

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

ARTICLE I.
THE DIVINE IMMANENCY.

BY THE REV. JAMES DOUGLAS, D. D., PULASKI, N. Y.

[Continued from Vol. xlv. p. 505.]

THE RELATIONS OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE DIVINE IMMANENCY
TO THE MIRACLES OF CHRIST.

THE subject of miracles is somewhat complicated. It naturally divides itself into two general parts: one is the historic fact of miracles, with proofs of the fact of their real occurrence as miracles; the other is, the mode in which these miracles were performed, by what agency or means, in what manner, or by what process. The explanation of the mode of their occurrence has some relation to the proofs of the historic fact of miracles, for if no satisfactory explanation can be given, and miracles are impossible, then no amount of historic evidence will convince the investigator or sceptic of the historic fact.

Another question arises in regard to the miracles of Christ, in relation to his divinity, whether they are absolutely essential as proofs of his divinity. Some treatises of polemical

theology may doubtless be open to the criticism, that an undue importance is given to miracles, as proofs of the possession, by Christ, of a divine nature, as well as of divine power. The fact that all persons claiming a divine mission, especially among heathen nations, assert the power of miracle, as proof of such mission, has greatly tended to disparage the miracles of Christ. It is the common argument of superstition.

The best proof of Christ's divinity to many minds by no means lies in his miracles. Far better and more convincing proof, appealing directly to the moral consciousness, is found, for many cultivated and thoughtful minds, in the teachings, character, and life of Christ. The distinguished scholar and theologian, Tayler Lewis, pointedly expresses the sentiment of thousands of believers in that pregnant phrase, "I believe in Christ because my soul has need of him." Even in the earthly lifetime of Christ, none were more profoundly impressed with the fact of his divinity, than those who returned from their interview with him, saying, "Never man spake like this man." It was the moral grandeur of that God-like heroism in death, more than the earthquake's shock, or the darkened sun, that led the Roman centurion to separate Christ in contemplation from those dying with him, and to exclaim, "Verily this was the Son of God." And it was a similar view and conviction in long after years that wrung from Rousseau the confession, when comparing the most renowned of the sages and martyrs of history with the Nazarene, "Socrates died like a philosopher, but Jesus Christ like a God."

The miracles of Christ have little to do with those deep moral convictions of the divine nature of Christ which are the most essential to a true belief. It is his character and life, moral manifestations, signs, and tokens of the nature and spirit within, that capture the assent of the soul. It is more to be divine in character, than to be divine in power. Christ himself repeatedly upbraids the Jews, because they did not believe in him without the working of miracles, and especially appeals to the beneficent character of his works,

as manifestations of his relation to the Father, rather than to their wonderful nature as miracles.

So far from miracles being proofs of a divine power or mission, they are repeatedly spoken of in the New Testament, as signs and tokens attending powers of evil and falsehood, "And then shall that Wicked be revealed whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming. Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders" (2 Thess. ii. 8, 9). The word here translated signs (*σημῖαι*,) is the same that is translated "miracles" in the Gospels. Again (Rev. xiii. 13, 14), "And he doeth great wonders so that he maketh fire to come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by means of those miracles which he had power to do in sight of the beast." Again (Rev. xvi. 14), "For they are spirits of devils working miracles" (signs). So also in Rev. xix. 20, "And the beast was taken and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him." Here, again, the word translated "miracles" is, in the original, *σημῖαι*, "signs." This is the common and most significant term used in the New Testament, to designate the miracles of Christ. They were, in the case of Christ, signs of the divine, in him, of goodness and compassion, as well as of power, different in character from the signs wrought by "the wicked," by the "spirits of devils" and by "the false prophet," which were signs only of magical power, "lying wonders" by which "they deceived them that dwell on the face of the earth."

The miracles of Christ should be examined apart from all other miracles, whether false or real, that we may find in them signs or proofs and manifestations of the divine power and mission of Christ, as the true Son of God. And it is especially and exclusively the miracles of *Christ*, that we propose now to consider. Our theory, of course, will include those miracles which were performed by the disciples of Christ in his name, that is, by the power of Christ.

