INSPIRATION

AND OTHER LECTURES

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

TORONTO: THE PRESBYTERIAN NEWS CO.

INSPIRATION

And other Lectures

BY

T. GEORGE ROOKE, B.A.
LATE PRESIDENT OF RAWDON COLLEGE, NEAR LEEDS

EDITED BY TWO OF HIS STUDENTS

EDINBURGH
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET
1893

PREFACE.

THESE lectures are published as a memorial of their author. It was well known among Mr. Rooke's more intimate friends that it was his intention in a few years to devote himself to the preparation of some of the work he did as theological tutor at Rawdon College for publication. That intention was frustrated by his untimely death. Those who were familiar with Mr. Rooke's methods cannot doubt that had he lived to carry out his design, these lectures, if he had published them, would have been largely, if not entirely, recast; for he was constantly revising his work, and bringing it into line with the most recent results of criticism and the latest attitude of thought. It was felt, however, that his work had a value of its own, and was well worthy of preservation in permanent form, although that form might not be such as he himself, if he had lived, would have wished to give it. From his papers as he laid them down after his last class—not dreaming that it was to be his last—these have been selected as specimens of his work. The range of the subjects is wide, but his treatment of them each was such as to win the interest of his students in no ordinary degree. The lectures on Psychology and Inspiration were not delivered in any formal way. They were constantly interrupted by oral explanations and expansions on the teacher's part, and by questions from the students. The ground covered at each class varied, in

consequence, according to the nature of the subject and the freedom of its discussion. It followed, almost necessarily, from such a method of teaching, that Mr. Rooke's MS. was not divided into formal lectures, etc.; and thus for the divisions into chapters and sections in the first two parts of the book, the editors are responsible. The lectures on Pastoral Theology were delivered practically as they stand, except that Mr. Rooke illustrated some of his points by extracts which he read from other writers on the subject, many of which the editors do not feel it necessary or desirable to quote. In this part of the book the chapters are divided, and the subjects of them stated by Mr. Rooke's own hand. These lectures introduced informal conferences on the subjects they discussed. The lectures on Psychology and on Inspiration were intended to prepare students for the examination of the Senatus Academicus of Associated Nonconformist Colleges, and in all three cases the circumstances of their delivery to some extent account for their form.

Whether this volume meet the fate of most memorial volumes or not, the editors are thankful that they were permitted to undertake the task of preparing the lectures for publication. They feel that their own share in the work is imperfectly done; but they also feel that the lectures themselves have a value which, quite apart from the interest which students who were educated at Rawdon may feel in them, makes them worthy of the form which they now receive.

J. M.
W. C. S.

IN MEMORIAM.

THESE lines are not intended for a memoir. They are simply an attempt to sketch, in some slight way, the spirit and the methods of a life of singular devotion, and its crowning work. Thomas George Rooke had fulfilled a pastorate of fourteen years before he entered upon the presidency of Rawdon College, near Leeds, and to that post he brought a sound and thorough scholarship, of which, if he had lived, he would have left maturer proof than can be given by such unrevised lectures as this book contains.

Mr. Rooke had all, and more than all, the usual modesty of real scholarship. No one would have known from him—what was yet true—that his name appears probably more frequently than any other in the prize and honours lists of London University. He was content to do such quiet work as he did for Dr. Davies' *Hebrew Lexicon*. It was by the side-lights of his talk that one discovered how much he knew, and how thoroughly he knew it. He was a man who constantly surprised companions with his familiarity, even in detail with out-of-the-way subjects. As a linguist, his ability was great. Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, of Oriental; German, French, Spanish, and Italian, among modern languages, were only some of what he taught. I recollect his telling me, on his return from a tour in south-eastern Europe, that he had spent a few days in a town where five or six different languages were spoken by sections of the people; but it was only when I asked him if he could speak them all, that he confessed that there was one of which he only knew the alphabet.

Large though Mr. Rooke's scholarship was, it was all needed for the post he occupied. The president of a Nonconformist Theological College must be a man of many gifts, —indeed, of too many gifts. He must guide the institution over which he presides; which means that he must be able to manage a sort of modern monastery, the inmates of which are not always so sedate as Bernard's Cistercians at Clairvaux, and do this with such help or othewise as an additional large body of men—called a committee—offers. He is also practically Professor of Theology in all its branches, of Hebrew, of Greek,—New Testament and Septuagint,—of Ecclesiastical History, and a few other subjects. In reality, it is an impossible task; and no higher tribute can be paid to Mr. Rooke's scholarship and industry than to say, what it is true to say of him, that he grappled with it, and, so far as the impossible is possible, successfully accomplished it.

In the thirteen years of his presidency of Rawdon College, Mr. Rooke did work that grew in power and influence as time went on. Firmly as he grasped the great evangelical verities of the Christian faith, he was always ready to advance where the light shone. To the impatience of immature students he sometimes seemed to move too slowly, but as they advanced they learned from him to be sure of their ground as they took each forward step. Very few of Mr. Rooke's classes took the form of mere lectures for transcription. Free discussion on difficult questions was always welcome, and some of the most valuable mental discipline of college life was gained by many of his students in such informal talks. By his own patient scholarship he taught us never to despise "the day of small things" in scholarship as well as in other things. We sometimes used to smile the smile of carelessness when, in the study of an Epistle, we were reminded to "note the aorist"; but since these days an aorist "noted" has often been a help to clearer views and juster exposition of the truth. He himself loved truth, and sought it with a diligence that was not unrewarded; and he infected his students with his own spirit. He taught his men to count no drudgery unblest that ended in a surer vision of reality. He was a seeker after truth, and he found—and he expected to find—

what he sought. He had very little sympathy with the merely philosophic sentiment, that the search for truth was preferable to its possession. He believed that God has not hidden the truth, but has revealed it; and so he always spoke as one who uttered what he knew, and bore witness to what he had seen.

Mr. Rooke's care for his students, and his influence over them, did not cease when he left his classroom. Always accessible to them, when well enough to speak to any one, he was the helper and the counsellor of all who sought his aid. He took almost unbounded interest in the progress of his men. He would help them with their sermons; if they desired to study any special subject, he would meet them in evening classes. I still have in my desk a criticism of a service which as a student I conducted in his presence; and though he did not hesitate to lay his hands upon the faults, he did so in such a way as to encourage the attempt to master them; and when the student left the quiet college life to enter on the stir and strain of ministerial work, Mr. Rooke's friendship followed him. He was full of sympathy with the joys and the sorrows, the difficulties and the successes of the young pastor's life. Many a man who climbed the hillside on which Rawdon College stands with a load upon his mind, descended it with a heart made light by the quick sympathy and ready help he met from Mr. Rooke. It was in talks at times like these we saw him at his best. All the inner kindness of the man, all his sagacity, the quickness of his mind, and the generosity of his heart, were manifest. Too delicate and highly strung to be always equal to himself in doing public work, he was never more thoroughly and happily at home than when, in the quiet of his own study among his papers and his books, he faced the difficulties and rejoiced in the successes of one of his own students.

The following extracts from letters to one of his students will show his wise and kindly interest in his men. The first is his reply to the announcement of an invitation to the pastorate of a northern church. He was spending his summer holiday among the Austrian Alps, and he gives a very lively account of the humours of a busy posting station on a

Sunday: "Outside the inn the village band is playing, and toy mortars are exploding in honour of a local magnate just arrived from a journey; and from the village shooting ground we hear the continuous fire of rifles, for Sunday is the appointed time for every Tyrolese to make himself a marksman *pro aris et focis*." These things, he says, make writing difficult; but he sends this as better than nothing. How much better let the reader judge.

"I do not think that you could have expected a nearer approach to unanimity than has attended the call; and I would rather hear of a few dissentient voices, such as those you mention, than I would of an unreasoning enthusiasm, in which all semblance of individual opinion is drowned. It is, to me, a good augury that the five who did not join in the first vote withdrew their opposition when they found what the wish of the great majority was. I should not wonder if some of these friends prove by and by to be among your best friends. They have given a good practical evidence of Christian feeling, and they deserve a recognition of the same in those pastoral relations which I hope you mean to cultivate diligently with all the people; for I am more and more convinced that it is by simple but real and earnest pastoral care that a minister finds his way to the hearts of his people, and establishes himself solidly there. I have few, scarcely any fears, as to your work; but I should have many, if your own soul were not so strongly affected with the solemnity and difficulty of that which you are about to attempt. For your own personal life, which a Christian minister needs to guard so anxiously, and in regard to which so many brilliant preachers have made a miserable shipwreck, I trust very firmly in your father's God. . . . During all the years you have been with us, I have gained increasing confidence that the well of living water which may sink low, but which can never wholly dry, has been opened within your soul by a touch which no mortal can give. You will never, I think, cease to watch jealously over those 'issues of life,' and this all the more because the spiritual health of many others must now grow strong or feeble in sympathy with your own. And I also think that one of those lessons which you say

you have learned at college, and which will never fade from your consciousness, is this, that the only way to keep ourselves is to let Christ keep us, to yield up ourselves entirely to Him; to clear out the channels of our life, that His life may flow in unhindered to us, and become the power to which each faculty and member of our frame shall be an obedient instrument. Nor have I any fear as to the doctrinal developments of which you may become the subject; for if you are the possessor of a life which only the Spirit of God can give, you will not lack that 'unction from the Holy One' by which a Christian 'knows all things.' But, all the same, I shall ever feel truly, and even intensely, interested in the crystallising of your convictions on all the deep and vital matters about which we have so often talked at Rawdon. And you must never think it will be a toil or an unwelcome task to me to read your letters, or to hear your narratives of widening experience, and clearer certainty of all that is most surely believed among us."

The next is to the same student, written just as he entered on the pastorate of the church mentioned in the previous letter. It is a capital bit of pastoral theology, as well as a bright specimen of talk on men and things.

"It was pleasant to see your handwriting this morning, and to learn that you are happily launched into waters which, whether wholly smooth as now, or rough and stormy as they may well be by and by, are hallowed for you by the footsteps of the Master, who Himself has made you a fisher of men. I have thought much and prayerfully about you since Wednesday, and I take it as a *good* augury that you entered your first pastorate through the doors of a prayer-meeting. Your own sincere requests, and the petitions of many on your behalf, will certainly be answered.

"To reply to your letter in the order of its contents. I would say as to books, that the only title on your first list about which I am doubtful, is Barrow's *Introduction*. If you think of taking a Bible-class through this topic, there could not be a better text-book, but it is too elementary for a student of theology who has got beyond his first or second year; therefore its retention on your list will depend upon the use you

think to make of it. I notice three books by Stanford on this list. His style of thought and expression is *sympathique* to your own. Therein lies a ground of warning as well as of congratulation, in view of this apparent liking of yours for him. I daresay you will understand what I mean. We should read authors whose minds are complementary to our own, rather than those whose minds are reflected in ours. James' *Anxious Inquirer* is still good and useful; but modern 'inquirers,' especially of the male sex, are better suited by such books as Bonar's *God's Way of Peace.* Each book has a useful sequel—James' *Christian Progress,* Bonar's *God's Way of Holiness.* . . .

"I can have no objection to address your letters 'Mr.' rather than 'Rev.,' especially as I quite share the preference which you evidently feel between the two titles. But, if you will let me give you the counsel, don't stickle for trifles of this kind with people generally, only a few will understand the reason; and you may get the reputation of being whimsical about small matters, which again often breeds unjust suspicion concerning more important aud fundamental things. Let people know that you don't care to be called 'Reverend,' and would really rather be 'Mr.'; but if they *will* follow the custom (as most of them will), let them, without any more ado."

The man who could write so brightly lived much of his life in pain and weakness. Many a time he dragged himself down to his classroom by sheer force of will, and we knew, as we looked at him that, had he been a man with easier ideals, he would have sent a message down to say that he could not meet his classes. That was not his way. His devotion to duty was a rare sight, and was not the least influential of the forces of his life. Idleness was doubly shameful, and carelessness grew more and more impossible to men who lived near him. His work at Rawdon was not always easy work, but he flinched no difficulty; and when, in in the summer of 1890, his last long illness began on the very day the College session closed, he might have said, what he leaves others to say, that his work there, quiet and unobtrusive as it was, remains his best monument.

J. M.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

PSYCHOLOGY.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

CHAPTER II.

SIMPLE "FORMS" OR "MODES" OF CONSCIOUSNESS.

CHAPTER III.

SPHERES OF CONSCIOUS PSYCHICAL LIFE.

CHAPTER IV.

KINDS OF ACTIVITY.

CHAPTER V.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS—ANIMAL AND RATIONAL SPHERES.

CHAPTER VI.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS—SPIRITUAL SPHERE.

PART II.

THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE AND INSPIRATION.

CHAPTER I.

THE BIBLE'S CLAIM FOR ITSELF.

CHAPTER II.

THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE.

CHAPTER III.

INSPIRATION.

CHAPTER IV.

THEORIES OF INSPIRATION CLASSIFIED.

CHAPTER V.

THEORIES OF INSPIRATION TESTED.

CHAPTER VI.

DIFFICULTIES OF INSPIRATION.

PART III.

PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

CHAPTER I.

CHAPTER II.

CHAPTER III.

CHAPTER IV.

CHAPTER V.

CHAPTER VI.

PART I.

LECTURES ON PSYCHOLOGY.

LECTURES ON PSYCHOLOGY.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

§ 1. PSYCHOLOGY, which literally means "a discussion of matters pertaining to the soul," may be defined more particularly as "the science which investigates the essential properties, the states, operations, and laws of the human soul"; or, more briefly, "*the science which deals with all phenomena of Consciousness.*" It is clearly distinguished from Metaphysics on one side, and from Anthropology on the other. Metaphysics investigates the problems of Being, Essence, Substance, Cause, and all other transcendental and speculative questions which arise out of the objective relations of the human mind. Another name for Metaphysics is Ontology, which points to this objective character of the science. Psychology, on the other hand, is limited to the subjective facts of the mind or soul.

Again, Anthropology deals with all the variations of human nature, the peculiarities which distinguish individual men and women from each other, such as the phenomena of sex, age, temperament, race, etc., and the resultant effects of these in human life. But Psychology deals, not with these variable elements, but with the phenomena of Consciousness, which seem to be common to all mankind, constant and essential under all those circumstances which furnish the ever-changing materials of Anthropology.

§ 2. Psychology is a very old science, though for a very long time it was treated only as a subordinate branch of Philosophy. Aristotle was the first to discuss it separately, having devoted a whole important treatise to "*The Soul*" (*De anima*—περὶ ψυχῆς); and his doctrine is still living and influential, having been quite recently revived under the name of Animism.[1] The doctrine was that the Soul is that energy or force which animates a body, the "Entelechy of the body," to use Aristotle's own phrase, *i.e.* that without which the body could not live. For this famous word Entelechy (ἐν τέλος ἔχειν) means "that which has its end in itself,"—an actual existence, as opposed to a mere potentiality, the "*Form*" which gives an indivisible unity to any phenomenon. Aristotle believed that everything which exhibits phenomena of organic life has a soul, *e.g.* plants and animals; this soul being inseparable from the body which it quickens. Plato, on the contrary, sharply distinguishes between soul and body. The soul, according to him, was a "plant of celestial growth" which had "fallen" into the body from a state of pre-existence; and which migrates from body to body, until it finds its way back to God. This last doctrine is the famous Metempsychosis, which also meets us in all Oriental philosophy, notably in Brahminism and Buddhism. (See, for Plato's *Psychology*, the *Phædrus* and *Phædo.*)

From the days of Aristotle and Plato, nothing new was attempted in regard to Psychology until the seventeenth century, when Descartes began to investigate the hitherto unexplored region of human Consciousness. Wolf, in the nineteenth century, founded an elaborate system, which he called Rational Psychology, but which was *à priori* and deductive in its methods, and therefore vanished, with much else of the same kind, under the critical assaults of Kant's Philosophy. Since then, no department of Philosophy has been cultivated more eagerly than Psychology. The two

[1] *Animism.* This word must not be confounded with the same term as used by Spencer, Lubbock, etc., in the modern science of Philosophy of Religion. [For Aristotle's use of the term see also below, Chap. III. § 32 (5).]

ancient schools of Aristotle and Plato have reappeared in modern forms. The first (Aristotle's) has given rise to two divergent doctrines: (*a*) The Sensationalism or Materialism which just now dominates English Psychology, and which has been taught by Cabanis in France, by Moleschott in Germany, and by Bain and Spencer in Britain; (*b*) The Pantheism of the whole Hegelian school. The second doctrine (Plato's) has reappeared in the Scotch Philosophy of Stewart and Reid, whom Hamilton follows, and in the spiritualist school of France, represented by Maine de Biran, Victor Cousin, Janet, Pressensé, etc.[1] Lotze, in Germany, has laid the foundations of what will probably be the Psychology of the future, in which the chief elements of Hegelianism and Spiritualism will be more or less reconciled and harmonised.

§ 3. There is no part of the modern field of controversy, either in Ethics or Religion, that does not involve a distinct psychological standpoint on the part of the controversialist; and very much of the hopeless misunderstanding in which these controversies often end, arises from the fact that each disputant has been reasoning from psychological premises which his adversary would utterly deny.

The tendency of "modern thought" (so called) is either towards Pantheism or towards Materialism; and the psychological basis of these systems must be irreconcilable with that of Christian Theism. For the words "Soul," "Ego," "Personality," which describe the subject-matter of Psychology, have totally different meanings to a Theist, a Pantheist, or a Materialist respectively. Hence it is a waste of strength and time to discuss doctrines of Religion and Morals, unless we have ascertained that the disputants are agreed in their answers to such questions as these: What is a soul? What is meant by Personality? Does the Ego really exist, or is it a name and nothing more? *i.e.* Does the pronoun "I" describe a real existence, or only a fictitious and

[1] [It is to the "spiritualist" school of Maine de Biran, etc., that the author mainly adheres in these pages.]

imaginary conception? This last-mentioned alternative is the settled opinion of all those philosophers who belong to what is called the Phenomenal School, of which J. S. Mill was the founder, and of which Dr. Bain is a well-known living representative. This school regards what we call the mind or the soul as being merely "a series of feelings," or a "permanent possibility of feeling,"[1] with no original or independent unit of Personality behind them. And the Evolutionist School, represented by Herbert Spencer, in exactly the same way, teaches that it is an "illusion to suppose that the Ego is anything more than the aggregate of feelings and ideas" which happen at any moment to exist together. Another way in which this fundamental doctrine is expressed by Herbert Spencer's school, is to say that the Ego is a mere "bundle of mental states," or, "a principle of continuity forming states of consciousness into a whole." This is not a new doctrine, for the Greek Sophists, against whom Socrates contended, compared the soul to the music of a harp, which is heard only when the strings are moved in a certain harmony, which has no existence apart from those strings, and which, of course, perishes when the strings are taken apart.

But against this doctrine, the consciousness of an ordinary man will always protest. For the word "I" is meaningless, unless it denotes a conscious unity and causality; which is the very opposite of that group or succession of nerve stimulations to which Mill and Spencer reduce the notion of the Soul. And an ordinary man would either fail to understand this last conception, or else treat it as a madman's dream. For there is no question but that each Ego is conscious of itself; and to suppose that a mere "bundle of mental states" or series of feelings can be aware of itself, can remember, imagine, compare its past, present, and future, and so forth, is to suggest what is sheer nonsense; nor can we argue profitably with any one who declares that this is his view of the human soul and of its self-consciousness.

---

[1] See Mill's *Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy*, chap. xii.

Most modern Materialists and Pantheists have felt this difficulty, which Herbert Spencer tries to avoid by saying that the bundle of states has come "by heredity," and through "social environment," to beget a fictitious self, which is always associated with the changing feelings and ideas; but there is no reality answering to this fiction. Most ordinary persons will fail to see that this explanation of self-consciousness and of the word "I" makes the matter at all more intelligible; and we seem driven back upon the old and common doctrine, that the words "I," "self," "soul," describe a single, independent, self-moving something that is different from all its feelings and ideas, and apart from which these feelings and ideas would be inconceivable. Further than that we can hardly go. The word "I" explains itself better than any metaphysical definition could explain it; and a belief in the real existence of the Ego is the first condition of all thought about the mind or the soul, *i.e.* of all Psychology and all Metaphysics. It is no less a condition of all Theology; for Theology, as distinct from natural science, implies the belief in God as Personal, *i.e.* as a single, self-conscious Will, after the analogy of our own self-conscious unity and causality.

§ 4. Psychological facts seem to arrange themselves under three heads, viz. Feeling, Knowing, and Willing; whence arises the well-known division of the human soul into Intellect or "Head," Emotion or "Heart," and Will. The science of mind is nearly always considered nowadays under three corresponding divisions. But this arrangement is quite modern; for the ancient Greeks and the Schoolmen of the Middle Ages recognised only a twofold division, viz.: (1) Intellect or thought (νοῦς, according to Aristotle); (2) Will or desire (ὄρεξις). Reid, the leader of what is called the Scotch or Common-sense school of Philosophy, adopted the same classification of mind into (1) Intellectual Powers; (2) Active Powers. The firm establishment of the threefold division is chiefly due to Kant in Germany, to Victor Cousin in France, and to Hamilton in Great Britain. Any one can verify for himself its justice and necessity; for the

phenomena of thinking, feeling, and willing are really and radically dissimilar, and therefore require to be classed separately from one another.

