, 75; Legendary Theory, 75; objections to his theory, 76.
RESURRECTION of Christ, 246, 336.
REVELATION, book of, 368.
REVELATION, a, without mystery absurd, 117; should be made through man, 175; objections to a perpetual revelation, 175; should be in human language, 171; false views of its purpose, 228.
REVIVAL, religious, a peculiar phenomenon, 194.
RITTER, Dr. Carl, on Genesis and Herodotus, 262.
ROCK, the smitten, a type of Christ, 316.
ROMAN CATHOLIC miracles, 246.
ROMAN EMPIRE, ten kingdoms of, 297; in Daniel's prophecies, 295, 318.

S

SACRIFICE, that of Christ meets demands of justice, 185; a type of Christ, 311.
SARACENS, a great nation, 284.
SARGON, 274.
SATAN, curse upon, Gen. 3:15, 309.
SAUL, his last battle-field, 270.
SCIENCE AND CHRISTIANITY, both interwoven with history, 119.
SCIENCE AND REASON, plan of argument from, 109.
SCIENCE, reveals an unseen universe, 161; knows no loss of matter and force, 161; agrees with Bible relative to destiny of the world, 165; supposed opposition to religion, 234.
SECOND PETER, 365, 368.
SELF-RESTRAINT of Bible writers, 202.
SENSES, a ground of certainty, 11.
SEPTUAGINT, 363.
SERGIUS PAULUS, accuracy of Luke, 95.
SERIES of prophecies, 347.
SHEM, blessings on, 283.
SIEGE of Jerusalem, 287.
SIN, a universal fact, 177.
SLAVERY, 169.
SOCIAL EVILS, undermined by Christianity, 195.
SOCRATES, his belief in God, 132; two lives of, 80.
SOLDIERS at the crucifixion, 333.
SOLOMON, in profane history, 273.
SON OF GOD, phrase defined, 5
SOURCES of Bible material, 372.
SPENCER, Herbert, on the divine existence, 133.
SPURIOUSNESS, marks of, 38.
STRAUSS, his admission, 70; Mythical Theory of, 72; objections to his theory, 73.
SUBJECTIVE objections to Christianity, 251.
SUETONIUS, banishment of Jews from Rome, 84.
SUMMARY, general, 356.
SUN, the, created at the "beginning," 148; seen from the earth on the fourth day, 152; Joshua, 277.
SUPERHUMAN nature of Christianity, 200.
SUPERIORITY of Christianity, 238.
SUPERNATURAL origin of Christianity, 199.

T

TABERNACLE, 312.
TACITUS, sufferings of Christians, 69; credibility of N. T., 82; Exodus, 267
TATIAN, his harmony of Gospels, 45.
TERTULLIAN, 43; quotations of the N. T., 43; Old Latin version, 45, 368.
TESTIMONY, a ground of certainty, 12.
THEISM, the most reasonable, 125.
THEORY, of imposture, 71; of honest deception, 71; Mythical of Strauss, 72; of Eichorn, 79.
THEOPHILUS, his harmony of the Gospels, 45.
TIMOTHY, Second, 3:15, 388.
TIME of Messiah's advent, 318; fulness of the times, 320.
TRIAL of Jesus, 331.
TRIUMPH of Christianity, 207, 211.
TYNDALL, Prof. John, attributes intelligence to matter, 133.
TYPES, defined, 311; sacrifice, 311; redemption of Israel, 312; Tabernacle, 312; Day of Atonement, 314; specific types of Christ, 315; remarks on, 317.
TYRE, prophecy concerning, 292.

U

UNITY, of human race, 156; of the divine nature, 140; of the Bible, 201.
UNIVERSE, the unseen, 161.
USHER, Bishop, his chronology, 156.

V

VALENTINUS, 54.
VARIOUS READINGS in N. T., origin of, 58; number and kind of, 60; effect of, 61.
VEGETABLE life, before animal, 152.
VERIFICATION of definitions of "inspirations" and "Scriptures," 389.
VERSIONS, Peshito and Itala, 45; Syriac, 363; Septuagint, 363.

W

WARS, not caused by Christianity, 236.
WESTCOTT, Canon, on the hypothesis that the Gospels were copied from one another, 79; on the canon, 368.
WILL, the Christianity adapted to, 190.
WOMAN, to give a Savior, 322.
WRITERS of O. T. reliable, 262.

Z

ZUMPT, Prof., on Cyrenius and the taxing, 94.

286.6302201
Eve
Restoration
Copy 3