The doctrine of the divine immanency has no relation to the historic proofs of the miracles of Christ, only to the mode or manner in which those miracles were performed, so that our task now is, not to discuss the historic fact of miracles, but taking it for granted that the narratives given us by the evangelists in the Gospels are true, to explain the mode or manner in which the miracles of Christ, as by them recorded, were performed, and to show, how, by this mode, they were signs of Christ's divinity and mission.

For a long period in the history of Christian apologetics the definition given to a miracle was, that "a miracle is a suspension of the laws of nature." This definition has so generally been abandoned as untenable, that it is scarcely necessary to consider it for the purpose of controverting it. The surprise is, that it was ever accepted as an appropriate definition of the miracles of Christ, and it never could have been so accepted, but for those vague ideas that are so commonly associated with the laws of nature. An examination of the nature and character of the miracles performed by Christ shows, that instead of their being effected by a suspension of the laws or forces of nature, it was rather by an intensification of those laws and forces that they were produced.

Natural laws, as we have seen according to the dictum of modern science, are the divine action. A suspension of natural laws then would be a suspension of the divine action. So that a miracle would be a ceasing of the laws or forces of nature to act, and absolute nothingness would inevitably result. The most superficial examination of the miracles of Christ reveals the very opposite of such a condition.

Let us begin this examination with the first miracle of Christ—the conversion of water into wine. This is effected every year in all the vineyards in the world. The whole process is a natural one, both in the formation of the juices of the grape and the process of fermentation, if we admit that it was fermented, and such it may be argued it was, as the governor of the feast pronounced it the best wine, and

Christ in one of his parables says, "And no man having drunk old wine" (which must necessarily be fermented wine) "straightway desireth new, for he saith the old is better."

The miracle was in the process, not in the product, for wine is no miracle in itself. The result was not new, only the process of producing that result. It is not necessary to postulate a new force, because the process of transformation was effected in so brief a period of time, and was, moreover, secret, hidden, and invisible, without those apparent instrumentalities by which such transformation is ordinarily effected. Such a change of process, from a long to a brief period of time, from the apparent to the secret and hidden, we have in the natural history of organic transformation and development. According to the accepted theories of scientists, the long processes of centuries not only, but ages in the past, are now summed up into a comparative moment of time, in the development of the higher organisms of the animal kingdom. For centuries, animal organisms were limited in their development to the simple one-celled Protozoa. The scientist tells us that it required millions of years for those successive transitions and advances of organic structure, by which the complicated organisms we now find in the higher vertebrates, and especially in man, were reached, but that now the embryo of the quadruped or higher mammalia in a few months passes through all those changes, secret and invisible, which in the original process of manifest development required ages for their consummation; that in the embryonic development of man there is now a condensed epitome of a process of transformation from a lower to a higher organism, beginning, as in the Protozoa, in a single cell, which once consumed ages for its original development. The period now required for this marvellous transformation from a single cell to the most complicated organism, compared with that once demanded in the first formative process, is as brief as is the single tick of the clock to all the seconds of time enumerated during an entire year, if we accept the geologic data given us by Lyell. So wonderfully have the

forces of nature quickened their processes! And yet no law of nature has been suspended, and no new force introduced. That same process, beginning, as then, in a single cell, and carried forward to higher and more complicated organisms, by the same forces as then existed, is completed in an infinitely small segment of that vast period originally required. Who then can assume to limit these forces or their intensity of action as applied to other and far simpler processes in nature?