But we must carefully guard against supposing or describing these three distinct classes of phenomena as separate faculties or parts of the soul. They are rather forms or modes of self-consciousness, in which the whole Ego asserts itself in one or other of three ways or directions. We cannot think without feeling and attending (*i.e.* willing); we cannot feel apart from some phenomena of knowing and willing; we cannot will except through intellect and emotion. In other words, every mental state is compounded of these three factors or elements. Yet they cannot all be present in equally well-marked degree. It is an ascertained law of Psychology, that as one of these elements becomes larger in consciousness, the other two tend to become smaller, and to retire into unconsciousness. *E.g.* strong feeling precludes calm thinking and regulated acts of will; intense thought deadens emotion and paralyses will in every aspect except that of intellectual attention; resolute volition silences all thought and all feeling, save that which is necessary as a basis and as a vehicle of itself. The distinctness of these three aspects or sides of mind may be grasped from another point of view; for if we compare, not different states of the same mind, but the minds of different men, we perceive that souls group themselves into three well-marked classes, according as the Emotional, the Intellectual, or the Active nature is predominant in each. It is an exceedingly rare thing to find a man in whom all three are perfectly balanced. Many would deny that such a man has ever been seen.

§ 5. It is a much disputed question, Which of these three forms or modes of self-consciousness deserves to be looked upon as fundamental, *i.e.* as accounting for and explaining the other two? In other words, in which of the three does Personality centre? Most British and American Intuitionalists, and all Hegelians, regard *intellect* or thought as the foundation of the soul. The School of Philosophy called

Sensational, and all modern Materialists, give the primordial place to *feeling*, which they regard as the root and origin of thought and will. Mystics (of nearly all schools), the German school of Pessimists represented by Schopenhauer and Von Hartmann, and the French spiritualist school founded by Maine de Biran, have fixed upon *will* as the fundamental aspect of mind. Schopenhauer, of course, means by will mere unconscious desire or striving; and many Evolutionists (*e.g.* the English Maudsley[1]) agree with him in this, ascribing all mental phenomena to a blind "*nisus*" or "Effort of Evolution." This form of the doctrine cannot be accepted, of course, by a Christian. But there is the strongest possible reason for accepting the doctrine of Maine de Biran, that *the phenomenon of Will is the central and ultimate fact of personal consciousness*, on which the other phenomena of thought and emotion depend.[2]

This principle is of special value in the Biblical and Theological developments of Psychology. Delitzsch has discussed it very suggestively in his *Biblical Psychology*.[3] He shows how the Scripture doctrine "God is Love" is only another way of saying "God is Will"; for Love and Will seem to melt into identity when each of these indefinable notions is probed to the lowest deep that our consciousness and our powers of thought can reach. Delitzsch's explanations and illustrations of this point are decidedly mystical, but, for that reason, all the more valuable; for there is a strong presumption in favour of any conclusion that is reached in common by roads so different as those of Mystics, the French Spiritualists and the German Pessimists. Much light is also thrown upon the deeper speculations of Oriental Philosophy and Theosophy by this explanation of the triplicity of the human Soul centring in Will, and so reflecting the triune existence of the Deity.

---

[1] [*Vide* Maudsley's *Body and Will*, especially pp. 190, 191. (London, 1883.)]

[2] The theory of Oetinger, the German mystic, is the same as that of Maine de Biran.

[3] *Vide* Delitzsch's *System of Biblical Psychology*, pp. 196–208. [2nd English edition, T. & T. Clark, 1879.]

Hence there is an increasing tendency, among modern Theologians, to recognise Will as the fundamental fact of Personality, human and Divine, and to make the Divine Will the ultimate explanation of the Universe. Martensen frankly avows this doctrine.[1] Dorner more than inclines to it; though, as a thorough Hegelian, he might have been expected to maintain the primacy of Thought unflinchingly. Dr. Harris, of America, makes a sort of compromise between the two positions, by finding at the back of all phenomena "Thought which Wills." It is not a very great step from that conception to the conception of *Will which originates Thought;* which is precisely the position of Martensen and Delitzsch, and which seems also to be the Biblical doctrine which explains thought as originating with God and not God as originating from Thought. (*Vide* the scriptural idea of the Logos which was in the beginning with God.)

Methods of Psychological Research.

§ 6. The question whether feeling, thought, or will is the most fundamental and original in the soul, like every other question in Psychology, cannot be thoroughly investigated until we have decided what is the right method of psychological investigation. Two methods are open, the Subjective and the Objective; and each has been, and is, used exclusively by rival schools.

The Subjective method, or Introspection, called by Locke Reflection, consists in the turning round of mind upon itself, or the interrogation of self-consciousness. It is the old and favourite method of Metaphysicians; and as such, is unsparingly reviled and ridiculed by the newer school of Positivists. Their objections to it have a certain plausibility, and mark out real dangers and defects of the method, viz.: (1) All subjective investigation is necessarily isolated and individual; and from it no one can arrive at any certain

[1] [Martensen's *Christian Ethics*, p. 76. (T. & T. Clark, 1873.)]

truth in regard to any soul but his own. (2) Even for one's own soul the results of introspection are untrustworthy; for mental states are always changing. We can never fix any fact of consciousness: it vanishes at the very moment of detection; we can only remember it as something past, and our remembrance is liable to mistake from all manner of accidental causes. Moreover, introspection is apt to transform the objects which it seeks to observe;[1] for, as before remarked, an emotion always tends to disappear whenever thought is actively exercised.

However, to both these objections of the Positivist, there is this fair answer, that exactly the same difficulties attach to all the supposed results of positive science. For every such science rests, in the last resort, upon merely subjective phenomena of consciousness which are purely individual and quite open to delusion. I have no guarantee, except my own subjective conviction, that anything exists except my own mind. And if the Positivist is content to build all his science upon that frail foundation, he cannot consistently rail at the Metaphysician for resting his Psychology upon the same ground. The Positivist verifies his physical creed by the consenting testimony of a great many separate men, whose *senses* have borne the same witness. The Metaphysician appeals for his psychological facts to the like consenting witness of a great many *souls*, to whom introspection has yielded a common testimony of self-consciousness.

(3) There is, however, a third and more serious objection to the Subjective method in psychology, viz. that some of the deepest questions of this science concern the genesis and origin of facts of consciousness; and introspection can never solve these, because only the formed and developed soul can observe and interrogate itself. Hence what seem to us original and ultimate facts of consciousness may be artificial products of associated or blended elements, the blending of which was the first condition of our ability to perceive them: *e.g.* the very notion of self or Personality, as was noticed

[1] *E.g.* as when we try to analyse the phenomena of love or anger.

before; the instinct of Duty;[1] or any so-called Intuition, *i.e.* immediate knowledge, or direct perception of what is out of self. The justice of this objection will suggest that the Introspective method should not be used alone, but in combination with the other, or Objective method; which need not be its rival, though it is so represented by all Positivists.

§ 7. The Objective method has two main lines. The first is through Biology, and consists in the comparative study of mind as one of the phenomena of life; a comparative study which is analogous to, though higher than, the study of life in a plant, a cell, an organ, an animal, etc. This is the favourite, and the exclusive method of Materialists like Maudsley, Bain, and the German disciples of Darwin (Carl Vogt, Moleschott, Büchner, etc.), who will admit no other source of knowledge about the soul except the observation of its organ, the body, especially in the minute explanation of the nerves and brain. To them Psychology is only one department of Physiology; and they set a high value upon the results which are to be gained from the comparative study of mind in little children and animals, and even in plants; for they always speak of mind as existing, at least in its rudiments, in all living organisms, even the lowest. The extravagance and repulsiveness of their language on this matter, and the immoral and irreligious tendency of the doctrine (which tendency they scarcely seek to disguise) must not prevent us from discerning a certain truth and value in Biological method of inquiry. It is of high utility, when joined to the Introspective method; and it is one great merit of the newest school of English Psychologists (represented by Sully and James Ward), that they employ this double method, checking their conclusions in each line by the facts which the other line discloses.

The second line of the Objective method lies in the region of Sociology, or social science; *i.e.* the study, not of individual

[1] [For the Author's views on this subject (the development of the instinct of Duty from composite elements), see below, Chap. II. § 24.]

animals, children, or men, but of many of these in society, influenced and modified by companionship, education, heredity, and so forth. This method has been pursued by a great modern authority in philosophy—Herbert Spencer. It was also the method of G. H. Lewes, who combined it with the Biological line. It is often called the Anthropological method, and is certainly a true and useful means of acquiring psychological knowledge. But if it is followed alone it will be quite as misleading as any other exclusive method.

§ 8. The true principle is to start with the Subjective facts supplied by one's own self-consciousness; but to regard all these facts as open to correction and explanation from all well ascertained results of observation, alike of the lower creation of other individual men in all stages of development, and of humanity as a whole. But, on the other hand, all such alleged results of observation outside of self must be scientifically verified—not simply assumed or imagined. This principle will not only allow, but will require self-consciousness to have the last word in all matters which fall within its province; *e.g.* whether any act or resolve is really voluntary and self-determined, *i.e.* originated by our own Ego, as one out of two or more things which it was equally in our power to do.

Modern materialistic philosophers require us to look upon such supposed activity of free will as impossible, and impugn the veracity of self-consciousness because it so strenuously contradicts their axiom of Determinism. But if self-consciousness is not worthy to be believed when it testifies that either of two resolves is equally open to us to choose, and that we choose one rather than the other freely (*i.e.* unconstrained by any power outside ourselves), it is not to be listened to in any of its testimonies, *e.g.* in that testimony which lies at the root of all positive science, as to the real existency of a Not-self.

§ 9. A still more important matter in which the Subjective method alone must be followed, concerns the very singular phenomenon of a Double self-consciousness, which reveals

itself to every adult mind clearly, and which begins to reveal itself so early in life that very few children can fix the time when they first distinguished between their two Egos. These two "selfs" seem quite naturally to accept the names of a higher, better, or true self, and a lower, worse, or usurping self. This phenomenon deserves the closest possible study, for it probably contains the clue to all the deepest problems of Psychology, especially those by which the science of mind is allied to the practical matters of Ethics and Religion. We cannot, of course, prove that the phenomenon is peculiar to mankind, and that it does not reveal itself to any brute; but we have a strong prepossession that it is so; and men have always been inclined to find the chief distinction between themselves and brutes in this very thing. When Professor Ferrier denies that brutes have self-consciousness, he really means that they have not this Double self-consciousness, this ability to pass mental and moral judgments upon their own states of soul, and to distinguish between two Egos that use precisely the same forms of consciousness and activity, but which belong to different spheres of life, one manifestly superior to the other.

The phenomenon itself may be, and is, very differently explained.[1] Plato and Aristotle believed that two distinct souls really dwell together within a man. Some Christian thinkers hold that the higher self reveals the separate existence of a spirit which is distinct from soul. Hegelians, who in this matter follow the Stoics, hold that the phenomenon results from the opposition within our imperfectly developed souls of two principles—the universal, or Divine; and the particular, or Individual—which are always antagonistic in any finite or imperfect personality. Others again, with Kant, hold that our Higher self-consciousness belongs to a rational or moral nature, and our Lower self-consciousness to a merely animal nature; and that both these natures are combined in every man, though he may not be spiritual in the Christian sense of the word. This last-mentioned is probably the truest account of the matter. Herbert Spencer

[1] [See further, Chap. V. § 45.]

would explain the higher consciousness as being only an artificial and fictitious notion,[1] belonging not to a man, but to his ancestry and environment; and he calls it the empirical, tribal consciousness. Positivists and Materialists would in like manner explain away the mystery. But on such a point Self-consciousness must be allowed to speak for itself; and its testimony is, for most men, clear in affirming the existence of two distinct selves within each single soul.

§ 10. Christian ethics alone furnishes a satisfactory solution of this mystery, in its doctrine of the Fall, by which the original unity of man's soul, made in the image of God, was broken; so that the "likeness of Adam," in which all his descendants have since been born, becomes something different from, and inferior to, the "likeness of God" in Adam, wherein alone we find the ideal and perfect type of man. Ever since the Fall, men have lived in two spheres simultaneously, with the possibility of either sinking or rising so as to pass out of one into the other exclusively. And what we call our "better self"[2] is the ideal or perfect man which we ought to be, and which Christians certainly shall be at the end of their life of faith; whilst our "lower self" is the degraded ego that tends to the level of mere brutish consciousness, and that may sink permanently to that level if the life that is in Christ only be finally rejected.

The phenomenon of double consciousness is, no doubt, one that belongs to fallen and sinful intelligences only, and to those only during their state of probation and possible redemption. For when we are entirely redeemed, and body, soul, and spirit are all changed into the image of Christ, we shall no more know the strife between a higher and a lower self, but the lower self will have entered into unity with the Ideal Man. And, in like manner, the souls that are finally lost will have "died eternally," in the total destruction of that unity, and in the withdrawal of that Higher self-consciousness

[1] [See Spencer's *Psychology*, vol. ii. pp. 571–577. (2nd edition, 1870.)]

[2] [The Author was wont to quote Luke xv. 17 ("And when he came to himself," etc.) as an instance of the recognition in Scripture of this phenomenon of Double self-consciousness.]

which bore witness concerning it. Their future life will be in the spheres of animal and sensuous existence only; and it is quite possible that they will be no more conscious of God or of moral obligations, though they may retain all those mental capacities and faculties which (when separated from morality) constitute a nature that is called devilish.

This explanation of the mystery of Double self-consciousness, on the principles of Christian ethics, may be very profitably compared with the Hegelian explanation, which is the only one that approaches it in philosophic completeness and plausibility. The comparison will bring out very strikingly the cheerlessness and vagueness of the highest hopes of Pantheism, and the infinite grandeur and solemnity with which Christian Theism clothes the prospect of eternity, alike for weal and woe.

CHAPTER II.

SIMPLE "FORMS" OR "MODES" OF CONSCIOUSNESS.

§ 11. MOST books of Psychology direct attention first, and in considerable detail, to the threefold division of soul which Bain prefers to call its "functions," but which the older books described as—(1) Faculties of the Intellect, (2) Emotional capacities, (3) Active powers. The student is generally required to analyse and classify the phenomena of consciousness under those three main divisions. *E.g.* he is bidden to distinguish and to trace the relationships of such intellectual phenomena as Sensation, Perception, Imagination, Memory, etc. etc.; to describe and explain such feelings as Anger, Terror, Sympathy, Love, etc.; and to ponder the origin and action of Volitions, and the mysterious power of Choice.

§ 12. Modern text-books, faithful to the prevalent fashion of Biological investigation, precede and accompany these subjective inquiries by elaborate examination of our bodily sense organs and the changes in nerve and in brain, which somehow stand connected with the phenomena of Consciousness. A modern Psychologist is expected to be familiar with Anatomy and Physiology so far as the nervous system of men is concerned, and he is too often led to believe that when he has learned the co-ordinated laws of body and mind, he has done all that can be done in fathoming the secrets of the soul.

Whereas, in truth, he has not touched the real or pure science of Psychology, but has busied himself about its Mechanics.

Sense organs, nerve tissues, classified faculties, capacities, and powers are merely the outward and inward machinery of consciousness; the apparatus by which the soul of a man reveals itself. But we desire, if possible, to know the soul itself, and not simply how it works. We are impelled by an urgent and righteous necessity of our nature to ask certain questions which modern Positivism forbids us ever to broach, viz., What am I? Whence do I come? What ought I to be? Whither am I tending? Why am I self-conscious? For what end? and for what cause? Some of these questions belong to Ethics, others to Metaphysics, others to Theology; but all of them depend for their successful investigation upon a previous clear conception of the purely psychological problem, What is the soul of man? We have already decided, on the authority of self-consciousness, that our soul manifests to us a real independent, self-moving unit, which we call the Ego, or our individual personality.[1] But, having fixed that starting-point, we can discern at least *four distinct lines of inquiry* in which we may pursue the mysterious subject.

Of these four, the favourite modern line, viz. that which concerns mere apparatus or machinery, is the least fruitful in itself. We can very well subordinate it to another of the four, viz. the simple forms or modes in which self-consciousness reveals itself subjectively. This is the first branch of detailed Psychological inquiry. The second concerns the Spheres, or graded realms of consciousness in which our soul can live, *i.e.* can exercise harmonious functional activity.[2] The third branch concerns the different Kinds of activity by which, within each and all of these spheres of life, self-consciousness can assert itself, under each and all of the modes or forms which we have distinguished and correlated in our first inquiry.[3]

---

[1] [See above, Chap. I. § 3.]
[2] [See below, Chap. III.]
[3] [See below, Chap. IV.]

§ 13. The simple Forms or modes in which self-consciousness reveals itself are three—the Ideal (or Thought), the Emotional, and the Practical.

I. In the first, or Ideal form, we are conscious of ourselves as thinking persons; we recognise something as not self; we distinguish differences and agreements in the phenomena both of self and not-self; and we combine these "perceptions," as they are called, in a complex and continued play of thought. This play of thought has certain well-marked features of its own which discriminate it from each of the other forms of self-consciousness.

§ 14. (1.) It is calm and, so to speak, cold. In mere thinking our personality is not moved, agitated, or excited in any way. Nay, the absence of agitation and excitement is indispensable for the highest and successful exercise of the ideal form.

(2.) Thought is under a certain necessity; *i.e.* although we need not think at all, unless we will to do so, yet when we do think, we must think under certain conditions and laws, the study of which gives rise to two sciences, Logic and Metaphysics. *E.g.* we can think only under the conditions of Time and Space, the laws of Contradiction, Excluded Middle, Association, etc.

(3.) The ideal mode is self-contained, *i.e.* it does not tend to produce any other and different mode of self-consciousness, nor does it provoke the soul to any excursion towards the realm of not-self. Our thinking self could always and for ever be satisfied with thinking alone, and easily loses itself in pure intellectual abstraction. This comparative simplicity and self-containedness of the ideal form entitles it to the first place in any analysis of the soul, though it is not first either in real importance or in order of temporal emergence. For the primacy in our soul belongs to Will, not to Thought, and self-consciousness is always waked up first by Feeling. But this last fact may be due to our present bodily condition, which makes us dependent upon the world without, and upon our senses for the first stimulation of the world within. In another state of being we may be very differently situated,

and Thought may take the lead of Feeling, not only in dignity, but also in time; *i.e.* we may perceive without the help or the stimulus of any previous sensation.

§ 15. The apparatus or machinery by which self-consciousness works in the Ideal form is twofold. One set is purely mental, and belongs to Thought alone. We call it by a collective name, the Intellect, and the old-fashioned Psychology discussed it under the heads of many separate "Faculties," such as Perception, Memory, Judgment, Abstraction, etc. New-fashioned Psychology reduces all the activities of Intellect to mere variations and combinations of three laws or principles: viz. Difference, Agreement, and Association.

The other set of apparatus is corporeal, and belongs in common to Thought and to Feeling. It is called Sensation, and has been most minutely examined and described by modern psychologists, who have immensely enlarged the old enumeration of five senses. *E.g.* they classify the sensations of organic life, such as heat, cold, hunger, sex, etc. etc.; and muscular sensations, such as cramp, fatigue, resistance, etc. It is the special set of five senses, however, which is chiefly important as machinery for awaking and sustaining Thought; the organic or systemic senses having more to do with the emotional form of consciousness. And amongst the five senses themselves, two are especially connected with the intellect, viz. touch and sight; and are often called the Objective or Intellectual senses, because they seem intended to give us objective knowledge, rather than subjective pleasure or pain. Two others, taste and smell, are chiefly emotional and subjective in their characteristics. The fifth sense, hearing, occupies a middle place between these two pairs, and is about equally divided between Thought and Feeling in its ministry and its effects.

§ 16. Psychologists have long been engaged in discussing the terms Sensation and Perception, and the relation between the two things which they denote. The Intuitionist's account of the matter is that Perception proper is the consciousness

through the senses of the qualities of an object known as different from self. Sensation proper is the consciousness of subjective affection of pleasure or pain which accompanies the act of knowledge. Perception is, therefore, the objective element in the complex state, the element which gives birth to knowledge; and Sensation is the subjective element, the element of feeling. There is a well-known law concerning these related phenomena, viz. that both of them are always present in every fact of consciousness, but always in an inverse ratio.

Psychologists of the school of Bain regard Perception as only a modification of Sensation, *i.e.* some affection of our body transformed by being localised, or projected outside of ourselves; and (according to these Psychologists) the great instrument by which this localisation and projection are accomplished is movement. The chance experience of some activity of our motor nerves is enough to turn a sensation into a perception; and in this way, Mill tells us, we get our only notion of space, which is purely empirical and borrowed from another empirical notion—time. The latest and mediating school of Psychology recognises a real distinction between Perception as a mental activity and Sensation as a corporeal affection; but it agrees in many points with the account which Phenomenalists give of the change of Sensation into Perception. Perception, when complete, is said to be the result of three processes—1st, Assimilation of many separate impressions; 2nd, Localisation of these impressions; 3rd, Intuition of things as real and as outside of oneself. According to this newer school, space and time may well be what Kant describes them to be, viz. necessary forms of thought.

§ 17. II. Feeling is not a good name for the second Simple form of consciousness; for it does not express either the whole or the chief part of its contents. The word Emotion does suggest the real fact; viz. that we are conscious of ourselves as subjectively "moved," excited, agitated. This movement or vibration of self-consciousness usually oscillates between two poles, which we call pleasure and pain.

Almost every different psychologist gives a different classification of the emotions. Some reduce them to a very

few primary instincts, pleasures, and pains: *e.g.* fear, self-conservation, desire to propagate the species. Others (and among them Dr. Bain) multiply the list inordinately. A favourite threefold classification is: 1st, The Individual or Personal emotions,—such as fear, hope, avarice, envy, anger, love of dominion, love of approbation, self-esteem; 2nd, Sympathetic emotions,—such as benevolence and pity; 3rd, Sentiments,—such as love of knowledge, wonder, curiosity. A very good fourfold division (Martensen's) is into: 1st, Appetites,—such as fleshly lust, covetousness, love of power, etc.; 2nd, Passions,—such as anger, fear, suspicion, malevolence; 3rd, Affections,—such as love, sympathy, pity, benevolence; 4th, Sentiments,—such as wonder, admiration, reverence, pride.

Very few of our emotions are wholly subjective, *i.e.* bounded by the circle of self: melancholy and self-complacency are among the few exceptions. Most of them involve a very clear consciousness of what is not self; and whenever this is the case, the Emotional form is not pure or single, but mixed more or less with the Ideal form. In other words, we rarely feel unless we also perceive. We think about something, and are moved or excited in exact proportion as we think.

§ 18. Yet we can always distinguish between our Thought and our Emotion; and the two Forms of Consciousness differ in every one of the three particulars which have been already noted in regard to the Ideal Form.[1]

For (1.) Emotion is never calm or cold; its very essence lies in the opposite of these qualities.

(2.) Whereas Thought is volitional at its beginning, but when once begun must proceed under absolute, necessary laws, Emotion shows the exact reverse of these conditions. Our Will has no control over the origin of emotions; we cannot help being moved; nor can we deny the reality of an emotion, as we can deny the reality of a notion or idea. Yet, when emotions *have arisen*, they come under the direct control of our Will for direction and modification. We

[1] [See above, § 14.]

are conscious that we can control, direct, and modify them *as we will*. They do not impose themselves necessarily upon us as a logical train of thought does; but we can even separate ourselves in Will from their continued activity, though we may remain conscious of their presence. We can repudiate and disown them, and so neutralise their influence upon our personality, though we cannot by any act of will destroy them. Or, on the other hand, if we please, we can intensify and perpetuate them, and make them the abiding springs of thought and action, bringing our Personality under the predominant rule of one or more of them, according as we choose to experiment with them.

This peculiarity of Emotion is of the utmost importance to the Moral Philosopher; and one of the most valuable results of Psychology to him, and to the moral educator and teacher, is the discovery of the real relations which subsist between Emotion, Thought, and Will. There are great secrets of self-control which every educator and teacher should expound, and which can neutralise those involuntary excitements of feeling to which any one may be exposed through heredity or environment.

(3.) Self-consciousness in the Emotional Form finds no satisfaction in the simple continuance of any appetite, passion, affection, or sentiment. Our thinking self can always be satisfied with thinking. It is not so with our Emotional self, which craves a restoration of its disturbed equilibrium that can be brought about only in one of two ways—(i.) By some reaction between self and not-self, as when Love seeks reciprocation from the beloved object, or as when an Appetite desires to be assuaged in its appropriate food from the outer world; or (ii.) by means of another mode of self-consciousness being awakened, *e.g.* by a new Thought or a fresh Practical Impulse. Hence, whilst pure Thought addresses no stimulus to our Will, and leaves our Personality in undisturbed repose, every emotion makes a direct appeal to our Will, and arouses our entire Personality to some co-ordinated action or reaction.

§ 19. The apparatus or machinery of Emotion is certainly twofold, like the apparatus of Thought. For we become con-

scious of all the higher affections and sentiments, and we express these to ourselves by a set of machinery which is purely Psychical, and which does not depend upon our nervous system. If we were without bodies, we are sure that we should still be able to love, pity, wonder, admire, etc. But we know very little of this inner mechanism of emotion; and all the tendency of modern science is to investigate only the corporeal machinery of Sensation, already referred to. Materialistic Psychologists do not scruple to refer every emotion, without exception, to a material origin in some state of our bodily organism. They have even laid profane hands on Love itself, which Bain boldly affirms to be merely a result of glandular excitement.

§ 20. The Ideal Form of Consciousness combines with the Emotional to form a very important branch of the soul's receptivity of impressions from the outer world, viz. all those impressions which we call beautiful. A special sense or faculty seems to be developed for the use of this compound form of consciousness—the Æsthetic sense or faculty, popularly known as Taste. The Beautiful is its peculiar object; beauty being something which appeals to our Ideal consciousness of the true, the fit, or the useful, and also to our Emotional consciousness of pleasure. The Sublime is only another phrase or mode of the beautiful, in which the emotional element is compounded with Fear, yet without becoming painful; and the Ludicrous is also generally classed with the beautiful and the sublime as a special object of our æsthetic sense. Sight and hearing are the chief corporeal apparatus by which this compound form of consciousness is exercised and subserved.

There is a large mass of literature concerning the Theory of the Beautiful; a question which has occupied philosophers from Socrates to Herbert Spencer. It is, however, only of late years that the term Æsthetic has been appropriated to this special branch of Psychological science. The ancient Greeks meant by æsthetic "anything which has to do with perception by the senses." Kant also keeps to this old nomenclature in his discussion of "Transcendental Æsthetic,"

i.e. of the *à priori* principles of all sensuous knowledge. Now, however, the term is almost invariably restricted to the Science of the Beautiful, and the Theory of what are called the Fine Arts; matters which pertain equally to the province of Thought and the province of Emotion.

§ 21. III. The third simple Form of Consciousness is the Practical or Volitional. In it we are conscious of ourselves as acting. We assert ourselves as the centre and the source of Free Power, which we really put forth: whether it be in resisting or accepting some impression of the world outside, or some emotion that has arisen within our own soul; or in originating some train of thought or action; or stopping or diverting the same.

Neither of the other two Forms of Consciousness can be exercised apart from such self-assertion; and this is why Personality is said to have its seat in the Will rather than in Thought or Emotion. The mere utterance of the word "I," implies that a Volitional Self-Consciousness has arisen; in other words, that Personality is now complete. Until this full development of Consciousness has taken place, Thought is a mere vague dream, and Emotion is an unrealised and unlocalised disturbance of something that is not recognised as a true Self. Therefore the centre of Personality is correctly traced to Will, which, by its conscious effort, causes the soul for the first time to say, "I think," "I feel."

§ 22. This consideration opens up a very interesting and very difficult field of inquiry, *i.e.* into the *sub-conscious or obscure phenomena of the soul;* a matter that has of late attracted considerable notice from Psychologists of the Sensational and Associational schools. But their conclusions, which tend to the ignoring of a true Will, and the explanation of everything by chance or fate, are not nearly so satisfactory as those arrived at three-quarters of a century ago (1811) by the French philosopher Maine de Biran, who traced the rise of Self-consciousness out of the chaos of confused impressions which seemed to make up the earliest period of human existence, so far as we can judge from observation of infants,

and from reflecting on our own mental history. We see in infants spontaneous movements, which, in all likelihood, the child does not recognise as its own, though they undoubtedly originate in that nervous machinery through which, in the full-grown man, Volition works. But sooner or later the infant becomes conscious of itself in the effort of its Will to overcome some resistance of its own body, which, though linked to the soul is not the soul, but a part of the Non-Ego, the external world. This is the emerging point of Personality, and a manifestation of all its three Forms. But it would be very wrong to say, with modern Sensationalists, that it is the occasion of a purely fictitious and artificial faculty which we call Will, but which is really nothing more than "an adhesive growth through which feeling can afterwards command movement" (Bain). On the contrary, the experience described is the clear revelation of a real Power and originating Cause, under which Feeling, more than any other Form of Consciousness, ranges itself as a servant under its natural lord.

This conscious effort of Will, by which the Ego is clearly distinguished from the Non-Ego, and the soul from its material dwelling-place and organ, the body, is well known to every one under the name of Attention. Attention is *the active self-direction of the mind* to any object, or the *focussing of consciousness* on some definite and restricted area. True Thought is impossible except as the result of such attention; and Emotion never rises into real consciousness apart from a voluntary recognition of it. Hence we are brought again to the conclusion that Will is the primary centre of the soul.

§ 23. We know nothing as to the purely psychical apparatus by which the Volitional Form of Consciousness makes itself manifest. Nor does Physiology give us any help in tracing the link which connects a Volition with that nervous system of machinery to which an anatomist gives the name Motor, and by which we give bodily expression to our thoughts, feelings, and resolves. But there are two great facts of which we are beyond all question conscious in regard to our Will, and

which are more important than any other to the Moral Philosopher: viz. our *consciousness of Freedom*, and our *consciousness of Duty*. These are the central phenomena of the third or Practical form of consciousness. Just now it must be sufficient to indicate in barest outline what they are.

(1.) We all mean by the first that we all have an invincible impression that we can "act" at any moment of time in any one of the five ways above enumerated, *i.e.* in resisting accepting, originating, or changing,[1] or refrain from such action *as we please;* and that no power outside our own personality controls us in this choice. Determinists, or Necessitarians, may argue us for a few moments out of this belief; but it comes back as soon as we escape from the limited region of pure logic to the full rounded circle of Psychical Consciousness. A whole cluster of undeniable facts of what we call our Moral Consciousness, gathers round this central conviction: viz. our sense of Responsibility for all our voluntary acts; Remorse concerning some of these acts; Self-approbation in regard to others; and an instinct of Self-judgment with regard to all. None of these would be at all reasonable, unless we had been free to act or refrain from acting.

§ 24. (2.) But along with this consciousness of Freedom from compulsion in our volitional acts, we are conscious of ourselves as "owing" respect, obedience, homage, to something that is not ourselves. We may be very vague, and more or less ignorant as to the actual object of this "Debt" or Duty, but we are sure that there is a creditor, personal or impersonal; and that, apart from our pleasure, and our idea of the useful and the fit, there is something that we "ought" to do; so that if we use our freedom to violate this obligation we do "Wrong," whereas if we fulfil the "duty" we do "Right."

These words, Duty, Obligation, Right, Wrong, belong peculiarly to the Science of Ethics, and cannot be appropriated by Logic, Æsthetic, or any physiological science. They describe notions incontestably distinct from any fact of

[1] [See above, § 21 (commencement).]

consciousness that pertains to either Thought or Feeling. It is not even enough to explain them as thoughts compounded with feelings; they stand apart in a province by themselves. These terms, moreover, find a place in every language, which shows that the simple fact behind them is not a dream of moralists, but the common experience of all human minds. All men in every age have acknowledged that they "owed" (ought) to will in accordance with something higher than the Ego.

We recognise in this deepest utterance of our practical Form of Consciousness, "I ought," the certain echo of another voice outside our consciousness, which says, "Thou shalt," *i.e.* "thou art under a debt"; a notion which is clearly distinguishable from "Thou must," *i.e.* "thou canst not help it." This voice, "Thou shalt," is what Emmanuel Kant means by the Categorical Imperative, *i.e.* the injunction to act in a certain way which comes to us absolutely without "if" or "but." It is the voice of moral authority, not of necessity; a command, and not a counsel of utility, or a dissuasive from pain. Kant has also made us familiar with another formula which combines in one expression the two central facts of our Volitional Consciousness — Freedom and Duty. It is his famous maxim, "Thou canst, for thou shouldest": *i.e.* I know that my consciousness of Free Will is no delusion; for I cannot mistake the reality of my moral obligation, which would be an absurdity if I were not free.

However, there can be no question that this primitive and original instinct of Duty, like every other instinct of our soul, is somewhat vague, and even blind at first. It gropes tentatively after its proper object, rather than fastens upon this at once and with unerring aim. A certain development and education are required before the Practical Form of Consciousness can assume that supremacy in the soul which belongs to it by common consent of all who have recognised in man a Conscience. For Conscience, or, as it has been variously called, "the Moral Sense" or "the Moral Faculty," is a remarkable development of the original consciousness of Duty into a highly complex combination of all three Forms of Consciousness. Thought and Emotion are, as it were, cast

into the mould, or written into the blank form of Duty, or built up round the central instinct of obligation; until each man has made for himself his co-ordinated system of what he *ought* to think, to feel, to do, and, above all—to be.

§ 25. This question concerning the nature and the genesis of Conscience is one of the most important and most keenly debated in Ethics. The solution of it which has just been hinted, has the singular advantage of holding fast by the firmest objective foundations of an Intuitional Morality; whilst at the same time it fully accounts for and explains the undeniable fact which forms the stronghold of Sensationalists and Evolutionists: viz. the widely varying diversity of Moral sentiments and judgments amongst men; so that there can scarcely be named any single act which one code of Morals pronounces wrong, but some other code might be cited which regards it as right.[1] This fact has always been the great difficulty of those who look upon conscience as a single original faculty or sentiment of the Soul. It is no difficulty to those who regard conscience as a compound Form of Consciousness, analogous to, though much more complex than, the so-called Æsthetic sense or faculty which has been already described.

Its basis is always the Volitional instinct "I ought"; but around and upon this all manner of materials from the Ideal and Emotional Forms of Consciousness can be gathered through habit, education, heredity, and environment; the natural result being that one man will be conscious of "Duties" the very opposite of those which his neighbour owns; yet each is equally loyal to the original instinct of Duty, which is neither a Thought nor an Emotion, but something distinct from and superior to both of these.

§ 26. A controversy has long raged, and still rages, as to the mutual relations of Desire, or Wish, and Will. Sensationalists and Associationalists deny that there is any specific difference between these two things. Will, in their creed, is

[1] See Locke's *Essay*, Book I. chap. iii. [especially §§ 10, 11].

simply the last, or strongest, or most persistent desire, or, as Hobbes puts it,[1] "the last appetite in deliberating." Accordingly, the third Form of Consciousness, as above described, is really resolved (in all these systems of Psychology) into a mere mode of the second, combined with the active machinery of our body. Bain describes Voluntary Power as "*a mere bundle of acquisitions*," by which he means artificial associations of pleasures that we have felt, ends that we discern and desire, and movements that we have learned by experience. Desire, which is thus conjoined with nervous movement, is called by the modern psychologists "Impulse," and in the very important school that has been developed from Schopenhauer's Pessimism, this phenomenon of Impulse is treated as the fundamental fact of mind.

All these psychologists tend to reduce the threefold division of mind into the older twofold division of the Greeks and Schoolmen. Their only disagreement is as to whether it is Feeling or Volition that shall be excluded from the scheme, for Desire or Impulse can be explained as either one or the other of these; and then all the phenomena of Emotion and of Will can be made to cluster around this common origin. But a simple appeal to Consciousness will generally be sufficient to convince most persons that Wish and Will are as different in kind as possible, and that, whilst Desire is distinctly an Emotion (sometimes of that low and simple kind which may be called an Appetite, sometimes of the higher and more complex kind that is termed an Affection), Volition is a something that sets itself apart from and above all Emotions; something authoritative, and not supplicatory; a controlling power naturally supreme in the soul, or, to use a quaint figurative expression of Hooker's, "Appetite is the Will's Solicitor, but Will is the Appetite's Controller."

§ 27. The discrimination of the third or Practical Form of Consciousness from the first or Ideal Form, *i.e.* of a Volition from a Thought, is just as clear and certain as the discrimination between Will and Desire. Will specially asserts itself

[1] [See Hobbes' *Leviathan* (Morley's Universal Library edition), p. 35.]

in choosing between two or more thoughts. It determines which shall be harboured and used as a motive or end of action, and which shall be excluded from consciousness, or, if it cannot be excluded, at least neutralised by other Thoughts, and by Emotions grounded upon these.

The marshalling of these competing Thoughts is called Deliberation, and this may be defined as "a Voluntary arrest of action, in order that certain Intellectual and Emotional processes may be completed as moral or rational grounds for the Volition which is to follow." Deliberation is a state of mind proper only to that kind of life which we shall have to consider presently under the name of Rational (in one or other of its two forms, *i.e.* the purely Rational and the Moral). And it bears decided witness to the real existence of a Personality in man, an Ego that is not the fictitious shadow and reflection of passing impressions and nervous states, but which rules, or ought to rule, over all the phenomena of Consciousness. For the end of Deliberation is always Choice, *i.e.* an act of Will in which the Ego asserts itself, and in which our consciousness of Freedom is more distinct and vivid than in any other mental state.

This word Choice is rather ambiguously used by different philosophers. Some, like Jonathan Edwards, completely identify Choice and Volition. Others, like Reid, regard Choice as a mere intellectual judgment. Locke defined Will as nothing but a power or ability to prefer or choose,[1] and this very limited and insufficient definition has been accepted by many modern Intuitionalists (*e.g.* Mansel).[2]

§ 28. Nothing can be more positive than the result of a close and keen analysis of Consciousness which compels us to discrimate Will from Thought on the one hand, and from Emotion on the other. But this separation between the three Forms of Consciousness must not be misinterpreted, as though we could ever be conscious of an act of pure Will in which

---

[1] [Cf. *Essay on the Human Understanding*, Book II. chap. xxi. §§ 5, 6, 15, 28.]

[2] [See Mansel's *Metaphysics*, p. 176. (Edinburgh, 1860.)]

no activity of Thought or Emotion were concerned. The soul is not made up of *three faculties*, as an old and crude Psychology used to suggest, but is a triune thing, of which Thinking, Feeling, and Willing are the distinguishable aspects and forms.[1]

As a matter of fact, our souls are rarely (if ever) active in any one of the three Forms alone. For even if we seem to be sunk in a reverie of pure Thought, in which no Feeling mingles, still our Will is not inactive; but our Consciousness of thought depends altogether upon our voluntary Attention to the Intellectual processes which are going on within us. And again, even if we seem to be sitting in a state of strong despair and anguish, in which Volition is altogether paralysed, and no object is recognised as presented to our Thought; still the consciousness of the Ego that it, and not the non-ego, is suffering this pain, is itself proof that Will is active, asserting itself as the subject of this strong Emotion. And unless the Emotion has reached a pitch in which consciousness is utterly benumbed, there must be some more or less intelligent recognition of the cause of all the pain; *i.e.* Thought cannot really be so inactive as it may seem at first to be. And lastly, no man is ever consciously active in a Volition, without being also conscious of an Emotion or of a Thought. His Will aims at something, and is under the stimulus of some Feeling.

Indeed, it is this universally recognised fact that has led so many psychologists to regard Will, not as a primary element in the Soul, but as something secondary and fictitious; a mere form or development of Desire; or an artificial product of Feeling, which some chance has associated with muscular movement. But the real truth is, that Will lies so deep in the very centre of our Personality, that it never reveals itself in Consciousness until the outer world provokes it, through the medium of one or other of its sister forms, Feeling and Thought. As "Unconscious Effort," our Will, very probably, exists in germ within us, even before the earliest possibilities of Thought or of Feeling have arisen for our Soul. But we

[1] It is as great a mystery as light in Nature, or the Trinity in Theology [*Remark of the Author when delivering the lecture.*]

never assert ourselves *consciously* until our new-born personality is complete in its three essential parts; and if Thought and Feeling were suddenly extinguished in our soul, Will would sink back into its original futile state of mere aimless striving, which other souls might perceive, but of which the Ego itself would be utterly unconscious.

This truth has very important practical bearings in Ethics and in Religion. For if we desire to educate our Will, or the Will of others, in the way of righteousness or holiness, we can do so only by observing psychological laws. We must approach the Will through the avenues of Feeling and Thought. We must bring about the appropriate state of mind in which the Will may find motives to the desired activity. Our own experience will give us abundant instruction in this matter. It may reveal exactly what kinds of thought tend to promote emotions that are both strong and right; and what kinds of Emotion put the strongest pressure upon Will. Our success in self-discipline, and in the training and salvation of our fellow-men, depends wholly upon our use of the means these put within our reach.

Yet in the practical application of this principle, we are constantly receiving evidence that Will is by no means the necessary slave of Motives. It can make and change the states of mind out of which action arises. It can, and often does, assert itself against the strongest force of unimpeachable Logic, and undeniable facts of pleasure and pain. Hence the Christian teacher and preacher is thankful to fall back upon his belief in a Divine Power that can get behind our Human Personality, and to which our regenerated consciousness ascribes all our willing and doing of God's good pleasure.