The second miracle of Christ, a miracle of healing from disease, is a type of a large class of miracles which Christ performed. Science, as found in a Christian civilization, has dissipated belief, even now common among heathen nations, in the medicine-man as a miracle-worker, and instructs us in the fact, that it is a power in nature, the vital power, that really works all cures, and that it is only the province of the physician, either to remove obstructions to the working of this force, or to aid, invigorate, and sustain it. It was the invigoration of the vital forces, in all the cases of miraculous healing, by that very divine power which is the source of all vital force, the inner power of vitality, which then effected those cures performed by Christ, and that, too, through these vital forces exalted and reinforced by that very divine energy, which is the immediate source of the vitality itself.

Another class of miracles was the restoration of sight to the blind. What was this, but the restoration of the organ of vision to its true normal function? We are not informed as to what was the special manner in which this restoration was effected: whether it was by removing some film or obstruction that had gathered on the outer coats of the eye, or clearing up some opacity in the lenses, or by imparting greater sensibility to the nerves of vision. Whatever may have been the mode of the cure, it was simply enabling the eyes to perform the functions for which they were created and formed.

The restoration of the dead to life was of a similar character. It is a function of the vital power in nature to

convert dead matter into living matter. This we know, at the same time we are compelled to acknowledge that both the mystery of the power itself and its modes of operation transcend human research. Life! we know not what it is, how it comes, or goes, and most imperfectly has the keenest and most patient human scrutiny been able to trace even the mode of operation. In itself and in all the varied modes of its operations, it is the standing miracle of the universe, the most wonderful of all the forces working in the realm of nature; and it was in the revelation of himself as the power of life, the Lord of life, that Christ most fully vindicated his claim to divinity. As the Lord of life "he could not be holden of death."

Now take the axiomatic truth, that like causes produce like effects, and let us consider the miracles of Christ on this principle; and what can we affirm concerning their natural effects but that they were produced by natural causes? But, as we have already seen, science discloses the fact that natural causes or forces and laws are only another name for the divine energy and action. In the case of the miracles of Christ, as we have discovered from the examination of these miracles, the result was not new, only the mode of action in which these natural forces produced the result. So that by this analysis of the miracles themselves, we are led to the definition, that *the miracles of Christ were a new mode of the divine action in nature revealing the divine presence and power.* On this ground the miracles of Christ were proofs of his divinity.

There is another definition of miracles whose consideration we cannot omit, and yet give any completeness to the discussion of our subject. It is that of Dr. Bushnell, as set forth in his elaborate work, entitled, "Nature and the Supernatural." As a relief from the untenable definition to which we have already alluded, that a miracle is a suspension of the laws of nature, it has been favorably regarded and widely accepted, notwithstanding the absurdities into which the author was led in his conclusions.

Dr. Bushnell naturally adopted the nature-philosophy of the current theology of his times, which had been bequeathed to Christianity by the Latin Fathers who were educated in the Greek and Roman philosophy of materialistic dualism, that is, to regard God and nature, matter and mind, the natural and the supernatural, as distinct, separate, and independent entities.

The fact that Dr. Bushnell adopted the theories of the old Greek philosophers concerning the nature of matter appears in the very definition he gives to nature as "that which has a fixed law of coming to pass; such that, given the thing or the whole of things, all the rest will follow by an *inherent necessity*." This is the very doctrine of Epicurus, who affirmed that everything which takes place in nature has its natural causes. The intervention of the gods is unnecessary for the explanation of natural phenomena. These are controlled by an *absolute necessity*.¹

In the heading of the third chapter of "Nature and the Supernatural," Dr. Bushnell gives a still more explicit statement of the doctrine that nature has its existence and processes separate from God, in the words "nature is not the system of God," and again, in his fourth chapter, on the problem of existence as related to the fact of evil, he writes, "So is it with cause and effect, laws and instincts, all that we call nature, *it is not the system of God* and is really no co-ordinate part of his universe considered as related to the powers that have their society in it and get their relations from it" (p. 71).

These statements of the complete separation of nature from God—especially this, "that cause and effect, all we call nature, is not the system of God," cannot be exceeded in fulness and explicitness. The direct and unavoidable implication, at least so far as the language is concerned, clearly is, that nature is not even a creation of God; for, if it were, it must necessarily be a part of the system of God.