On the other hand, the same consciousness testifies that our willing and doing of what God disapproves, is the outcome of our own evil and perverted self-assertion. It was in no sense necessitated, except mediately, through steps for which we were responsible, and every one of which can, if we choose, be retraced. Consciousness agrees perfectly in this matter with Revelation, and the fact remains, however paradoxical it may appear to our reason. For, in truth, Logic, the tool of the Intellect, will never open this lock.

§ 29. Another point that needs insisting upon before we pass from considering the three simple Forms of Consciousness is, that no one of the three is at the beginning what it is destined to become by development through natural and educational influences. Hence arises the risk of mistake in judging of the ultimate facts of the soul from the phenomena of a full-grown man's consciousness. The expansion of an infant's soul is gradual alike in Thinking, Feeling, and Willing; and any one of the three forms may be developed at the cost and to the detriment of either or both of the other two.

Details and illustrations of this development need not be given here, because most text-books in Psychology devote superabundant space to them. We shall find it more useful to examine matters which are either ignored in modern English Psychology, or else treated from a miserably inadequate point of view, viz. the Spheres of Conscious Psychical life, and the Kinds of activity possible therein for each Form of Consciousness separately.

CHAPTER III.

SPHERES OF CONSCIOUS PSYCHICAL LIFE.

§ 30. In the phrase "Spheres of Conscious Psychical Life," the first term and the last (sphere life) are complementary and mutually explanatory. By Sphere is meant much the same that a modern scientist would call Environment, *i.e.* the surrounding medium or condition of things in which and by which life is carried on. But Sphere is much the preferable term, for the sake of its associations and its pictorial suggestiveness. The conception of a series of superimposed and concentric globes, *e.g.* a globe of earth surrounded, embraced, and penetrated by a globe of water, that again by a still larger globe of air, and that again by a globe of ether, will give real help to the understanding of the psychological phenomena which have now to be considered.

§ 31. The other term, "Life," is not so easily disposed of. It is, indeed, admitted by all that it applies only to organised bodies (*i.e.* bodies in which the parts are reciprocally related as ends and means); but beyond that point all definitions are either hazy or palpably insufficient. Modern Biologists, who contemplate Life chiefly from the outside, have defined it as "the adjustment of an organism to its environment," or as "the balance between reproduction and decay." An

organism is said to live when its constituent elements are continually shifting, circulating, vanishing, reappearing, and changing their place and form, yet so that the thing itself remains.

But a far better account of life is one that can be illustrated and verified from our own subjective experience. We have powers and organs that are capable of action, each one for a certain appropriate end, and the peculiar tasks or operations of which we call "Functions." The active exercise of any one of these functions is the life of the organ; and the combined and harmonious activity of them all constitutes our life as individual men. There may be an immense number of various combinations and harmonies of the several activities; in other words, the kinds and the degrees of life are very many; but the real idea of life is always the same when thus observed from within, viz. it is *Harmonious Functional Activity.*

§ 32. It is only natural that men should wish to know something more about the phenomenon of Life than is formulated in this definition. And their first question is generally one on which there has been long and eager controversy, viz. *Can life be referred to some other larger and more comprehensive principle; or is there a Vital principle which stands out distinct and separate from other well-known forces in the Universe?* The answers which have been given to this question can be tabulated as Theories of Life. There are seven of them, of which three are more or less materialistic, and the other four more or less consistent with Theism.

(1.) The first is the Mechanical Theory, which reduces all phenomena of life to mere cases and instances of the general laws of motion. Descartes, though a Theist, held this theory. Life, according to him, was only a special "Vortex," or whirling motion of matter. So Boerhaave (died 1738) explained human life as only a complicated case of Hydraulics. Haeckel, among modern Biologists, held such a mechanical Theory.

(2.) The Chemical Theory, which regards life as a system

of Chemical reaction. Sylvius (a Dutch physician, who died 1672) taught this doctrine, and many modern materialists would agree with him. Electricity is often named as the mysterious secret, alike of Chemical and Vital phenomena.

(3.) Organicism, or the theory of Irritation, is a great advance upon both of these, though it is too materialistic for a Christian philosopher. It is due to certain great Physiologists, viz. Haller (of Germany), Bichat and Majendie (Frenchmen); who all regarded Life as a special and peculiar force, pertaining to and inseparable from certain bodies or tissues, which are organised in a higher degree than is due to physical or chemical force. The forms and criteria of this new principle are—Contractility, Irritability, and Sensibility. Life, according to Bichat, consists in the reaction of such an organism against the forces of dead matter; or, to give another definition, it is "the sum of functions which resist death."

(4.) The fourth theory is called Vitalism by its adherents, who are mostly French Physiologists of the better sort.[1] They regard Life, not as the peculiar reaction of an organism against its environment, but as a special and superior force which itself presides over the making, conserving, and repairing of all organisms. They distinguish two such principles, viz. (1) Organic Vital Force, and (2) Animal Vital Force; the latter of which is the principle of Intellectual and Conscious life. From this double division of the principle, the theory is sometimes called Duo-dynamism. It has manifest affinities to Cudworth's idea of "Plastic Forces" (*i.e.* forces which mould and fashion dead matter into living forms), and also to the doctrine of what the mystics, Paracelsus and Van Helmont, called "Archaia," or "First principles." This theory is distinctly supernatural, and consistent with Theism.

(5.) A fifth theory is that of Aristotle and the Stoics,[2]

---

[1] Such as Barthez, Dumas, Fouquet, Lordat and Jouffrey, who are often called the Montpellier school.

[2] See above, Chap. I. [§ 2].

which was revived by Stahl (a German physician, who died 1734), who taught that Life is one sole force which presides alike over organic and intellectual phenomena. This theory is called Animism or Dynamism. It is congenial with modern Pantheism; since vital force, as thus explained, is one and the same thing with the Over soul, or Soul of the world, which is supposed by Pantheists to account for all functional activities and for all movement, conscious or unconscious, intellectual or material.[1]

(6.) A sixth theory is called by Morell (rather awkwardly) the theory of Evolution, by which, of course, he means something very different from the Evolution of Darwin and Herbert Spencer. The theory is founded upon a principle as old as Heraclitus, viz. that the Universe is not a fixed reality, but merely a relation, a perpetual Flux, a never-ceasing Becoming. Life, according to this theory, is the flow of phenomena created by the opposing forces of the Universe. Everything in the Universe is alive, in a higher or lower degree. Conscious life consists in the tension of the highest and most complex powers of nature. This, again, is a pantheistic theory.

(7.) Lastly, there is the Ideal or Theistic theory, of which the Italian Count Mamiani is the best modern exponent.[2] According to it, Life is the last and highest manifestation of the Divine Causality, the form which God's Thought and God's Will take in the organising of Individuals, with a view to their participation in the good. It begins in the lowest form of vegetation; it is perfected in the spiritual communion of finite man with God. This theory must commend itself to every Christian Psychologist, and has been more or less consciously adopted by most of them. It agrees with the clear affirmations of Scripture concerning God, Who is Himself the Living God, the only One Who has life in Himself; and concerning the work of the Son of God, first

---

[1] On the first five theories, see article by Saisset, *Revue des deux Mondes*, August 1862.

[2] See Ueberweg's *History of Philosophy*. [Morris' translation from 4th German edition, pp. 507, 508.]

in Creation and then in Redemption (cf. John i. 4, x. 10, v. 26).[1]

§ 33. Whichever of these theories may seem most reasonable, there is one broad distinction which is specially brought out by Vitalism, and which forces itself upon every observer, though he may not be prepared, like the school of Montpellier, to found his theory upon it. This is the distinction between Organic, or Vegetative Life, and Animal, or Sensitive Life. It is of fundamental importance in Physiology, and requires recognition and study by the Psychologist.

Examples of what is meant by organic or vegetative life, would be: the growth of any common plant, or the functional activity of our own heart or liver. Examples of animal or vegetative life would be: our own individual existence, or the phenomena of activity and sensation in a dog or bird, so far as we may judge these to resemble the like phenomena in our own case. By comparing these, we perceive that animal life has two features which are lacking in organic life, viz. Consciousness and Spontaneity. A plant cannot move of its own accord from its place, and it gives no sign of feeling. So far as we can discern, it does not recognise any world outside of itself. It lives within itself, and for itself; and all its functions are performed for the simple end of developing and maintaining its own organised fabric. Similarly, our heart, and the circulatory apparatus connected with it, lives a self-contained and independent life; and if it were cleverly detached from our body, and placed under suitable external conditions, we should see it working on like a hydraulic engine, but just as devoid of spontaneous motion from its place, or of consciousness, as a plant.

The human body is composed of a great number of organs like the Heart. It is as though a multitude of vegetative organisms, themselves more or less complex, had been brought together and put into mutual relations, the result of which is similar organism most complicated of all. We can think of

[1] [For the above classification of theories of life, cf. Fleming's *Vocabulary of Philosophy*, pp. 280–282 (3rd edition, 1876).]

the body apart from the phenomenon of consciousness, and can see how the functional activity of this complicated organism need never rise above the level of vegetative life. Paralysed idiots have been known who could not leave their beds, or turn in them, and who have not seemed to wish to do either, who have betrayed no symptoms of pleasure and pain; but who have gone on eating, digesting, respiring, secreting and excreting, exactly like plants, their sympathetic nervous system being uninjured. The ends of such a life appear to be two—nutrition and reproduction, which are sometimes stated as the functions of all life. But there is no reason whatever for supposing that either of these phenomena is indispensable in the highest forms of life.

Since Consciousness does not enter into the phenomena of organic and vegetative life, the Psychologist has nothing to do with these phenomena. Still they are useful to him, as suggesting explanations of very much that concerns the phenomena of Psychical life, which, so far as we know it, is built up on the results of Organic life, and uses those results as its instruments and media of activity. Vegetable and Animal Physiology are exceedingly useful to a Psychologist, but only from the accidental circumstance that we live just now under the conditions of fleshly organisation. A Christian believes that in the next world those conditions will be done away (1 Cor. xv. 50), therefore a Psychology that cannot rise above physical conceptions is worthless to him.

§ 34. He needs a doctrine of the soul which will apply, more or less, to the conditions of Spiritual and Heavenly existence, such as that of the angels, or of God Himself; for Scripture affirms that he is destined to share in these exalted forms of life (Luke xx. 36; 1 John iii. 2; Col. iii. 3, 4). This is one reason why the entire drift and tendency of modern English Psychology (or as it is often called, Mental Physiology) is wholly abhorrent to Christian men. Yet we are not indifferent to the instruction which is afforded by the researches of Physiologists into the lower Spheres of Life; and we fully recognise that the higher spheres are reached by created mortals in regular order, viz. from the Sensuous to the

Rational (both of which are natural), and from that to the Spiritual (1 Cor. xv. 46, 47).

Limiting ourselves then to those spheres of life concerning which our own Consciousness can give us evidence, we find that for the perfect man as we know him (*i.e.* an earthly being who is made in, and retains, the image of God), the spheres are three; which may be named the Animal, the Rational, and the Spiritual.[1] But only the regenerate can have experience of the last; and, owing to the sadly low level at which most Christians live, it often seems difficult to distinguish between a life that has become Spiritual and a life that is merely Rational. The distinction, however, between the other two spheres is so manifest, that in some form or other it has been a commonplace of every Psychology, ancient and modern. Plato makes it the very foundation of his speculation. To him the soul is an existence which can live in either or both of the two spheres—Sense and Reason.[2] It can be conscious of mere animal existence and nothing more; or it can abstract itself from the world of Sense and satisfy all its activities in the realm of Ideas; or it can combine both of these experiences, and use the phenomenal more or less as an embodiment of the intellectual.

Plato illustrates this by a comparison with the Greek myth concerning Glaucus,[3] the sea monster who is also a God. Every one of us can understand for himself what Plato means by this; and as Christians we ought to be able to understand equally well what Paul means when he professes to live a new life in the element or sphere of Faith in Christ; to be himself "in Christ," and through Christ to "live unto God" and "in Spirit" (cf. Gal. ii. 19, 20, v. 25; 2 Cor. v. 17). In our highest devotional moods we do realise something of this spiritual life, and feel that it alone deserves the name of living. We are also conscious how really it differs from the

[1] Maine de Biran names the three spheres: Sensitive; Voluntary; Religious, or Mystical.

[2] In other words, the Soul is the uniting term between the two factors: Phenomena (τὸ μὴ ὄν) and Intellect (νοῦς).

[3] See Plato's *Republic*, marginal p. 611, Jowett's translation (2nd edition, 5 vols. 1885), vol. iii. pp. 508, 509.

most harmonious activity of our unregenerate mind. Bubier's hymn, commencing, "I would commune with Thee, my God,"[1] expresses this Christian experience; and no one who has entered into his secret runs any risk of confounding the knowledge of God's Love, of which he speaks, with any—even the highest—exercise of our knowing, or our loving faculties, in the impersonal realm of thought, or in the realm of created companionship.

Plato has another famous myth,[2] in which he seems to have caught a glimpse of the three spheres which are provided for the life of the soul. His language is not consistent with that which he uses elsewhere; and, indeed, it is perfectly impossible to draw up a consistent scheme of Psychology from Plato's Dialogues. But in the myth of the charioteer and the horses, Reason, the driver, corresponds to what a Christian would call the Spirit of Christ in a man; whilst the two horses correspond with our Rational self and our Animal self; which are not two separate selves, but the one self which lives, now in the Rational and now in the Animal sphere, or partly in one and partly in the other at one and the same time.

Plato also recognises the possibility of a degradation and descent of the Soul from each higher sphere of life to the one next below it; and of its permanent condemnation to the lowest life of all as punishment for its sins upon earth.[3] This doctrine of the Greek philosopher is one of the most remark-

---

[1] The first two verses of Bubier's hymn are as follows:—

"I would commune with Thee, my God;
E'en to Thy seat I come;
I leave my joys, I leave my sins,
And seek in Thee my home.

"I stand upon the mount of God
With sunlight in my soul;
I hear the storms in vales beneath,
I hear the thunders roll."

(Copied from "Psalms and Hymns" Hymn-Book, No. 443.)

[2] See Plato, *Phædrus*, marginal pp. 246–248 (Jowett's translation, 5 vol. edition, vol. ii. pp. 123–125).

[3] See Plato's *Republic*, marginal p. 615.

able instances of his agreement alike with modern Psychology and with the clear teaching of Holy Scripture.[1]

§ 35. The sphere in which a soul lives has very much to do with the character and complexion of its life. Indeed, in one sense it may be said to determine these. A Spiritual man is one who lives habitually and by preference in the Spiritual Sphere; an Animal man is one who lives habitually and by preference in the Animal Sphere; and a Rational man, one who lives in the Rational Sphere. Both these last, it should be remembered, are included by Scripture in its description of the man who is "natural" (ψυχικὸς ἀνήρ). Of course, it would not be possible for the soul to live in any one of these, unless it were inwardly fitted to its surroundings; *i.e.* to be Spiritual a man needs to experience a certain change within himself, by which he becomes susceptible to the influences of the new element into which he is uplifted. But this inward preparation never reveals itself until the outward conditions are also changed; and therefore in Psychology we can describe each power and form of conscious life by its sphere; just as, in popular Natural History, we might roughly describe a bird as a creature which lives in the air, and a fish as a creature that lives in the water; though such descriptions would not be scientific, unless we added certain particulars as to the bodily structure and organs of those creatures respectively. But then, the bodily organisation is closely related to the element by which it is intended to be surrounded. One of the clearest scientific distinctions between a fish and a bird is found in the breathing apparatus with which each of these creatures is provided. A flying fish may seem to a careless observer to be in the air; but a single inspection of its breathing shows its true element to be, not air, but water. Such a fish does not enjoy its brief incursion into the air. We may fairly guess that it has no community of sensation with a bird, even when it seems to be flying.

Just so, a natural man knows nothing of real Spiritual life,

[1] Cf. Beck's *Biblical Psychology*, pp. 8, 9 (translation from 3rd German edition. Clark, 1879).

even when he is surrounded by the same spiritual influences of which the regenerate are delightfully conscious, and when he imitates them in their spiritual language of devotion and religious experience. The same words mean quite different things to him and to them. Not a higher degree of the same thing, but a really different thing is present to the consciousness of the Spiritual man as compared with the natural man. If this assertion seems strange, its meaning can be tested and illustrated by corresponding experiences in the Animal and Rational Spheres of life, which will be familiar to every one. The word "sweet" does not describe the same thing to a greedy schoolboy and to a passionate Platonic lover, each of whom receives half of the same dainty from the hands of the same person. The one is conscious of a merely sensuous pleasure, and nothing more. For the other, sensuous phenomena are swallowed up and forgotten in a purely emotional experience. The morsel is sweet, not to the nerves of taste, but to that immaterial part of his soul which in figurative language we call "the heart." And a cake of sawdust would be quite as "sweet" to him, under these conditions, as the sugared piece of confectionery. The schoolboy's entire self is poured out through the channels of Sense upon material objects; and he is utterly ignorant of joys that are Rational only with no admixture of the Sensuous. The Platonic lover's whole self is poured out through the channels of Soul, upon objects that are immaterial. It would seem to him an odious profanation of sacred things if any one were to suggest that his rapture is only a refined and exalted physical one; and does not differ in kind, but only in degree, from the schoolboy's consciousness of what is sweet to him.

In like manner, a merely Rational man, and a Spiritual man, may exercise their mental faculties upon the same book, the Bible; and may use the same language in describing its effect upon them. Each may say it elevates, quickens, purifies him; but the Spiritual man means something which the natural man cannot even guess; and has quite lost sight of the meaning which, until he became Spiritual, seemed to him ample and adequate. He is not conscious of logical, æsthetic, or moral aspects of the written Word of God (though

if his attention were recalled to these he would fully recognise them), but he has entered into something higher than all these, even those Spiritual realities which the book unveils; and he despairs of explaining his experience to any one who is not a partaker with him of this new life, which ranks as high above Rational life as that life ranks above animal existence.

§ 36. This doctrine often seems fanciful and strained even to those who, as Spiritual persons, might be expected to give hearty and immediate assent to it. The reason is that these persons have never analysed and discriminated the mixed phenomena of their Consciousness. Under our present conditions of training for our ultimate home, which is Heaven, we do not quit the animal sphere when we rise into the Rational, nor the Rational when we are uplifted into the Spiritual, but each higher form and power of Life is superadded to the lower. We not only continue to use the same language for analogous experiences, but we also continue to experience the old and lower forms of life contemporaneously with the higher. Thus we are liable to deceive ourselves, as well as others, in regard to the relative proportions of the various forms of life. We sometimes overrate, but far oftener underrate, the value of those inward facts which belong to the higher life, and for which we have only ambiguous terms.

The difficulty resembles that which we find in discriminating our mixed motives and confused ends in questions of morality. A man of tender conscience will often distress himself because he detects so much that is selfish, mercenary, and mean in the secret history of his actions, which other men have rightly recognised as noble and altogether moral. It often seems to him as though his reputation for virtue were false and undeserved. But the presence of the lower motives does not destroy the value of those which were higher, and it is these last which have determined the true character of the man's actions. The fact that the man is vexed and grieved to discover any admixture of selfishness in what he would like to feel was the pure expression of his allegiance to Duty alone, is a strong proof that he is living under the power and influence of Duty.

Exactly in the same way, real Spiritual life, in our present state, reveals itself in the discontent and self-upbraidings of regenerated men, who often doubt whether they are regenerate, because the evidences of Spirituality are so fitful and so defective within their souls. They have not yet grown old enough, or been lifted high enough, to enjoy that happy content which is the *ideal test* of a life that is perfectly adjusted to its sphere and fully developed in itself. Such an undeveloped state is necessarily full of anguish and suspicion, and this is the great burden of Paul's teaching from his own deep experience in Romans, chap. vii. But, though he was painfully conscious of that strife within himself which resulted from his living partly in the natural sphere and partly in the Spiritual, he most emphatically claimed the latter as the one to which his true life belonged, and he expected his fellow-Christians to bear him witness from their experience, that the realities of the Spiritual life were such as no natural man has ever known—either by sense or by the faculties of his soul (1 Cor. ii. 9, 10). However, before this matter can be fully explained, it is needful to investigate the third great branch of our subject, viz. the Kinds of Activity which are possible for each form of Consciousness in each sphere respectively. Then we can return to a more thorough examination of the difference; not only between the three forms of life, which are determined according to their spheres as Animal, Rational, or Spiritual; but also between aspects of the Rational life, which may be called the Intellectual and the Moral.

CHAPTER IV.

THE KINDS OF ACTIVITY POSSIBLE FOR EACH FORM OF CONSCIOUSNESS IN EACH SPHERE.

§ 37. PHYSIOLOGY has for a long time distinguished three kinds of activity in the behaviour of organised bodies, and has given to the resultant actions three names—Reflex, Instinctive, and Voluntary. All three can be recognised in the soul of man; but the first two may be studied better in the world outside of us, rather than in the smaller world within.

1. By *Reflex activity* is meant activity that results from a *direct stimulus* applied to an organism *from without.* Examples would be: the swelling of a seed which is steeped in water; the rush of sap to a branch that has been pruned; the movement of the lungs when a new-born child comes under the influence of a fresh atmospheric current. There are numerous instances of this kind of activity in our own body, viz. all those which belong to the Ganglionic or Sympathetic nervous system (*e.g.* swallowing, breathing, digestion, etc.). Also those the machinery of which is regulated from the spinal cord, and which are not necessarily under the control of the Will, although, in the actual circumstances of our life, they come to be so. But that there is no necessary connection, is proved by familiar experiments with decapitated and dead frogs, and with human corpses.

Similar experiments have even been performed upon a living man who was paralysed below the waist, and was not conscious of movement provoked in his legs by artificial stimulus.[1]

For Reflex action in Physiology has nothing originally to do with Consciousness. All that it requires is the organisation of soulless matter in a certain way. Its best examples are seen in plants and in the lowest forms of animals, as to which we are sure that Judgment will exercise no influence, while it is doubtful whether Sensation is present.[2] In the higher animals it continues to be manifest in its own proper nerve tracts, but it is put, to some degree, under the control of Will; and the *dignity* of an animal is generally to be measured by the exact degree in which this control of Will over Reflex action is extended. A bird or a beast that can, and does, hold its breath and simulate death, to escape an enemy, is clearly a nobler creature than one which cannot, or will not, resist the external stimulus which provokes it to breathe, to shrink, to quiver, or to scream. And, if we find in our souls (as we shall find) something analogous to this Reflex action of organised matter, we may be sure that our dignity as men will also be proportioned exactly as these activities are regulated by our Will, and made subservient to ends that are higher than are the external objects that may seem to have the power of provoking these activities in us.

A very large proportion of those bodily actions which we call "*habitual*," and practise without thought or intention, or even consciousness, is due to the gradual training of our soul and of its nervous machinery; so that, on certain stimuli being applied to that machinery from without, the corresponding activity follows, and continues just so long as the necessity of the case requires, or perhaps until our conscious attention is called to the fact. Examples would be: the daily constitutional of an absent-minded student; or the uninterrupted march of a soldier who has gone to sleep.[3]

There can be no question that similar "habits" can be

[1] See Carpenter's *Mental Physiology*, pp. 70–74 [5th edition, 1879].
[2] *Ibid.* pp. 53, 54, 57, 58.
[3] *Ibid.* pp. 74, 75, 83.

contracted by the soul, so as to dominate its activity quite apart from its possession of a bodily machinery. Certain trains of thought or feeling may come at once, and, as it were, mechanically, into play, by reason of some outward stimulus that has provoked the first of them, and then has been withdrawn; and our will may be too indolent or careless to take notice of what is going on. Thus our soul may come to have a bent and a bias to sin, which it will be most difficult for us to correct when we do discover it; which may even be incurable, and which is bound to cleave to us long after our material body has vanished, taking with it the sense of sight, or hearing, or touch, through which the evil habits of thought and feeling were first instigated.[1]

[§ 38.] 2. From Reflex activity of the Soul we ascend to activity that may be called *Instinctive, i.e.* an impulse which moves the soul *spontaneously from within* towards an end which is at first quite unknown, and which is recognised only through the satisfaction which accompanies its attainment. Instinctive activity differs from Reflex activity in that it requires no provocation from without. As the derivation suggests, it is a prick or stimulus from within (Latin, *instigo;* Greek, *στίζω*), and, as such, it is one of the greatest mysteries in the universe. Indeed, it may be recognised as the primary mystery of consciousness. This mystery may be seen in the activity of a plant in a dark cellar, which will stretch out its tendrils in the direction of the sunlight, which is not visible; or in the action of a root, which will break through a stone wall to reach water.

Volumes have been written to illustrate the only definition that can be given of instinct, viz. *an unknown Faculty or Force which urges the organism to do all that is necessary for its life.* Instinct is proverbially a "blind" activity; *i.e.* it does not preconceive its end. A soul that acts instinctively does not know beforehand what it is going to do; it is conscious only of the impulse—perhaps in the form of a craving and a restless uneasiness, which strikes out at random until it lights

[1] See Carpenter, pp. 25–28.

upon its predestined satisfaction. It is not always easy to distinguish such instinctive activity from reflex activity; for the object at which instinct aims is often present to the senses of a living creature; yet we cannot be sure that the inward impulse at all depends upon the outward object. It has indeed been contended that all instinct depends upon outward impressions, but that these last may be so subtle, refined, or distant, that they escape observation. Modern Evolutionists regard instinct as a compound or inherited reflex of influences that came upon the ancestors of living creatures.[1] Cuvier explained the instinct of animals by supposing they are haunted by a sort of dream, which comes to them from the outside universe. But if we may judge from the fact of our own consciousness, there is no need of either of these fanciful hypotheses. There is real spontaneity in many of our impulses. Our soul is moved to seek we know not *what*, we know not *how;* but by and by we discover what we have blindly groped for, nor can we doubt that it was the real end of our activity. To most minds this experience is one of the most convincing of all proofs that we are part of a wonderful system of prearranged harmony; creatures that are not complete in ourselves, but which have been framed to find correspondences and complements in the universe around.

[§ 39.] As instinct is distinguished from reflex activity by its spontaneity; so it is distinguished from the grade of activity which is next above it by its *blindness*, and its *lack of intelligent Intention.* No experience and no education are needed to direct instinct. A chick ready for hatching begins untaught to peck at its shell; and a new-born infant seeks the breast, and when it has found it, begins to suck as all infants have done before. Again, instinctive actions are performed by different individuals of the same species in the same manner, and present no variations or improvements in the means which are blindly employed to secure ends that have sometimes ceased to be appropriate; and yet the creature feels unable to

[1] See Herbert Spencer's *Psychology*, p. 439.

repress or to change its instinct, as in the well-known case of the beaver who built a dam in a perfectly dry parlour.[1]

It is just here that we often find a great difficulty in determining whether brutes have gained any footing in the Rational Sphere of life; for, as we shall see presently, mere animal life seems to be revealed chiefly, if not solely, through reflex and instinctive activities; and life becomes Rational when ends are recognised beforehand, and when they are sought by consciously adapted means. Hence, when we observe individual animals learning wisdom by experience, and acquiring the power of performing actions quite different from their natural instincts; we must either attribute to them a certain amount of rationality; or else we must reconsider and limit our ideas of what Rational life is, so as to exclude intelligent brutes from it. This always has been, and still is, one of the most delicate problems of Psychology; and the facts of brute intelligence are often so startling, that we are often tempted to doubt whether there is any clear dividing line between the soul of a man and the soul of a beast.[2] Yet, notwithstanding this imperceptible shading off of intellectual faculty and activity, we are inwardly sure that the Spheres of animal life and Rational life are distinct; and that the second is immeasurably raised above the first, though we cannot show where the boundaries of the two lie.[3] This may help a Christian man to hold firmly to the analogous distinction between the Rational and the Spiritual Spheres, notwithstanding his frequent difficulty in pointing out where the dividing line is to be drawn, in his own conscious experience of both.

The difficulty of distinguishing between instinct and intelligence in animals, is increased by the presence in them of a great number of phenomena that seem to betoken processes of Reason, whilst they are really due to an unintelligent *imitation*.

---

[1] See Carpenter, pp. 92, 93.

[2] Cf. Romanes' *Animal Intelligence*, pp. 10–17 [Kegan Paul, International Scientific Series]. [Romanes somewhat boldly remarks that Instinctive action—as distinct from Reflex action—involves mental activity, p. 11.] See also Carpenter, pp. 85–91.

[3] [See further, below, § 43.]

It is very probable that imitation is itself the result of a mere blind instinct; and, just as in beasts that imitative impulse may simulate reason, or even occasionally morality, so in rational men the same imitative impulse may bring about results which simulate Spirituality. This theory may explain many a case of apparent Conversion, whose unhappy issue has thrown doubt upon the doctrine of Regeneration.

[§ 40.] In Human Psychology the name Instinct is generally confined to activities that appear within the *Emotional* form of consciousness. But there is no reason why it should not also be extended to describe spontaneous activities within the *Ideal* form. Perhaps, however, Intuition is a better name for any Ideal activity that arises within us, we cannot tell whence. Intuition may take the form of a question, or of a judgment; but in either case its distinguishing mark is spontaneity. We can never explain or account for an intuition or an instinct; all we can say is, that we are somehow so constituted that our souls cannot help being active in such and such a way. Intellectual instincts or intuitions are included under the famous terms "Innate Ideas." Two such intuitions are of special importance in all questions that concern Morals or Theology, viz. Causality and Finality; in other words, the instincts which lead us to seek after *cause and end*, and to ask "How?" "whence?" and "why?" to find out the beginning and reason for everything, self-consciousness included; and to recognise the capacity of producing effects, and the adaptation or fitness of things to accomplish ends or designs.

Our *Emotional* instincts form a subject of study which is even of greater importance from a moral point of view. For Morality has essentially to do with character; and character is nothing more or less than those fixed impressions and tendencies of a soul which are traceable to Reflex and Instinctive activities which the Will has allowed to become habitual. Hence it becomes necessary to enumerate and to classify these activities; and, as Martineau has shown, only when this has been done, can we make a scale of comparative obligation

for virtue, and discuss intelligently the morality of any given action or state of action.

Martineau's classification of the primary and blind instincts of the soul is as good as any that can be named. It is as follows:[1]—

I. Propensions: viz. the two organic appetites of Food and Sex, and the animal propension to physical activity alternating with repose (in other words, that vivacious spontaneity of vital force acting through the muscles and nerves).

II. Passions: viz. some instinctive repulsion, which when it arises towards an object that is present to consciousness, is called Antipathy; if it acts in regard to the past, is called Anger; if in regard to the future, Fear.

III. Affections: which take the form of instinctive attraction. They are three in number: viz. the Parental instinct in regard to offspring; the Social instinct in regard to equals; the instinct of Compassion, or Sympathy, towards the suffering.

IV. Sentiments, also three in number: the primitive intellectual instinct of Wonder, out of which all philosophy springs; the æsthetic instinct of Admiration, directed towards all that is beautiful; and the almost moral instinct of Reverence, directed towards goodness.

In the *Practical* form of Consciousness, only one primary instinct is recognised, viz. the instinct of Duty, the spontaneous impulse to do what "we ought" to do; an instinct which forms the earliest element of Conscience, and which unmistakably claims precedence over every other motive power of the soul.

[§ 41.] 3. The third kind of activity of which the human soul is capable, is *Voluntary;* and this consists in the *selection and direction* of the reflex and instinctive activities. For, what we call our Will never originates anything,[2] but only presides over the complicated machinery of the soul, and determines the use to which that machinery shall be put, in

[1] Martineau's *Types of Ethical Theory*, vol. ii. pp. 120–155. (Clarendon Press, 1885.)

[2] See Carpenter, p. 25.

view of all those objects of consciousness which are presented from without, or which arise spontaneously from within. The Will can dispose only of that which has been put at its disposal. Any reflex or instinctive activity can become voluntary; and does so become, whenever we either adopt it as our own; or put in train some other activity which we know by experience will tend to produce it; or even when we refrain from putting into train the activities which we know will neutralise or check it. For an instinct or a reflex movement, which we allow to have free course, when we could—if we had chosen—have stopped it, becomes as truly voluntary as if we had given it the heartiest assent of will.

The instinct of Duty bears witness to this fact. For we are conscious again and again of circumstances in which we "ought" to resist emotions and ideas which present themselves within our souls; and if we are merely idle, and do nothing, and allow these guests to take up their abode with us, we are responsible for all the consequences of this permission. We have willed to do nothing, when we ought to have done something; and the activities which we allow are justly imputed to our Personality as its very own. Thus voluntary activity must be separated in thought from both the other kinds, reflex and instinctive. The dictum of modern materialistic philosophy must be strenuously denied; viz. that what we call Will is simply a transformation and a fixing of reflex and instinctive activities, for which we are not responsible. Indeed, upon the denial of this doctrine depends the entire possibility of what we call moral obligation. (See further, Carpenter's *Mental Physiology*, pp. 27, 28.)

CHAPTER V.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS RESPECTING THE WORKING OF EACH KIND OF ACTIVITY IN THE ANIMAL AND RATIONAL SPHERES.

[§ 42.] We are now in a position to examine into the working of these kinds of activity in each of the Spheres of conscious Psychical life; and in this way we shall reach clear conceptions and certain conclusions in those much discussed and, to us, all important matters—Morality and Religion.

1. In the sphere of Animal life, an almost unbounded scope seems to be provided for reflex and instinctive activities; whilst the Will exercises either no control at all, or control that is unconnected in any way with the notion of responsibility. For the instinct of Duty seems to be entirely absent from souls that move only in the animal sphere, and which may therefore be termed Animal souls, *e.g.* such souls as dwell in the bodies of ordinary beasts and birds. Among such irresponsible creatures two grades of animal life may fairly be recognised; though, of course, it will be remembered that no gulf separates them, but they shade insensibly into one another.

There is, first, a lower grade, in which there is reason to believe that self-consciousness is entirely absent. Activity is not voluntary, but is only an unintelligent response to outward impressions, and a blind forthputting of instinctive

energy; such as the life of a jelly fish, sea anemone, a newly-hatched chicken, or the freshly born young of any animal, including man.

Second, there is a higher grade, which shows activity that is unmistakably voluntary, and is often exceedingly intelligent in its pursuit of ends and in its adaptation of means; but to which we cannot attribute anything like our human consciousness of either Pure or Practical Reason,[1] or of anything that transcends the conditions of earthly and sensuous existence. This is the kind of life which we attribute to those nobler brutes of which we make companions in all that part of our life which is limited to sense impressions. Various names have been given to it: *e.g.* (i.) "Sensitive life," by the French school; (ii.) "Particular life," by the Hegelians; (iii.) "Earthly" life, by the New Testament (*e.g.* Phil. iii. 19). These different names point each to some useful character by which the higher animal life can be distinguished from that Rational life which is man's proper sphere.

(i.) It is, first, a life that is entirely dependent upon the bodily senses for its aliment. Its single recognised end is to experience pleasure and to avoid pain; and all its pleasure can be traced to some sensuous origin.

(ii.) Again, it is a life that centres in its own particular self. Its thought has never arisen to the conception of an Universal, either apart from itself or including itself.

(iii.) The emotions of such a life have never been stirred towards supersensuous objects, and they are directed towards earthly things. What is not material is unknown and undesired. Above all, no glimmer of the immaterial instinct of Duty has ever shed light upon the path in which other instincts drive such a life blindly. Such being the case, there is no reason why a life like this should continue when its bodily conditions cease. We can quite understand why an animal's soul may, and perhaps does, perish along with its material body. The consciousness of such a soul has sprung

[1] [For the sake of readers unacquainted with Kant's use of the terms Pure and Practical Reason, it may be explained that for "Pure Reason" may be substituted "Intellectual Intuitions," and for "Practical Reason," "Practical Instincts." (See above, § 40.)]

out of the dust, and it may very well return to the dust; or if it continues apart from the vanished organism, it must be in a very dull and deadened state, little differing from utter apathy; or perhaps in a state of pain, namely, that pain which always arises from instincts which lack their appropriate objects, and desires which have lost the necessary machinery for their expression and exercise.

[§ 43.] From these premises we can draw fair inferences with regard—(*a*) to the alleged immortality of brutes; (*b*) to the necessary annihilation of degraded men. But without pursuing that line of speculation any further, there can be no doubt that a mere animal, however much alive and healthy, and however imperfectly furnished with bodily organs and senses, is conscious only of activities which we should rightly trace to a reflex or instinctive origin; and most of these Instincts and Reflex activities belong to the Emotional Form of consciousness. *The mark of animal life is the predominance of emotional, and of reflex aud instinctive activity.* In the Ideal form of consciousness, only the lowest instinct, viz. curiosity, can be positively attributed to most animals. They often seem to be asking concerning strange objects, "What is this?" But it would be absurd to suppose that even the highest animals have ever asked, "Why is this?"—meaning, "what is its end," or "what force produced it"? And only a very few animals can be credited with the question, "How is this?"—meaning, what is the manner of its happening? In other words, the instincts of Causality and Finality are unknown to animals; and so is the instinct of Duty. Animals are non-moral: morality is a region of consciousness of which they have no suspicion or idea. Their earthliness, sensuality, and selfishness are altogether innocent and blameless.

It is an inkling of this fact that often leads wicked men, when under the sting of an awakened conscience and a clear discovery of the folly of their ways, to wish—as did Colonel Gardiner—that they were a horse or a dog. They do not wish to lose life altogether; but they would be well content to descend to the low grade of merely animal life, in which pleasure of the senses is unaccompanied by any sense of sin.

But it is doubtful if a man can ever sink in this way, without carrying with him some remembrance of his former state; and that remembrance will be sufficient to poison for him pleasure that is merely sensuous, and to prevent that pleasure from being innocent to him, as it is to a creature that never was conscious of anything higher than animal existence.

It has been observed already [1] that the borderland between mere animal life and Rational life is very obscure; and that these two spheres of consciousness shade off very gradually into each other; so that it is often hard to say concerning an animal, whether instinct or Reason is guiding it; and of a man, whether he is morally responsible for his acts or not. But if we disregard, as we may well do, this uncertain margin and fringe of observed phenomena, we can recognise very clear distinctions between animal and rational consciousness in regard to the three kinds of activity already spoken of. Of the three kinds, the Reflex and Instinctive (and these chiefly emotional activities) predominate in the animal sphere of life, whilst Voluntary activity is low, and the moral and higher intellectual instincts seem altogether absent.

[§ 44.] 2. In the Rational sphere of life, the elements of consciousness are mixed in quite different proportions, and with results which we cannot help regarding as superior.

(i.) First of all, Reflex and Instinctive activities, instead of being predominant, are put down into subordination to the will, which asserts its independence of mere sensation, and claims the right to select and determine which among competing springs of action shall prevail.

(ii.) Second, new instincts and new forms of reflex activity emerge into consciousness, and assert themselves as worthier in dignity than those older and grosser emotions of which the animal was conscious. The animal felt, and still feels, what Martineau calls the propensions; it craves, lusts, hates, fears, etc. It also had, and still has, an imperfect experience of the parental, social, and sympathetic affections. But in a creature that has become conscious of Rational life, these affections

[1] [See above, § 39, second paragraph.]

spring up vigorously and permanently, and assert their superiority over selfish propensions and passions; and a whole host of secondary transformations of these original instincts (such as love of fame, etc.) is also added to the enlarged contents of the soul. The Intellect is enlarged no less than is the Feeling; new instincts of Causality and Finality are added to the older instinct of curiosity; and these again are combined with emotional instincts to produce æsthetic sentiments. The instinct of Duty springs up within the sphere of the Will; and in its turn combines with ideal and emotional elements to form what we call a Conscience. And thus all the crude materials of Rational existence are gathered together.

(iii.) But this is not the end of the matter; for the third and most distinctive feature of rational consciousness is the Hierarchy, which reveals itself among these immensely increased contents of the Ideal, Emotional, and Practical forms. The soul declares itself to be an organised republic—nay, in one sense a monarchy. One spring of action asserts itself as worthier, or better, than another; and this simple self-assertion has all the validity of a proof. Two scales of worthiness, or goodness, frame themselves of their own accord. One scale belongs to the ideal side of consciousness—the scale of Prudence, on which the utility of acts is measured. The other scale is on the practical side, viz. the scale of Duty, on which the rightfulness or obligation of acts is measured. Nor can there be any doubt as to the relative superiority of these two notions, Utility and Right. Right stands first: Duty is always supreme in all that falls within its province. But subject to the behests of Duty, Utility claims to rule among the reflex and instinctive activities that compete and strive within the soul. A rational being does not act blindly, or because activity gives him pleasure—as does a brute; but he acts deliberately for ends that are useful and right; and only as he does so, can he vindicate his claim to possess that faculty of Reason which gives its name to his sphere of life.

[§ 45.] (iv.) We have not yet exhausted the analysis of rational life as distinguished from life that is merely animal. A Rational soul has become conscious of *enlarged environment*,

as well as of enlarged capacity and faculty. It recognises a supersensuous element, as interwoven with that around it which is sensible. It knows itself as something more than its earthly and material surroundings; and is conscious, more or less, of its relations to the Universal.

In other words, we are now confronted with that remarkable phenomenon of Double self-consciousness, noted at an early stage of our investigation into Psychology.[1] It is in this phenomenon that the superiority of man to brutes has been specially recognised, from the days of the ancient Greek philosophers down to Hegel and Herbert Spencer, though the explanation of it has been various. Xenophanes of Colophon, the founder of the Eleatic school, was the first to recognise this:[2] and his disciple Parmenides has fairly expounded it; showing that we have, on the one hand, an Universal or Rational consciousness, in which we lay hold upon that permanent unity of all existence which alone is real and true, and which Xenophanes called God; and, on the other hand, we have a particular or sensible consciousness, in which we apprehend the many changeable forms in which the One shapes itself—which forms possess only a relative and fictitious reality.