This theory of nature so far as its dualistic character is

¹Ueberweg's History of Philosophy.

involved, is even more complete and explicit than that of Epicurus, which has been uniformly denounced by theologians as atheistic materialism, when regarded, standing by itself, as an attempt to explain the whole universe. Its essential character is not in the least changed by being associated with a theory of a divine existence external to the material universe. It is still a theory of atheistic materialism in respect to the universe of matter, that is to say, it is a godless theory of matter, a theory of the material universe existing without God, by virtue of an "inherent necessity."

This part of the dualistic theory, that, in regard to matter, is atheistic materialism. The other part, in regard to God, is supernatural theism, that with which no theory of nature has any thing to do, because wholly external to nature. In it, there is nothing to prevent a person from rejecting this supernatural part of dualism, as superfluous and irrelevant to a philosophy of nature.

The doctrine of the "inherent potency" of matter by Tyndall, is infinitely further removed from atheism, although often so denounced by theologians, than is the doctrine of "inherent necessity," accepted by Dr. Bushnell from Epicurus. For the analysis of "potency" reveals as its origin, mind, as we have already seen, while the doctrine of "inherent necessity" is only another form of the atheistic doctrine of fate. In place of "inherent necessity" write the "immanent God," and you have the true theory of matter and the material universe.

The doctrine of dualism again appears, in equal clearness, in the definition which Dr. Bushnell gives of the supernatural, which is, "that is supernatural, whatever it be, that is either not in the chain of cause and effect, or which acts on the chain of cause and effect in nature from without the chain." It is impossible to formulate a statement more complete and explicit than this, setting forth the theory of the entire separation of the supernatural from the natural, or of God from nature. If this is not a doctrine of dualism,

then no language can be found and no words marshalled to express it.

With this doctrine of Dr. Bushnell, the action of the supernatural on the natural, whether that action originates in the spiritual nature of man, in a spirit, or in God, alike partakes of the nature of the miraculous, since he defines a miracle to be, the action of the supernatural on the natural, including in the supernatural man in his spiritual personality, as well as spirits and Deity. Such is the language of Dr. Bushnell: "We act supernaturally ourselves, which God and other created spirits may as well do as we" (p. 492). According to this theory and definition of miracles, every exercise of the human will, a supernatural power, as Dr. Bushnell affirms it, by which a man lifts his foot from the ground, thus overcoming the law of gravity, is a miracle. If this be a miracle, then the miracles of Christ cease to be a proof of his divinity. The direct tendency of the author's theory of dualism is to produce that very state which he so justly deprecates on page 452, "God is too far off, too much imprisoned by laws, to allow expectation from Him." "Prayer becomes a kind of dumb-bell exercise, good as exercise, but never to be answered." From this moral condition, he sees no deliverance, except as "God breaks forth in miracles and holy gifts to let it be seen, that he is still the living God." The result of such breaking forth into miracles the author shows from history is "a rushing into fanaticism," so that the final outcome is that "between these two kinds of excesses"—lethargy and disbelief in the power of God on one side and fanaticism on the other—"the church is always swinging and by a kind of moral necessity must be." In this perplexing dilemma, the author "finds ample room to doubt, which is really widest of a just respect, the excesses of fanaticism and false fire, or the comatose and dull impotence of a religion that worships God without expectation;" at the same time admitting (p. 468) "that the class called thinking men, in our age, will be ready with few

exceptions, to reject in the gross and without hesitation, all such pretended facts"—which he furnishes.