Heraclitus of Ephesus, who seems to have been a contemporary of Parmenides, and who in general taught very different doctrines from those of the Eleatic school, agreed with them in the all-important matter of this double self-consciousness in men; and he applied his principle to practical ethics, by teaching that we act and live rightly only in so far as we live and act in conformity with that "*Universal Reason*" (*κοινὸς λόγος*) in which we participate, but which does not properly belong to us. On the other hand, we live and act wrongly, just so far as we follow our own particular self which Heraclitus called the *ἴδια φρόνησις*, *i.e.* man's "own conceit," or man's "private mind."[3] This latter notion and phrase are strikingly parallel to St. Paul's thought in Rom. viii. 6, 7, where the Authorised Version translates *τὸ φρόνημα τῆς*

[1] [See above, §§ 9, 10.]

[2] See Ferrier's *History of Greek Philosophy*, p. 88 (new edition, Blackwood, 1881).

[3] [See Ferrier, pp. 137, 138.]

σαρκός by the phrase "*the carnal mind*," and the Revised Version translates "the mind of the flesh"; and in Rom. vii. 18, where he says he knows that good does not dwell in himself, that is, in his flesh; and again in ver. 14, where he distinguishes between the Divine Law, which is "spiritual," and himself, who is "carnal"; which last fact he further explains as the result of his being "sold under sin," so that it is not himself who speaks and acts, but sin which dwells in him—in other words, a will that has broken away from God.

[§ 46.] Plato's well-known theory of the threefold division or composition of man's soul[1] harmonises perfectly both with this phenomenon of double self-consciousness, and also with the scheme which we have thus far traced in the building up of conscious Psychical Life. For we have seen[2] that animal life is revealed in two grades, of which the higher grade is distinctly intelligent and voluntary; but nevertheless lacks certain features of supersensuous and universal perception, which lack marks it off as different from, and inferior to, Rational life; and, since in the economy of the Divine creation each successive power and form of life seems purposely to be built up upon that which lies below it, we can discover within ourselves capacity of living in every one of the three storeys of that edifice which has thus been reared for us. (1) A man can live as a creature of blind and aimless instincts, unconscious of anything higher and in no wise differing from a beast. (2) He can live as a creature that *chooses* sensuous, particular, and earthly ends; and pursues them intelligently and deliberately. (3) He can live as a creature that subordinates all its instincts and ends to Reason and Duty; or, in other words, that rises above the particular and sensuous to the universal and supersensuous.

Now Plato has actually used this figure of a three-storied building to illustrate his doctrine of the threefold composition of the soul.[3] But his idea is that there are three separate souls, each of which keeps to its own storey; while our idea is

[1] See *Republic*, Book IV. [marginal pp. 441–444] *Timæus*.

[2] [See above, § 42.]

[3] *Timæus*, marginal pp. 69–72, Jowett's translation, vol. iii. pp. 653–656.

that of a single soul which moves at will upwards or downwards among the three. Plato depicts the human body as a building, in the basement of which (the belly below the midriff) dwells desire or appetite (ἐπιθυμία); this idea corresponds with the lower animal life in our scheme. In the bosom dwells what Plato calls θύμος, a word which is variously rendered by his translators—courage, enthusiasm, energy, impulse, will, force of character; though none of these terms expresses to us what Plato meant. θύμος really corresponds with that particular, or selfish, will which marks out the higher grade of animal life. Finally, in the head Plato locates the Reason (νοῦς), or immortal and Divine part of the soul, which is the distinctive and exclusive mark of man; for brutes share with man the courageous nature, and plants share with him in appetite. Plato further observes that these three composite parts of the soul are differently mixed in different men and nations; and that the higher always carries with it and comprehends the lower; but the lower by no means includes the higher. This is sound doctrine, and is abundantly borne out by observation. Plato's concrete illustrations show his Greek prejudice and pride rather than his philosophic impartiality. For he cites Egyptians and Phœnicians among nations, and shopkeepers among men, as exemplifying the predominance of desire, the lowest part of the soul. The Scythians, Thracians, and northern barbarians exemplify the predominance of θύμος; whilst the Greek philosopher is the type of that noble and rational life in which νοῦς rules the whole man.

[§ 47.] Plato not only anticipated the best modern Psychology in this recognition of a three-storied consciousness in man, in which animal appetite lies at the bottom and Divine Reason dwells at the top, whilst a particular selfish will mediates between these two extremes; but he also drew a just and useful distinction between the two forms, or directions, in which rational human consciousness asserts itself as something superior to that predominantly emotional life which characterises the mere animal. These two superior forms are, of course, the ideal and intellectual on the one side, the practical or moral on the other. A Rational man may be

developed in one or other of these directions; *i.e.* he may cultivate thought, imagination, and knowledge in all its branches, and pay little or no attention to the *doing* of what he ought to do; or, again, he may be very conscientious in fulfilling what he recognises to be his duty, but at the same time may be limited in *intellect*, and inactive in thinking and inquiring about the causes, ends, and relations of things. Plato shows that the threefold composition of the soul reveals itself in each of these parallel sides of consciousness; or, as we should say, the one soul can bring something of the three spheres of life into its consciousness of each of these sides. For, according to Plato, on the Intellectual side the lowest activity of the soul is simple perception (*αἴσθησις*); the animal life, only, requires to be exercised for perceiving anything. Then comes *δόξα*, often translated "good sense," which consists in correct, but unreasoned impressions, impulsive intuitions, such as those with which we credit women. Last of all is logical knowledge, opinion which can give its reason (*ἐπίστημη*).

Similarly, on the Practical side of consciousness are: first, the lowest desires; then good habits, due to vigour of character, but not consciously moral; lastly, virtue or holiness, in which, as in knowledge, the Divine *νοῦς* makes itself felt, just as *θύμος* asserts itself in good sense and good habits, and just as mere appetite is active in simple sense-perception and simple emotional desire.

Plato's account of all these matters is perfectly reconcilable with our conclusions. All that is necessary for that reconciliation is to set aside his notion of three separate entities, three distinct souls, and to realise the case as that of one single soul, endowed with three, and indeed with more than three, possibilities of life; able to be active in three or more spheres, dwelling, as it were, in each of these successively or simultaneously; and ordering this composite life after a fixed pattern or rule, which it discerns by virtue of its character as rational, *i.e.* as being conscious of that Universal Law or Order which imposes upon it its duty, the highest and most august thing which is present to human consciousness within the limits of the Rational sphere of existence.

[§ 48.] Having reached this point, we can form a conception of the much-disputed notion *Morality*,—a conception which will have the merit of corresponding in one point or another with nearly all, if not with all, the ideas which have been thrown out by earnest thinkers, whose conduct has shown them to have been practically conversant with the thing itself; for it is only *moral men* who have any claim to be heard when a theory of morals is in question.

Morality, then, consists in the steady and deliberate subordination of everything in consciousness that is recognised as lower, to everything that is recognised as higher; and, in particular, in steady and deliberate subordination of the selfish animal life to Rational life in its noblest form as a life of persistent allegiance to Duty. There *is* a morality which may very well pass for such in the eyes of onlookers, who cannot read a man's own secrets of self-consciousness, and which consists in the subordination of mere animal life to Rational life on its more intellectual side, prudence, *i.e.* the perception of what in the long run will contribute to the pleasure or well-being of the individual. Or, again, animal life may be subordinated to Rational life on the æsthetic side; *i.e.* to the instinct which leads us to seek after a mode of life that is beautiful, seemly, and congruous with the speculative order. Either of these principles, Prudence or the Æsthetic Pseudo-Conscience, may rule a man's behaviour in such a way that he wins the character and estimation of a moral man among his fellows. And provided that he himself has never been conscious of any higher principle than prudence or theoretical beauty, he is moral; but it is not the truest and highest morality which he possesses.

Prudence has been aptly termed the "lower storey of virtue"; and there is no doubt that a man who governs his life according to its dictates does right up to a certain point; *i.e.* up to the point where regard to his own self-interest ought to be subordinated to some higher claim of Duty which he ought to feel. But prudence is only a refined selfishness at best; it has its root in the animal sphere quite as much as in the Rational; it is akin to the particular, not to the universal side of consciousness. Therefore a life that is merely

governed by prudence is only a lame approach to real morality. And under certain circumstances it may be a flagrant example of immorality; as when a trader who foresees impending bankruptcy, prudently makes provision for himself and family at the expense of his creditors and of the public generally. The more skilfully he does this, the more immoral his conduct is; yet from the view-point of prudence his conduct is praiseworthy, as our Lord fully recognised in the parable of the unjust steward (Luke xvi. 1–8).

[§ 49.] Again, a man may have an intense appreciation of beauty, harmony, congruity, alike in the world without and the soul within; a mixed form of consciousness which we have seen [1] to be compounded partly of intellectual and partly of emotional elements, and to be as variable in its shades and expressions as is the proportion in which these elements can be blended together. And under the influence of such æsthetic impulses a man may pursue after a great many ideals of conduct that seem "lovely" to himself and to multitudes besides. He may subordinate every lower thing in consciousness to this high thing; and the result may be such a life as that of the poet Goethe, which life Matthew Arnold seriously commends to us as a perfect model, and which would, indeed, be the natural outcome of his teachings, and of those of other so-called apostles of "Culture," or of "Sweetness and Light." But the very example so praised, the life of this great æsthetic king, Goethe, is alone sufficient to show how far above mere culture real morality is. Goethe was a colossal egotist. The development and perfecting of his own particular life was the supreme object of all that he did and willed. He had no compunction or remorse in treading down the lives of other men (and especially of women) if he could in that way add something to the completeness of his own. He lived undoubtedly in the Rational sphere; but he suppressed that aspect and element of Rationality, which, whenever it is recognised at all, is the highest and noblest, viz. the notion of Duty; what we ought to do and to be in deference to the universal

[1] See above, § 20.

law, as distinct from what is convenient, useful, or beautiful from our own particular point of view.

If all men lived as did Goethe, the æsthetic principle would very soon be found to contain within itself the cause of its own disastrous and humiliating defeat. The collision of many selfish wills, each bent upon its own absolute perfection of culture and development, would work ruin, disorder, and hideous deformity in the universe, instead of beautiful completeness and harmony, which was the avowed end of each life. Injustice and violence would become things of necessity; and the moral aspect of the universe would be as hideous as the æsthetic result. In truth, there is nothing in this theory of morality which is made equivalent to culture which we could not with perfect propriety connect in thought with that Prince of all darkness and immorality—Satan.

Milton's Satan only requires a very little remodelling in order to be a perfect reflection of the mind, heart, and will of that over-praised human being whose imagination has given us a companion picture of Mephistopheles. In a finite world, of which Milton's Satan was the absolute lord, there might well be faultless order, absolute congruity (from Satan's point of view), æsthetic development in every direction; in short, every kind of beauty except that which has no charm in the eyes of a man like Goethe—*moral* beauty, the loveliness of a system in which every thought and desire is subjected to the supreme rule of Duty; and the selfish particular will has accepted its rightful place, according to the appointment of Something that it owns as greater, nobler, and more original than itself—universal law. No life that centres in a *particular* purpose of æsthetic culture and development is a really moral life.

[§ 50.] Real morality begins, when in the field of self-consciousness some selfish and particular impulse comes into conflict with what is recognised as the utterance of a higher law of Duty; and when the Will, *i.e.* the man's own Personality, deliberately selects the higher and checks the lower, so that not inclination, but Duty, shall find expression in actual

determination, word, or deed. Any one can have experience of the psychical experiences just described, and can verify the description. We all know how this inward determination of Duty approves itself as superior to any and every other determination from which either the element of Duty has been consciously excluded, or in which Duty has been consciously sacrificed to what is inferior to itself. And when we do thus sacrifice Duty, our act invariably avenges itself in the peculiar phenomenon of consciousness which we call Remorse.

This phenomenon cannot possibly be explained (as many wish to explain it) as a mere delusion, or an artificial product of experience, based on such a prior foundation as regret for what is recognised as intellectual-error, mistaken judgment, or disregard of prudence. Remorse is an obstinate and irrefutable witness to the real distinction which subsists between conduct that is moral and conduct that tends to utility or to pleasure. It is no less convincing a witness to the legitimate superiority of Duty as a principle of action, over every other principle on which a system or science of ethics has ever been made to turn. (For a vindication of this doctrine concerning remorse, see Martineau's *Types of Ethical Theory*, vol. ii. pp. 388, 391.)

[§ 51.] But whilst all true moralists agree in affirming the essence of morality as consisting in the deliberate subordination of every lower element in consciousness to the supreme element of Duty; there is great diversity in their explanations of what this supreme element is in itself, and why it is and ought to be supreme. Reason, pleasure, and will have each been named as the real foundation and sanction of morality; and our psychological analysis will very greatly help us to harmonise all these different explanations, and to see the common truth which each really great ethical teacher has expressed from his own personal point of view.

We have seen, for instance, that Rational life asserts itself as superior to animal life, not only in its greater complexity and richness of factors (which is all that Herbert Spencer would recognise as conferring higher rank upon organised

existences),[1] but especially in that new consciousness of the universal and supersensuous to which the particular sensuous self must now give place, as worthier from every point of view than itself. This universal supersensuous Thing is not only outside consciousness, but also within it. The man has discovered himself to be double, and it gradually dawns upon him—

1st. That he has to choose which of the two selves shall rule each moment and phase of his practical existence.

2nd. That he can thus choose.

3rd. That each separate choice helps to build up or to take down what is called a *character* for him, *i.e.* a fixed stamp or mould of habitual thoughts, feelings, or involitions; which mould will be determined by the predominance given either to his sensuous particular self on the one hand, or to his supersensuous universal self on the other hand.

The description is only figurative; and, as Hegel says, the fact which it sets forth is specially terrible because of the mystery which it feebly explains. The combatants and the judge are locked in the same self-consciousness. "The ego is at once the Fighters, the Field, and the Prize of Battle."

[§ 52.] Now this discovery of self-consciousness can be looked at and explained from three different points of view, according as we are inclined by temperament to regard the Ideal, the Emotional, or the Practical form of consciousness as the earliest and the chiefest. If we regard *Thought* as the real centre and foundation of the soul, we shall identify Duty with the Pure Reason, and shall recognise in our higher and better self the voice of that Absolute and Universal Thought which has planned everything, ourselves included, and which, if we choose, we can call "God."

Many, however, like Spinoza, deem it preferable to leave the great idea in vague impersonality, and to regard the Universal Reason as an awful Thing, rather than a Divine person. Whichever view is taken, the system of morals that

[1] [See Spencer's *Data of Ethics*, chap. v.]

is founded upon the recognition of a sublime objective Universal, to which every particular self-consciousness owes obedience, is sure to be a noble and a helpful one. It will be *Intuitional Morality* of the kind termed by Martineau, "Dianoetic"; and its genealogy, as traced in the history of philosophy, is one of which any science might be proud. In each succeeding age its representatives have done as much, if not more, than any of their fellows (outside the circle of the Hebrew and Christian Church) to keep the world right and good. They included such as Xenophanes, Heraclitus, Socrates, Plato, and the Stoics; and Hegel has worked out the same system afresh from wider and profounder excursions into the realm of pure thought. (See the sketch of explanation of the rise of morality in man's soul, given in Caird's *Introduction to Philosophy of Religion*, chap. ix.) [New edition, Maclehose, Glasgow, 1889, pp. 257–260.]

The only defect in this Ideal type of intuitional morality is that it is too cold, too rarefied, too sublimated into distant mists of thought, and nothing but thought; and so the mass of men fail to care for it or to feel its power. It certainly lays hold upon the elect among thinkers, but it leaves the multitude unimpressed. Ordinary souls know little, and care less, about such grand abstractions as Universal Reason, Absolute Thought, the Divine Logos, the mighty All, in which Being and Not-being, the one and the many, are absorbed, expressed, and identified. Spinoza can perhaps be enthusiastic for morality that floats down from such intangible clouds; but ordinary creatures, of strong passions and keen sensations of the material world, see no reason why they should pay obedience to mere mental abstractions. Therefore, with the mass of mankind, the morality of the Stoics and of Hegel has been much more admired and wondered at, than it has been followed as the living law of conduct.

[§ 53.] But we can, if we please, regard *Emotion* or Feeling as the central and fundamental form of consciousness; and then we shall explain the inward strife in which morality

begins, as being a combat between the universal and the particular, with respect to pleasure and pain. Am I, the individual, to seek my own pleasure without regard to the pleasure of the Universe? Or, *vice versâ*, is my private pain to be avoided at any and every cost, although the effect may be simply to transfer it in enormously multiplied amount to others? Or is Universal well-being superior to my particular well-being? Shall I love myself, or shall I love the Universe?

The answer to this question which we instinctively feel to be noblest, identifies Duty with benevolence, with sympathy, or (as Jonathan Edwards phrased it) with "love of Universal being." Thus we get such a system of intuitional morals as used to be termed Sympathetic; a very beautiful and fascinating theory, and one that has ruled the lives of quite as many mortals as bow to the yoke of Reason. For benevolence, love, self-sacrifice for the good of others, is a real and mighty instinct within the human soul; and its practical influence has been proved by a long succession of admirable lives,—from Buddha, who was contemporary with Xenophanes, down to the Altruists of to-day. The three ethical systems of Adam Smith, Hutcheson, and not a few who are classed among Utilitarians, but whose emotional instincts are truer than their logic (*e.g.* Comte), exhibit Truth from this standpoint and side; and we cannot but admire them, even while we criticise their foundations as defective, insufficient, or, it may be, altogether false. We can at all events understand from our Psychology how such systems originated, and why they have been so powerful in their influence. (See, further, the description in Caird's *Philosophy of Religion*, pp. 260–263.)

But, again, such a system of morality cannot be trusted to rule by its emotional sanctions and nothing else, and to draw after it the whole of man as we know him, and as history reveals him to us. Pleasure and Pain are dangerous arbiters of ethical questions; because each seems so much larger in its present and selfish form than it seems when pictured as something future and Universal, in which we ourselves may have no conscious part. Even the noblest of men might be

easily conceived of as yielding in some moment of supreme temptation to the attraction of pleasure, or the pressure of pain, upon his particular self; and sacrificing, not himself to Universal being, but Universal being (so far as it depends on him) to self. We can understand only too well how plausible and powerful might be the sophistry which would persuade to such a selfish choice. And we know that, apart from the stronger sanctions of Religion, this Sentimental and Sympathetic morality has never been—and cannot be—sufficient for the mass of mankind. Where it has seemed to be sufficient, it will be found, on close examination, that another principle has really been the secret of that self-sacrifice which is rightly recognised as the test of virtue. Not pleasure (nor Love of Universal Being, nor Benevolence in any form) but Duty, or Religious enthusiasm, has constrained the man to do virtuous deeds. And if these concealed sources of moral heroism were dried up, the Hedonist principle would very quickly make shipwreck of the character or the society which was committed to its guidance.

[§ 54.] We have still to look at those systems of morality which have started from that point which regards the *Practical* form of consciousness as the centre and foundation of the soul. Duty is clearly distinguished in these systems from any and every utterance of the pure or speculative reason. It is not identified with the True, the Fit, the Beautiful, the Good, or anything but its own unique deliverance, "thou shalt,"—the "*Categorical Imperative*," as Kant, the greatest teacher of this school, phrased the well-known voice of universal law. In any moral system of this kind, the contrast between that universal and august thing outside, and the poor unworthy self within, needs no emphasising. And the reason why the second of these two should be subordinated to the first seems to need no explanation. It declares and enforces itself somehow, this mysterious instinct of Duty; and the complex of associated notions and ideas which gather little by little round that living centre, and which we call our Conscience, are found to underlie every system of ethics that

has really vindicated itself by its results on any large scale, and through any long period of time.

Plato's doctrine and that of the Stoics can be expounded in the light of Kant's *Critique of the Practical Reason;* and it is exceedingly probable that if Socrates had lived in the nineteenth century, he would have endorsed the distinction (which is so real) between the Pure and the Practical Reason, and so would have cleared his own philosophy of much that perplexes a modern student. And we have just seen that behind every sympathetic theory of morals there really stands some sanction of Right conduct higher than the simple liking of a man's heart, or the pleasurable indulgence of an instinct of Benevolence. This something can only be the august constraint of Duty, which not only says, "thou shalt"; but which can and does avenge every disobedience to its command by inward penalties and pains, which surpass the worst tortures that can be inflicted on the body, or which human ingenuity has ever been able to devise.

Now, any system of morals which proceeds from this Practical fact of Consciousness, this law of the Practical Reason,—whether in its first germ of an instinct of Duty, or its developed result in the Conscience of a well-trained man, —is found to be exceedingly powerful and wonderfully far-reaching; so that we can hardly refuse to recognise this third line of inquiry as the true path to follow, if a complete theory of Natural Ethics is to be constructed and verified. The highest form and degree of Rational life is Morality, *i.e.* activity of the entire man in persistent allegiance of Duty; or, as Kant would say, such activity as might be an example of law to the universe; each private individual's conduct reflecting perfectly, in its measure and quality, what the law of the universe is. There is no absolute necessity for a man to be a Theist in order to hold and to adorn such a doctrine of morals as this. Confucianism is organised morality of this kind; but Confucianism is essentially atheistic. The law of the universe may be regarded (with Matthew Arnold) as an altogether impersonal thing, a mere "stream of tendency," which is yet irresistible in its universal

sweep. But because it is felt to be duty, and not mere blind necessity, this sense of law may be trusted to compel obedience from every ordinarily constituted mind. It has a right to say "thou shalt"; a right so unimpeachable and so self-evident, that when it is translated into the form of human law, that law prevails; not, as short-sighted or cynical people think, by its sanctions of physical force (which nevertheless are very useful for the vicious minority that every society contains); but through what are felt to be *moral* sanctions, apart from which the gallows, prisons, bayonets, and all the array of judicial and military force must in the long run fail to compel the obedience of mankind.