Dr. Bushnell goes on to cite, as historic facts, that among the Huguenots, during the period of their persecution and flight to the mountains of Cevennes and to England, after the repeal of the edict of Nantz, "the miraculous gifts were developed and by them were more or less widely disseminated abroad. They had tongues and interpretation of tongues. They had healings and discerning of spirits. They prophesied in the Spirit." He also states that "about forty years after this appearing of the gifts among the Huguenots, a very similar development appeared among the Catholic or Jansenist population of Paris. Cures were wrought at the tomb of Saint Mèdard and particularly of persons afflicted with convulsions. . . . They had the gifts of tongues, the discerning of spirits, and the gift of prophesying. . . . The sect of Friends from George Fox downwards have had it as a principle, to expect gifts, revelations, discerning of spirits and indeed a complete divine movement." The tragic severity of the author's rebuke of "thinking men" for questioning these alleged facts prepares the reader for what follows in stories of dreams and prophets; and surprise ceases that this author should give his sanction to the imposture of saint's miracles, should justify by inference, at least, saint's worship and honor the grossest superstitions of mediæval Romanism:

It may well be asked, Is it not time that another theory of miracles should be considered, that will not impose on "thinking men" the religious necessity of exercising credulity on such fanatical claims to the power of miracle, will deliver the Church from the heathen doctrine of dualism, and restore to it its pristine belief of an ever-present, ever-acting God, ("My Father worketh hitherto and I work;") will induce the constant recognition of Him, as the source of all power, the life of all life; will harmonize the truths of science and religion; will present Christ in the powers of his Divinity, as something other than a human fanatic, or juggler, and re-

veal him in his true relation of Oneness with the Omnipresent and Omnipotent God, who is himself the Absolute Spirit, Creator, Upholder and Lord of the universe?

In contrast to this theory of miracles based on dualism, as the action of the supernatural, an ab-extra power, on nature, the doctrine of the divine immanence presents the miracles of Christ, as a new mode of the divine action in nature disclosing the fact of the presence and power of God in nature and its processes. Thus viewed, the miracles of Christ were especially corrective of the false philosophizings of the age in which he made his advent, and of the erroneous views that existed, alike among Jews, Greeks, and Romans, of the true relations of God to the material universe.

Aristobulus, a Jewish priest who lived 160 B. C., may be regarded as the most influential teacher of his time whose expositions of the Hebrew Scriptures assumed anything of a philosophical character. He taught that although God is invisible He yet sits enthroned in the heavens and is not in any respect in contact with the earth, but only acts upon it by his power, having formed the world out of matter previously existing. The relation of God to the material universe was thus regarded as being simply that of the mechanic or artificer to the work he has formed or made. His existence, though absolute, was yet separate from the world. He also held that the Logos was a being intermediate between God and the world, the first begotten Son of God and, for us, who are imperfect, a God; that through the agency of the Logos, God created the world and has revealed himself to it. The Logos is also the representative of the world before God, acting as its High Priest, Intercessor, and Paraclete.

Philo was born only twenty years before Christ. He taught a confused doctrine of omnipresence in some of its aspects, in others he was dualistic concerning the nature and being of God, teaching that He is everywhere by his power but in no place with his essence, (describing him as enthroned on the outermost borders of the heavens, an extra-mundane place, as in a sacred citadel); that in creating the world, he

employed as instruments incorporeal potencies or ideas, since he could not himself come in contact with polluting matter; that these potencies surround God as ministering spirits, just as a monarch is surrounded by the members of his court, and that the highest of all the divine forms is the Logos. He rejected the idea of the incarnation of the Logos, on account of the impurity of matter.

Among the Greeks the doctrines of Democritus and Epicurus, were those commonly accepted, concerning the relation of God to nature, which was, that the idea of God was not necessary in natural philosophy, for all things take place by the operation of natural causes, that atoms exist from eternity and have their motion in virtue of their gravity, that animals and men are products of the earth, that the soul is material and composed of exceedingly fine atoms.

Diametrically opposed to all these theories was the doctrine taught by Christ, that "God is Spirit" and that as Spirit, he is the Creator and upholder of the universe. By Spirit-power performing his miracles, energizing, directing, and controlling the forces of nature, through the simple exercise of his own will, as divine personality, Christ manifested the spiritual nature of the Creator, and asserted his own relation to Him as partaker of the same essence, himself God of very God,—“I and the Father are one.”

The word most commonly used in the New Testament to designate the miracles of Christ is *σημεῖα* "signs," as we have already explained. Let us now consider the miracles of Christ under this appropriate designation. Of what were these miracles the signs? They were especially signs of the power and presence of God in nature—the power that works all the varied processes in nature, doing his pleasure here as well as among the inhabitants of heaven. He showed that the power in nature was divine, that it was not held in the bonds of necessity, but that back of these forces was a free will changing their mode of action at pleasure, that uniformity in the action of the forces of nature is not grounded on any principle of necessity, but in the wisdom and benevo-

lence of God. As a wise Being He must choose out of all possible modes of action the best mode. This fact will give permanency to the mode chosen and uniformity of action. But this uniformity is not necessitated.

There is still another principle which secures uniformity of action. God demands of his intelligent creatures that they be co-workers with him. But there could be no coöperation, were there not uniformity of action. It would be impossible to work with capricious and changing plans and modes of operation. Uniformity of action in the forces of nature is not grounded on the nature of those forces apart from God, but as related to Him and emanating directly from Him.

The miracles of Christ were especially significant of the mode in which that civilization he came to inaugurate would achieve its destined triumphs in the realm of nature,—not by overcoming and paralyzing, but by intensifying and multiplying, adding force to force, one increment to another, giving greater energy to the forces of nature. Christian civilization has given greater fertility to soil, causing “two blades of grass to grow in place in one.” It has sought out and applied mechanical and other devices by which it can increase water-power, intensify steam-power and can multiply indefinitely electrical power. The peculiar characteristic of Christian civilization is its command of the forces of nature and intensification of these forces.

Observe, further, how it is by the exercise of the childlike spirit of humble docility which Christ especially inculcated, that Christian civilization has won its victories and achieved its marvels in the realm of nature. Not by self-conceited theorizings about the nature of these forces, but by humbly seeking to understand their mode of action,—“being taught of God,” humbly knocking at the door of nature in patient experimenting, asking the God of nature to tell them the secret hidden things of force and law, did Bacon, Newton, Davy, and Watts gain that knowledge of the forces and laws of nature, which has enabled men so to command these forces as to achieve results miraculous to other civilizations. And,

observe, these wonderful works of a Christian civilization have been wrought, not by introducing new forces into nature, but by obtaining from them new modes of operation and giving intensity to them.

In complete harmony with the manner in which Christ performed his miracles has Christian civilization obtained its triumphs, wonderful not only, but also especially beneficent to our humanity.

But the highest significance of the miracles of Christ lies in the fact, that they were especially signs and symbols of his true work and mission of spiritual healing and restoration.

The special mission of Christ was not to heal the sick and restore sight to the physically blind of Judea, for there were doubtless thousands of the diseased, infirm and blind, that he himself passed by, without attempting to reach with his divine power of cure and restoration. An ultimate spiritual intent is revealed in the miracles of Christ, with more or less fulness. Take, for example, the death and resurrection of Lazarus. Instead of responding to the call of the sisters, when they sent the message, that their brother was sick, he let death do its work, in order to furnish the occasion for revealing himself as "the resurrection and the life."

A spiritual aim will reveal itself to every thoughtful reader of the miracles of Christ, who seeks to apprehend their true significance. His was a higher mission than that merely of relieving physical infirmities and sufferings. It was that of spiritual healing and restoration, of which the few isolated cases of physical cure were only emblematical. His aim was the restoration of the souls of men, to impart health, holiness, *i. e.*, to make hale, healthy, holy (words of kindred root and signification), to give soundness and vigor to the spiritual faculties of men, to deliver them from spiritual death, to call them forth from the corruptions of that grave, "where their worm dieth not." As Luther says, "The true miracles of Christ and Christianity are their creation of spiritual life in the human soul, compared with which, such outward miracles as the healing of the sick and walking on the water,

were quite secondary and unimportant." These too are the miracles perpetuated, the greater miracles, which he assured his disciples they should perform, through the divine power of the Holy Spirit to be conferred on them in greater measure because he went to the Father.