No government has ever been stable, unless it has thus reposed, in the last resort, upon the common instinct of the governed, that they ought to obey their rulers. And if we examine thoroughly into the reasons why men submit to laws in one place and revolt against them in another place, why some monarchies and republics have endured long, and are likely to endure, while other monarchies and republics have perished amidst general execration; the explanation will always be found to be in the conformity or otherwise of these laws and constitutions to justice, *i.e.* to the great law which obliges every individual to render to every other individual his due; a notion that necessarily involves the supreme principle of Duty, distinct from utility and distinct from pleasure; a principle recognised neither by speculative reason nor by emotional sympathy, but which is recognised at once by the practical form of consciousness, which says, as soon as two or more alternative courses are present to it, "I ought to do this thing rather than another." The ruler who himself believes in this principle of Duty, and who frames his administration and laws upon it, can employ physical force to compel the submission of refractory individuals; and can feel assured that the great majority of his subjects will justify and sustain him in his act; even though no individual among them may gain anything, or find any personal gratification through the enforcement of the law. That enforcement may even cost both treasure and blood to the loyal

majority; and both of these will be freely put at the ruler's disposal, because his subjects, equally with himself, count law the highest of all things.

On the other hand, the tyrant who is conscious within himself of disobedience to laws of the universe which declare his Duty, lives in wretchedness, terror, and self-condemnation; though he has devised his own laws with the utmost ingenuity, so as to enlist the self-interest of his subjects, and their love of pleasure, on the side of their submission to himself. He may profess the ethical creed of Hobbes, but he is himself a living proof that truth lies with the ethical systems of Butler and Kant. This has even become a commonplace of both poets and philosophers.

For English students of this question no guide is better than the writer just named, Bishop Butler;[1] whose three *Sermons on Human Nature*, and *Dissertation on Virtue*, contain by anticipation the substance of that doctrine which is now identified with the name of Kant.

[§ 55.] To Kant there was nothing higher in human consciousness than the realisation of this universal law of conduct, as centring in, and as proceeding from, a Personal God. The perfect and complete man, according to him, was the man who acknowledges and discharges his duties towards the law of God; and these duties Kant has defined very precisely in one of his best known works, *Religion within the Limits of the Pure Reason*. Religion is to him nothing more than what other men would call morality, if only that morality draws its sanctions from God. This is also the doctrine of a large number of excellent men to-day, some claiming to be no more than Deists or Theists, others calling themselves Christians, and setting no little store by that name. But whatever such men may wish to be called, their true name, in respect to religion as well as in respect to philosophy, is Rationalists. For Reason, either in its Pure or Practical form, is to them the highest faculty and organ of the soul; there is nothing in the universe that rises above the concep-

[1] Cf. Butler's second Sermon.

tion of a perfectly good will, to which all other wills ought to conform themselves.

But this conception, though very noble, and altogether satisfying to the intellectual and moral elements in our self-consciousness, does not by any means satisfy our emotional instincts, nor does it meet our consciousness of Spiritual defect and need. The experience of all ages proves abundantly that the world-wide phenomena of Religious instincts and acts cannot be reduced within the limits either of the pure or practical reason. In other words, Religion is something essentially different from Morality. It cannot even be defined, with Matthew Arnold, as "morality touched with emotion." In fact, this familiar but mysterious phenomenon, the religious consciousness of man, has exercised the wits of the greatest masters of Psychological analysis; who have seen how closely entangled it is with feeling on the one hand, and with the moral consciousness on the other hand, but who have also seen what Matthew Arnold ignores, viz. that it transcends both these forms.

The true way out of this standing puzzle about Religion is to carry on a little further the inquiry already pursued into the spheres of conscious psychical life. We have verified the separate reality of two such spheres, notwithstanding the fact that they seem to melt insensibly into each other—viz. (1) That of Animal life, in which the environment is sensuous; the activity of the soul is through the medium of that material organism which we call our body; and the objects of consciousness are particular and individual things without, and a particular individual self within.

Then (2) we have verified the reality of the higher and wider sphere of Rational life, in which self-consciousness becomes double, embracing both the particular and the universal, and recognising the superiority of the latter to the former. In this sphere the soul is no longer satisfied with merely sensual and material responses to its instincts, and new instincts have revealed themselves, particularly in the ideal and practical forms of consciousness. Have we not, then, a fair warrant for listening to men who affirm that they have gone still further in the ascending scale of consciou[illegible]

life, and have verified the existence of a third sphere, which they call Spiritual, Mystical, or Religious; into which the Rational sphere melts insensibly, just as the animal sphere melts into the Rational; but which, in its full revelation, transcends the Rational, as distinctly and as gloriously as that transcends the Animal?

CHAPTER VI.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS RESPECTING THE SPIRITUAL SPHERE OF CONSCIOUS LIFE.

[§ 56.] THE typical example of this testimony to the existence of the Spiritual sphere occurs in 1 Cor. ii. 6–16. From this passage we gather the marks by which real Spiritual life can be distinguished from all that lies below it in the human consciousness. Spiritual life, which is the same thing with True Religion, consists, then, in conscious communion of the whole soul with God, Who is recognised as a Personal Being; Love being the bond which unites the finite human personality with its recognised Redeemer and Friend, Who is Divine: *i.e.* the *instinct after a personal God, communion with Him, love, conscious Redemption*,—these may be taken as four indispensable elements or factors in every life that deserves to be called Religious or Spiritual.

(1.) The notion of a *Personal God* is distinct from the notion of a universal Mind or Heart or Will, in which Pantheists of all ages have lost themselves. Any and all of these last conceptions are marks of the rational sphere; and though the character of spiritual is claimed by many a follower of Spinoza, Emerson, Hegel, etc., the claim cannot be conceded by one who has entered into Paul's experience in the passage above referred to. The spiritual man knows, loves, and obeys God as a Person; not as a vast impersonal

Totality of thought, feeling, and will, which could only be called "It" and not properly "Him." (The Confucian religion, so highly extolled of recent years, is a misnomer; it is no real religion at all.) And since the culminating revelation which God has made of Himself in Christ, it is no longer difficult for the spiritual man to give an intelligent account to himself and others of this wonderful idea of *Infinite Divine Personality.* He can point to Christ as one in whom dwelt "all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. ii. 9); who was for thirty years beheld and touched by men, as God tabernacling in flesh (John i. 14); and who is to a Christian believer, not a mere personage of past history (like Socrates or Cæsar), but a still near and living Personality, with whom, as we shall see presently, it is possible to hold true communion. This first test of life in the spiritual sphere is clearly implied in 1 Cor. ii. 8, 11, 16.

Schleiermacher's conception of Religion is open to serious objection here; for although he himself had an intense consciousness of Christ as the Personal centre of the religious sphere, yet his definition finds no room for that essential point. "The feeling of absolute dependence" may be altogether Pantheistic, as indeed it is in many who profess to have it nowadays. It may describe nothing more than a passive self-surrender of the finite to the impersonal Infinite, in which the finite desires to be absorbed. Such a frame of consciousness is not Spirituality but Buddhism; and the Pantheistic mystic is merely struggling towards the sphere of spiritual consciousness; he cannot yet be said to have fully entered into it, although he strongly feels its attraction; he has not yet emerged from the sphere that is rational.

[§ 57.] (2.) Then, next, the really Spiritual life consists in *communion* with this Personal God, who for Christians has graciously revealed Himself in Christ. And wherever there has been real Spiritual life in the world, Christ has been the medium of this feature in it. This communion does not mean unconscious absorption into a great "It." It is no trance or dream from which one awakes unable to give

account of any realised activity of thought or feeling or will; but it consists in conscious fellowship with One who sums up in Himself all that is worthy of thought, who responds with emotion to our emotion, just as Christ in the flesh responded to a disciple who sought His sympathy, pity, and encouragement, and whose will is in direct relation to the personal will of His human servant.

It is in this sense that the spiritual service which forms so large a part of religion is said by Paul to be "reasonable"; *i.e.* not blind, compelled, or reluctant; but intelligent, willing, and based upon obligation, in which the heart finds sweetest cause of delight. For this communion of the soul with God enlists all the forms of consciousness—all the faculties and capacities of the man. It does not deserve the name of Religion, unless it is thus complete and coextensive with the whole human consciousness. It is a mistake to regard it as the antithesis to theology; for it includes theology, and is imperfect and faulty without theology. Yet it is no apathetic thinking about God, no more than it is an unreasonable tumult of feeling towards God; nor is it even a blind submission beneath the overwhelming consciousness of God; but it is such a fellowship as can be described in the well-known words, "In Him we live and move and have our being," or "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me." And just as Schleiermacher's conception of religion proves defective when tried by the test of Personality in its Divine object, so Kant's conception of religion fails when tried by this test of communion between the human creature and the Divine Creator and Lawgiver; for Kant's God is not a Personality with whom men can hold conscious and happy fellowship. We can stand in awe of Him, reverence and obey Him; but it is impossible to love Him. (See Martensen's *Christian Ethics*, pp. 373-375.)

[§ 58.] (3.) The fullest and deepest realisation of this communion of a man with God is when "the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts" (Rom. v. 5); *i.e.* when a man is conscious of *reciprocal complacency and desire* between God and himself. The genitive in the sentence is purposely ambigu-

ous, and may be either subjective or objective. Paul probably meant both: *i.e.* (*a*) love is a third distinguishing characteristic of Spiritual life; and (*b*) it is only the spiritual consciousness that can give us a true conception of what this much-abused word Love really means.

Misapprehension on this point is provokingly widespread, and is all the more difficult to deal with, because Love is a word which every one supposes that he perfectly understands. He also expects that every one else understands it just as he himself does. Yet so soon as we begin to talk about Love, we find it necessary to define our meaning by all manner of qualifying terms, many of which are mutually contradictory; so that it is plain that natural intuition cannot be trusted to reveal to every one at once, and truthfully, what the thing is to which this magical name belongs. Specimens of the bewildering qualifications which we are thus obliged to append to the vague indefinite notion, which alone is shadowed forth by the word Love, are as follows:—Sacred love, profane love, sensual love, Platonic love, parental love, conjugal love, filial love, maternal love, brotherly love, particular love, universal love, selfish love, disinterested love, philosophic love, etc.

The true conception of Love may be reached by a process of abstraction, or comparison of the features which characterise these and all other supposed examples of the thing (though many do not deserve the name of love at all); but it is better deduced from what God has been pleased to reveal concerning its manifestation within Himself. For God is love; and even if there were no universe, and nothing in existence beyond the Godhead, love would still subsist in absolute supreme perfection. Nothing, therefore, can be of the essence of love that does not find its pattern in the Divine Consciousness, apart from anything creaturely and finite. Long before there was a world for God to love, it was true that "the Father loveth the Son"; and it is from such a pregnant sentence as this last that we should endeavour to frame our idea of what Real, Eternal, Living Love is; rather than from any other sentence, even in Scripture, which deals with finite and created relations that

have not been, as the Godhead is, from everlasting, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.

Spiritual men are privileged to have some ravishing and ineffable experiences of this supreme love which is within the Godhead. For they are joined mystically to the Son of God, and therefore share, so far as their imperfect sanctification permits, in Christ's consciousness of this Divine Glory (John xvii. 20, 26). It is from that experience that we ought to start in any attempt that we make to explain and to analyse the mystery of Love; and all our fancied conclusions should be tested by that ideal love which is possible within the Godhead alone.

[§ 59.] (i.) The first of such conclusions will certainly be, that love cannot be a mere emotion or affection of the heart, or even of the mind; as in most dictionaries it is defined. *It is a movement, or determination, of the whole personality,* and not of that single third part or form of consciousness which we have called the Emotional. Love is not a feeling, but a forthputting of self-consciousness in all its forms—thinking, feeling, and willing being all inextricably blended in its every manifestation. This conclusion may be tested: first, by our own too brief and rare experiences of love to God through Christ; and secondly, by our conception of the Divine Being; for it is not said that God *has* love for one of His attributes; but that God *is* love, *i.e.* the totality of the Godhead is manifested in love.

(ii.) Our next conclusion is that love is *something reciprocal.* An isolated being cannot love at all; neither is the outflowing and forthputting of one personality towards another sufficient to constitute true love; but a reaction is required from that other personality, so that for all that is given in consciousness an equivalent is consciously received. This reciprocity is of the very essence of love; and so soon as it fails, or is materially impaired, love begins to be transformed into something else, which may indeed be called by the old name, but which is really a modified and not an ideal love. Perfect supreme love is neither selfish nor disinterested, but is always mutual. This point is of critical importance in any discussion about love;

but it is certain to be vehemently challenged by many who meet with it for the first time. We can put it again to the double test: first, of any spiritual man's experience; and second, of the eternal love between the Divine Father and Son.

(iii.) But what is it that flows forth in the consciousness of a person who loves, and which also flows into the same from the reciprocally loving person? *Two factors or elements* can be specified in this reciprocal movement of consciousness; and only these two are essential to the idea of love within the Godhead, or between two created beings who are not partakers of the Divine image. But, as we shall see presently, a third element becomes an inseparable accident of all love that subsists between mixed or different natures; *e.g.* between God and a created being, or between beings that are in any way akin to God.

The two essential elements in all love everywhere—in God Himself and throughout the universe—are Complacency and Desire.

(*α*) By complacency is meant the going forth of consciousness towards another personality; first, in an emotion of pleasure or delight; second, in a judgment of approval or esteem; third, in a deliberate appropriation or choice. The person who loves another perfectly, makes that other his own, to cherish, admire, and rejoice in; and since love is not one-sided, but reciprocal, he is also conscious of that other person's complacency towards himself; he wills its continuance, approves it, and takes pleasure in it.

(*β*) But love is more than reciprocal complacency, it is also reciprocal desire. Each personality is conscious that it needs the other to complete the capacity of its own being. It moves towards the other, and wills that the other should move towards it; its rest and satisfaction would be disturbed if the desire were not reciprocated. Indeed, the continuance and the complacency of love depends upon the persistence of love's desire; and desire is in its turn nourished and perpetuated by complacency. The very words which have been employed in nearly all languages to express the notion of love, can be explained onomatopoetically[1] as describing

[1] *E.g.* אָהַב, *amo*, ἔρως, πόθος, *lufian*.

both these phenomena of consciousness, viz. desire and complacency.

[§ 60.] This statement as to the essentials of perfect and purely ideal love, can be tested by examples drawn from fields that are widely diverse and very comprehensive.

(*a*) First,—as within the Godhead. It can hardly be doubted that nothing beyond the account just given is needed to set forth, so far as we can comprehend it, the glorious mystery of the Father's Love to the Son, and the Son's to the Father, and of both in reciprocation with the Holy Ghost.

(*b*) Again, a Christian's love to Christ has for its deepest substance just these elements—complacency and desire. Any other element of which we may be conscious can be referred to one of these two as its derivative, and tends to vanish away and be forgotten in proportion as these two are mightily realised; but neither of these two ever tends to be lost or forgotten in any other element, *e.g.* in gratitude or in awe.

(*c*) Once again,—in that great realm of the dumb creation where Lucretius found so many illustrations of the "*alma mater*" of love. It is legitimate to say of such creatures as doves and four-footed quadrupeds, that they "love" one another; and such a phrase becomes very appropriate, because we see them disconsolate when they are separate, but happy in their mutual contact and in the mingling of their innocent animal life. When we say that such creatures love, we evidently mean neither less nor more than that their individualities are merged in a reciprocal complacency and desire. With a certain reservation—to be accounted for directly—we could almost say the same of conjugal love in its perfection. Two pure souls that are joined in lawful married love are scarcely conscious of anything but immeasurable bliss that resolves itself, if analysed, into just these two factors, reciprocal complacency and desire; and that is why the conjugal relation has been the favourite emblem of the mystical or spiritual sphere of consciousness in every religious system from that of Moses to that of Swedenborg (cf. Eph. v. 22–32).

[§ 61.] Some one may ask here, in what way the unchaste love of harlotry fails to stand this test; whether in it also are not found the two essential elements of complacency and desire; and whether the account given of love is not reduced to an absurdity by the possibility of our saying concerning Paris and Helen, they dwelt in God, and God dwelt in them, because they dwelt in love?

The proposed instance need not alarm us. If Paris and Helen were mere animals, their so-called love would be both innocent and a true manifestation of the Divine Will within their proper sphere; just as is the beautiful picture which bird-love presents to every poet's eye. But since they are not mere animals, but rational creatures made in the image of God, and conscious of Duty; and since in true love the *whole* of self-consciousness goes forth in reciprocal complacency and desire, it is necessary that these two lovers should esteem each other *morally*, should recognise and delight in their mutual likeness to God, if their relation is to deserve the name of love. No one will delude himself with the supposition that fleshly lusts and illicit passion do involve any such action and reaction of the noblest part of human self-consciousness. On the contrary, there are always secrets of the soul which Paris or Helen dreads to exchange with the paramour,—and even to explore for himself or herself. It is a commonplace of tragic poetry and of everyday life, that such miscalled love stands hard by hate. What would be true love in an irrational bird or beast, is nothing better than lust in men and women, who are conscious of a higher sphere of life than that of sense and animal instinct, and emotion that is unrestrained by duty. Love always includes the entire sum of self-consciousness, so far as it can be reciprocated between the lovers. Hence passion that violates duty, and that profanes either the Divine image in man or the ideal of universal humanity, is not rightly called love. God does not own it as anything akin to His love. He abhors and condemns it all the more because it is so daring a caricature of the holy bond in which His own Triune Personality subsists.

There is another reason why we cannot admit the Scripture testimony above cited from 1 John iv. 7, 16 as having a

fair application to the case supposed, viz. that of unchaste and illicit love. The apostle is there speaking of, and to, spiritual men, and has no thought of any sphere of life except spiritual. It is a perversion of his intention to carry what he gives us as a test of regeneration into the world of ordinary earthly life. When John says, "Beloved, let us love one another," . . . "for every one that loveth is born of God," he has no thought of that outer circle which, as he presently tells us, lies wholly "in the evil one" (chap. v. 19). He is giving to professing Christians a short and decisive test by which to prove whether they have really passed into the new life of the Spirit. He declares that they have not done so, unless they love the brethren (chap. iii. 14). Love to God and to all God's children is the criterion of real Spiritual life. Clearly it is an abuse of terms to apply John's words about such spiritual matters to things of the natural life; even though there is a sense in which love can be really manifested in the natural sphere.

[§ 62.] The most serious and plausible objection that will probably be made against the account above given of love, will arise from the fact that no mention has been made of Benevolence; which is commonly supposed to be an essential element in love, even if it be not the very root out of which love springs. (*E.g.* Newman Smyth, in *Old Faiths in New Light*, pp. 123, 124, resolves love into the three elements of benevolence, sympathy, and self-respect.) The omission we have made has been intentional. Benevolence is itself an ambiguous word, and therefore dangerous to use in explanation of another, which is still more ambiguous. If by benevolence is meant goodwill, the disposition to do good, kindness, an impulse to promote the happiness of others, we have only to try to fit these notions to the supreme example of love within the Trinity, and we shall see at once how utterly inappropriate they are. They are equally inappropriate to the case of a Christian's love to God: "Our goodness extendeth not to Him." Probably also a truly loving married pair would feel astonished if they were told that their love had its root in the disposition of each to do good to the other.

Yet this conception of benevolence is commonly floating before the minds of most unreflecting persons who repeat the words, "God is love": they would interpret that word as meaning—God is benevolence; God cannot help seeking the welfare of other beings; the impulse to make His creatures happy must overrule every other of His attributes. Such an interpretation of love in the case of God is not admissible; and with it we set aside the whole body of reasoning which leads logically to Universalism, and which depends absolutely upon the granting of this false premise, viz. *that Divine love means Divine benevolence.*

But some persons are more cautious in their explanation of benevolence. It means, they say, a feeling of delight in the happiness of others; or, a desire that others may be as happy as one's self, and a willingness to diminish one's own happiness if another's can be increased thereby. If this is a true account, then benevolence is certainly part of the contents of that exchange of two or more selves in reciprocal complacency and desire into which love has already been analysed. It is not a third thing in addition to those two, but a compound, or a derivative of them both together; and in the case of the Godhead, or of regenerate persons in whom the love of God is shed abroad, benevolence, as thus explained, cannot be distinguished from complacency. Newman Smyth's definition of benevolence seems to be "the giving of self"; if so, then, again, this notion is perfectly included within the terms "Reciprocal complacency and desire." And any one by comparison can decide in a moment which of the two phrases is better suited to describe—the love which unites and pervades the Godhead; which subsists between God and His redeemed people; or even which makes two human hearts one, in marriage, in friendship, or even in the relation of parent and child.