The miracles of Christ then, so far from being a suspension of natural laws, were rather an exaltation and reinforcement of the forces in nature, signs of the presence and power of God in nature and of that exalted and intensified spiritual power which Christ confers, giving what Carlyle calls "more soul," strength and control to the spiritual nature, supremacy over the lower or carnal nature, its appetites and passions, in one word "power to become the sons of God."

Nor was a miracle the action of a supernatural power on nature, as something ab-extra from itself, for the divine power is in nature, a power without which, nature itself could have no existence and without whose constant energizings, nature could have no continuance in existence. Nor again was a miracle the introduction of a new force in nature. These forces of growth, healing, transformation, life were already existing and working in nature. Only the mode of action was new. These forces were simply reinforced, new power imparted to them, so that they accomplished results in briefer periods than ordinarily, worked changes more rapidly.

The intent of the miracles of Christ was to reveal the forces of nature as dependent upon or rather as the very energizings of the divine will, held by no bond of necessity, except in the self-imposed limitations of the divine power and will, from which they emanated. And thus it was that Christ revealed himself in fulfilment of prophecy as Immanuel, "God with us."

This was the central fact and principle, from which all the redemptive processes radiated. God with us, to reveal to us truth, to impart life, spiritual life, to succor in temptations, to strengthen in trials, to sympathize with us in our sufferings, to forgive our iniquities, to aid us in our struggles, to redeem us from transgressions, to deliver from sin, to heal

our diseases, to restore us from death, to be the triumphant power of the resurrection, "the Resurrection and the Life." Such was the significance of Immanuel, "God with us."

The revelation of this primal and fundamental fact of the divine relation to nature and to man constitutes the key to the ministry and teachings of Christ.

The miracles Christ wrought were signs of a present God, that he is not afar off, but is that power in nature which can change the operations of nature at his own pleasure. They were also signs prophetic, of what men, receptive of his Spirit and teaching, would be able to do and achieve in the realm of nature by the use and command of its forces, gaining that power by the exercise of the childlike, humble, teachable spirit which he inculcated as the inexorable condition for entering his kingdom, the kingdom of truth—the spirit demanded by science for all scientific investigations;—learning the character and laws of the forces in nature, and thus getting power with God and ability to produce those marvellous results in the realm of nature which are found and found alone in a Christian civilization.

We now find a ready solution to the questions, so often asked concerning miracles, How? and For what end? They were performed by an in-dwelling divine power. To the leper, Christ said, "I will; be thou clean." Virtue or healing power is represented as flowing out of him at the touch of those seeking healing. The whole class of miracles called nature-miracles, those performed on nature or the objects of nature, as distinguished from persons, manifested the possession of a power, not only competent to control and direct the forces of nature, but a power which is the very source of energy in nature.

The power that acted in the healing of diseases exhibited a similar nature. In all these cases, an immanent power of life, to others a fountain of life. The Saviour always attributed his miracles to the Father, both by prayer invoking His power and by affirming, that they were the

works of the Father. They served also to characterize that new dispensation he came to establish, as a religion of humanity, giving relief from suffering, as well as from sin, fostering not only a spirit of reverence and sympathy in man toward his fellow-man but also toward all existences and all life, awakening those better moral sentiments resulting from the discernment of a divine beauty in the lily which "God so clothes"—of divine life as the source of all life, which shall suppress needless cruelty to brute creatures, will tend to beautify and improve the creation of God, "converting the desert into a garden," will cherish industry, dignify labor in the consciousness of fellowship with the divine presence and ministrations, will inspire art with loftier and purer, because with spiritual, ideals and aims, and so bring in that day for which "the earnest expectation of creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God."

In the next article the doctrine of the divine immanency will be further considered in its relation to instinct and inspiration.

[*To be continued.*]