[§ 63.] The truth is, that the analysis of love into the three alleged primary elements or colours of benevolence, sympathy, and self-respect, is plausible only when we are speaking of love which has already begun to decompose, and to change into something more complex but also less rich than is its ideal

perfection within the Godhead. The Triunity of reciprocal complacency and desire is no longer to be recognised, when self-assertion begins to balance benevolence (as in Newman Smyth's account of the matter), and when sympathy mediates between the two. Reciprocity has manifestly begun to fail; and on one side or the other, perhaps on both, complacency and desire have consciously diminished. In perfect love the self of each loving person is merged in a common and reciprocal consciousness; the ordinary opposition between one's own well-being, respect, rights, etc., and another's, is utterly forgotten and destroyed; no one of these notions can be imagined except as embracing the entire circle of loving personalities. So soon as the common consciousness begins to split up into divergent and contrasted elements, it is manifestly modified in its nature and in its absolute blessedness. It may still deserve to be called love; but it is love of a special kind, which must not be confounded with love that is supreme and ideally perfect.

Either of the two essential factors, complacency and desire, may be thus weakened and diminished in consciousness through the failure of reciprocity; and as each retires into abeyance or tends to vanish, it can be replaced by another element, viz. complacency by compassion, and desire by benevolence. Thus two distinct kinds of love arise, which no one can possibly confound, either with each other or with ideal love; and yet the same name, love, is popularly applied to them all, alike in their extremes and in every intermediate shade by which the love of compassion and the love of benevolence can approximate to their common original—the only perfect love of reciprocal complacency and desire.

An example of that modified love, in which complacency has been replaced by compassion, would be the outflowing of a good mother's soul towards a child who has brought upon himself the most terrible mental, moral, and physical degradation and injury, as the consequences of wickedness which that mother hates and loathes. She no longer takes pleasure in gazing upon and thinking about her son. She has lost touch with him, and is sadly conscious that there is no reciprocity of feeling, thought, and will between him and her.

She desires him as strongly as ever; but her desire is not for the boy as he is, but for the boy as he used to be, or as he ought to be; and all the delight and satisfaction of their old love is turned into pain and grief, such as our word compassion very fitly describes.

Of the same kind, but less marked in degree, is the modification of ideal love which is seen in the attitude of a mother towards a sick child or a baby. Newman Smyth seems to think that the truest idea of Divine love may be gained from contemplating the spectacle of a mother brooding over her sleeping infant. But this spectacle suggests only one limited form in which the Divine love manifests itself to us, and can be reproduced by us. We could scarcely conceive of such maternal love as abiding for ever, and for ever satisfying our own souls; still less as expressing and interpreting the nature and being of God from eternity and to eternity. It expresses only a passing phase of love; it implies the existence of an object which is not yet what we desire, and hope that it will be; and which does not, and cannot as yet, reciprocate the outgoings of our souls towards it. The perpetuation of such relations would inevitably give rise to pain, dissatisfaction, and disappointment; or else would sink the soul in a kind of stupor and lethargy, in which there was no pain, simply because there was no intelligence and no activity of will. Eternal love is certainly something very different from the eternal brooding of a mother over her irresponsive and unconscious babe.

An example of that other extreme modification of ideal Love—in which desire has been replaced by benevolence—is often seen in the modern helper of philanthropic and social movements, or of religious enterprises, in which the man himself has no personal sympathy, but which he recognises as emphatically beneficent in their tendencies. The Roman centurion, of whom the Jewish elders said that he loved their nation and had built them a synagogue, probably had no desire for the company of Jews; but he looked with complacency upon many of the realised results of their religion, and he wished them well; and he also wished well to others, whom he could reach through their means. In like manner,

thousands of generous givers to our modern societies and funds desire anything but close contact with the people whom they earnestly wish to benefit by their gifts; yet it would be wrong to say that they do not love those people because they simply wish them well, but do not wish to dwell with them, and to mingle consciousness with them. They do love; but theirs is the modified love of benevolence, not the ideal and perfect love of complacency and desire.

Between the two extreme examples which have thus been given, many intermediate shades or kinds of unreciprocated love might be exhibited, according as two or more of the four elements — complacency passing into compassion; desire retiring into mere benevolence—are blended and combined. Or if, instead of examining a perfect love that has become modified in one of these ways, we note the genesis and growth of love in a soul that never was conscious of it before, we may perceive how admiration or gratitude, equally with compassion, can furnish an element round which other germs of reciprocal love will gather and develop. But until there is reciprocal complacency and desire, between at least two souls, love cannot be spoken of as actual and complete; but, at best, only as inchoate, potential, or modified. Especially is it to be remembered that as referred to a single individual, the word love is more or less of a misnomer, and is sure to lead to confusion and misunderstanding.

[§ 64.] This point has evidently pressed hard upon Dr. Martineau;[1] for, in order to explain the conception "God is Love" without conceding the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, he is obliged to regard a created universe as coeternal with the Deity. And if the doctrine of the Trinity be abandoned, we are bound either (with Dr. Martineau and some Unitarians) to adopt this modern form of Manichæism; or else to exchange Theism for Pantheism, resolving our idea of love at the same time into a vague unconscious impulse of what has been called "Centrifugalism" or "Diffusion," *i.e.* a blind tendency to objectivise what is not yet realised as subjective, a desire

[1] See Hutton's *Essays*, vol. i. pp. 231-236 [2nd edition, Macmillan, 1880].

by the All to give itself away, before It has discovered that It has a self to give. Such a conception as this is abhorrent to the plain sense of the glorious Scripture declaration that God is Love. And Dr. Martineau's Dualism is equally contrary to the Bible doctrine, that God alone is eternal and self-subsistent. Just as the great philosophical problem of Being shuts us up to one of the two alternatives, Pantheism or Trinitarian Theism; so does the problem of Love present us with a similar choice between an eternal Trinity within the Godhead, or an eternal Cosmos outside Deity.

A Christian Theist believes that the existence of a Cosmos is itself one of the manifestations of the Divine Love,—a reflection and projection of that reciprocal complacency and desire which ever subsists perfectly within the Godhead, and apart from which creation could not be explained. For we dare not say that God needed the Cosmos to complete Himself. He would be none the less God, ever blessed and all perfect, if the Cosmos were annihilated, or had never been. But through the Cosmos we can see how each Person in the Godhead glorifies and delights the other Persons; whilst, at the same time, one of those subordinate and modified forms of love, already described, comes into play between the Godhead and the universe which He has called into being. God cannot be supposed to desire anything that the created universe could impart to Him; but in His love to the universe at large, benevolence has taken the place of desire; and in His love to our fallen world, compassion has taken the place of complacency. In the case of man, who was made in the Divine image, desire does form an element in the Divine love; but this surprising fact is explained only through the relations which subsist between Humanity and a second Person in the Trinity. Divine love is poured forth upon mankind only in Christ, the only-begotten Son, and for His sake; and if any individual man is finally separated from the Son, it is not the love of God, but the wrath of God, which abideth on him for ever.

[§ 65.] The notion of Love has been examined at rather disproportionate length, because it forms so very important an

element in the Spiritual consciousness—as distinguished from the rational. Loving communion with God is the highest conceivable form of spiritual life; and love is the supreme explanation and motive of all that is thought, felt, or done within the spiritual sphere. The conclusive test by which we can decide for ourselves and others whether persons are spiritual, is the fact whether or not they "walk in love," *i.e.* whether the motive and the end of life for them is that reciprocal complacency and desire between their souls and God which is made known to them in Christ; for here again —as in the case of God-Consciousness and Communion with God—Christ is the only revealer and interpreter to us of the spiritual sphere, and we know love, exactly as we know God, only so far as we know Christ (1 John iv. 10; Eph. v. 2). It is only in Him that we can discern the reality of that Divine image in which our true manhood consists.

But if so, it follows of necessity that true love can subsist for men and women only *in the Lord*. Though it may seem a hard thing to say, it is nevertheless undeniably certain that what the world calls love is rarely, if ever, recognisable as such by God, or in the light of God's self-revelation in Scripture. And the very multitude of names that have been invented to distinguish various kinds of so-called love, is itself a proof that some men have had a strong suspicion that it is so. In fact, any one who has cared to think upon the matter has perceived that ideal human love is possible only between ideal human souls; in other words, that souls created in the Divine image can rightly go out in reciprocal complacency and desire only towards what reflects and manifests the Divine.

Such is Plato's well-known doctrine; and it points in the right direction, though it has been grievously and wilfully mishandled by men who have not known God, and who have seemed to delight in debasing and denying His image that is in them. To give things their proper and scriptural names, that reciprocal complacency and desire of which fallen human beings can be and are continually conscious, is "fleshly love"; it belongs to the world, and for that very reason "it cannot please God"; "the love of the Father is not in it" (Rom. viii.

5, 8; 1 John ii. 15, 16). If only it is analysed with honest scrutiny, it resolves itself into elements so selfish, so inhuman, so merely animal, that the holy name love appears a manifest blasphemy as misapplied to describe it. Or, if it can stand this analysis, and reveals itself as unmistakably noble through its unselfishness, this unselfishness is not to be taken as a proof that the soul in which it dwells is spiritual, but only that he is struggling upward from the rational into the spiritual sphere.

Every human being who is not "reprobate" has a religious impulse that prompts him thus to rise and to seek after God; though he may not know Whom it is that his soul desires. And the impulse of self-sacrifice in order that other human beings may be benefited, is one of the surest signs that God's spirit is influencing a man, and drawing him up into fellowship with Christ, the only pattern and source of what modern ethics terms Altruism. A true Altruist is much nearer the kingdom of heaven than a professed Christian who plainly lives for self; yet it does not follow that the Altruist is spiritual, or that he dwells in love. The object of his benevolence and self-sacrifice is impersonal,—that huge indefinite idea of humanity as a whole; and this fact alone shows that his consciousness has not risen above the rational sphere; for in that sphere universals are the *ne plus ultra* of research, desire, and grasp. What is called the love of humanity is a fine and admirable thing, but it is not what John meant when he said, "He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God."

As for the human being who is wrapt up in reciprocal complacency and desire with a single created finite and personality, he is so far from rising thereby towards the spiritual sphere, that he is even sinking towards the animal sphere. He is forgetting what is universal in the glamour that attracts him to one particular fellow-being. So-called "love" that isolates two human creatures from all the rest of their race and from God is not "Human" love; nor are those two creatures rational. This last assertion indeed is the oldest of proverbs; and not only is it true that the frenzy of particular love is irrational, but it is also true that

it is the most selfish and immoral thing in the world. (Witness the detestable maxim, "All is fair in love.") Duplicate selfishness, or selfishness in partnership, is just as hateful and wrong as is selfishness in the individual.

Therefore the sacred name of love should be jealously reclaimed for the spiritual sphere alone, and used only for that form of human consciousness in which a man realises his personal relationship towards God, and towards all in the universe that reflects the nature or the attributes of God. Such a conception will light up with wondrous meaning every Scripture declaration concerning love, and will also explain the high original from which human thought has borrowed its noblest utterance on this same theme. Especially will it show us how, for a spiritual man, love has taken the place of law (Rom. xiii. 8–10; 1 Tim. i. 5). Law, the categorical imperative, moral obligation (which, as we have seen,[1] may be impersonal in its origin, and yet sufficient for a rational being),—this is the supreme principle in the rational sphere. But in the spiritual sphere the supreme principle is love. We think, feel, and act, not according to what conscience tells us is right, so that we "ought" to do it; but according to what the mystical Intuition of our souls tells us is pleasing to and desired by God; and what, therefore, is the only thing that is pleasing and desirable to ourselves. And the most spiritual man on earth is the man whom love thus rules, or, as Paul puts it, whom the love of Christ constrains, as one reconciled with God.

[§ 66.] (4.) This brings us to the last feature and test of a really Spiritual consciousness, viz. the *consciousness of Redemption*, of having been lifted by a supernatural act of Grace from a state of ignorance, alienation, and ill desert towards God, into a new condition of loving fellowship with Him. It is from non-recognition of this point that Ewald's conception of spirituality fails. For he regards any and every man as spiritual who has any measure of God-consciousness, *i.e.* who discerns in the universe a supreme Personal Will, Almighty,

[1] See above, § 54, paragraph 3.

All-wise, and All-good, and who acknowledges his obligation to serve and glorify this Being. But such a definition of the "spiritual man" would not have satisfied Paul, nor does it accord with our own present Christian consciousness as compared with our former unconverted state. A religious instinct is not religion, and the sincere recognition of a Personal God is not spirituality. There is no time here to discuss this matter as it deserves, but the following citations will set forth the conclusion above affirmed under the authority of deservedly honoured names; and for the present it must rest as something stated and abundantly confirmed, even if it does not carry complete conviction to every one who hears it for the first time.

(See Martensen's *Christian Ethics*, i. pp. 237–241; Pressense's *Study of Origins* [Hodder & Stoughton, 1883], pp. 437–453 (especially pp. 440–450); Lotze's *Microcosmus*, ii. pp. 115–118 [translation, Clark, Edinburgh, 1885]; Dorner's *System of Christian Doctrine*, i. pp. 293, 301, 302; ii. 332 [translation, Clark, 1880].)

PART II.

LECTURES ON THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE AND INSPIRATION.

LECTURES ON INSPIRATION.

CHAPTER I.

THE BIBLE'S CLAIM FOR ITSELF.

§ 1. Our subject is the Authority of Scripture and what is commonly known as the Inspiration of the Bible; though this last phrase is objectionable on many grounds, and by no means defensible. The Divine Character and Authority of Scripture would be a much better title for the topic which we are about to investigate. That topic is the natural and necessary foundation of any intelligent study of Revealed Theology, for Revealed Theology is busied wholly and solely with the matters set forth in Holy Scripture; and before we can study these with any confidence or living interest, we need to satisfy ourselves that Holy Scripture is a real and authoritative source of knowledge concerning Divine things. Christianity rests by common consent upon the acceptance of the Bible in this character as the supreme rule of religious faith and practice. And Protestants lay special emphasis upon this principle, affirming with Chillingworth that "the Bible and the Bible alone" is their religion. We are manifestly bound as students for the Protestant ministry to make sure of this our only ground of continued subsistence as religious teachers.

§ 2. It is assumed that we have already made sure of other ground which underlies this distinctly Protestant and Christian position. We have accepted the main doctrines of

Natural Theology, viz. the facts that God is, and that He is the Rewarder of them that diligently seek Him; *i.e.* that God is able to reveal Himself to man sufficiently for the answering of man's religious instincts, and that He is more likely thus to have met such a natural craving of our soul than to have left us crying out in vain for more knowledge about Himself, and about our own imperfect and sinful selves. We have no doubt as to the possibility of a Divine revelation in the form of writings which record special words of God to certain men, and special acts of God, the meaning of which He enabled certain men rightly to understand. The only question is, Whether the Bible is such a written revelation, and whether it is the sole and sufficient source of all that additional knowledge of Divine things which we need to supplement our Natural Theology?

Further, it is assumed that we have come to some definite conclusion as to the Canon of the Bible, the number and names of the several books which are comprised under the common title "Holy Scripture." We have examined the evidence for genuineness and authenticity in the case of each book separately in the Old and New Testaments, and have satisfied ourselves as to its title to a place in the sacred collections of the Jewish and Christian Churches respectively. And now we proceed to inquire concerning those two Canons as a collective whole: What is the Authority of this volume in a theological point of view? Whence is that authority derived? and where does it reside? It is not, however, at all necessary for the purpose of this inquiry that we should all agree exactly in our conclusions concerning the extent and contents of the Canons of the Old and New Testaments. It is quite possible that more or less of uncertainty may attach in some minds to the right of one or another book to the place which long tradition has assigned to it in the sacred Canon; *e.g.* we may doubt whether Canticles, or Ecclesiastes, or Esther, or Chronicles, or Second Peter is properly reckoned canonical; but suspended judgment on such a point need not prevent us from inquiring into the Authority of the rest of the Bible. There is no question as to "the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms" being accepted as Scripture in our Lord's

time and by our Lord Himself; and there is equally no question as to the acceptance by the Christian Church from the earliest times of twenty New Testament books which undoubtedly contain all that is fundamental and essential to the Christian religion. Here, then, we have a Bible quite large enough to be the subject-matter of our inquiry as to "Authority" and "Inspiration." If any one wishes to disturb that inquiry by disputes as to the canonicity of this or that particular book, we can, for the sake of argument, grant his contention and leave the book in question out of our present account. And there may be even a practical advantage in our doing this; for experience has shown that the quickest and most satisfactory method of proving the canonicity of books like Canticles and Second Peter is to establish the Divine Authority of the rest of the Bible, and then to show how perfectly the book in question falls into its traditional place as part of this wonderful record of God's self-manifestation in grace.

Here, however, we shall assume that all the sixty-six books usually deemed canonical are accepted frankly as such, and that the Bible about which we speak consists of all these sixty-six and no more. We also assume that the unity of this Bible has been clearly recognised; *i.e.* we discern that every book in the Bible has a definite connection with the central fact of Christ's redemptive mission, and was written with distinct reference to that kingdom of God which Christ came to establish upon earth. These are the necessary preliminaries to our inquiry concerning the nature and extent of the Authority which we ought to ascribe to the Bible as a whole, and concerning that peculiar quality in the Bible which is commonly, though improperly, denoted its "Inspiration."

§ 3. It is only reasonable that we should begin by asking whether the Bible makes any claims for itself in this matter of Authority, and if any such claim, if made, has ever been sufficiently verified. Here we are, of course, obliged to distinguish between the Old Testament and the New; for in the New Testament there are manifest claims made on behalf of the Old Testament which are not matched by anything that

can be urged for the New Testament itself. Our Lord and His apostles always spoke and acted upon the assumption that the Old Testament Canon as a whole was absolutely authoritative in matters of religion. From its utterances, and from its teachings concerning Divine things, there could be no appeal. This is the unmistakable meaning of Christ's word in John x. 35, the literal rendering of which is "The Scripture cannot be loosed," *i.e.* cannot be set aside as no longer binding upon the conscience and the judgment. The term "to loose" was familiar to Jewish ears in this judicial sense (cf. Matt. xviii. 18), and the context of John x. 35 suggests that our Lord's hearers would understand Him on this occasion to be refuting their charge of blasphemy, by showing that their Scriptures do the very same thing that they blamed Him for doing; and He clenches the argument by this parenthetic remark: "The authority of Scripture cannot possibly be gainsaid; you cannot loose yourselves from its rule." It may, however, be said that Christ was using a mere argument *ad hominem*, shutting the mouths of His opponents by a saying that was true for them, but not necessarily true for us or for everybody. This supposition is, however, negatived by the fact that our Lord always showed extreme reverence for the collection of books which He termed "the Scripture" or "the Scriptures" (Matt. iv. 4–10, xxvi. 54; Luke xxiv. 44–46; John v. 39). Christ certainly looked upon the Old Testament Canon as the only authoritative rule of Faith and Practice that had been delivered to men until His own day, and He expressly declared that He had come, not to destroy this rule, but to complete it (Matt. v. 17–19). The apostles all adopt the same tone in their references to "the Scriptures." Paul especially seems sometimes to speak of the Scripture as though it were a living intelligence and not a mere material book (Gal. iii. 8, 22). He distinctly calls these Scriptures "holy" (Rom. i. 2); and for Paul a saying of Scripture is apparently equivalent to a saying of God Himself (Rom. ix. 17). It is, in fact, superfluous to prove that New Testament writers ascribed to the Jewish Bible exactly that supreme authority in matters of religion which Protestant Christians claim for the whole Bible. Every

attentive reader sees and feels that this is a simple statement of self-evident fact.

Our Lord and His apostles did not fail to justify this attitude towards the Scriptures of the Old Testament, or to invite decisive tests of the claims which were made on behalf of those Scriptures as a supreme authority on religion. They appealed to the clear fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies as proof that the writings which contained those prophecies really came from God. In this line of argument they followed the lead of the Old Testament itself; for the great test of a Divine commission in any man who professed to speak for God was laid down in this thing, that what this man foretold actually came to pass (Deut. xviii. 21, 22). A very instructive example of the public application of this test to the rival claims of two professed messengers of God is given in Jer. xxviii. Miracle was also appealed to by the men whose utterances are embodied in the Old Testament as a proof of their authority (*e.g.* Ex. iv. 1–9; 1 Kings xviii. 22–24). And, indeed, Miracle and Predictive Prophecy always go together as credentials of an authoritative Divine Revelation; and though the spirit of this nineteenth century depreciates and despises them, their evidential value remains unimpaired, and will be recognised again by all men in due time. Without dwelling on this point, it may be noted in passing, that the claims for religious authority made by the Old Testament for itself, and by Christ and His apostles to the same effect, are even now receiving new and striking confirmations through the fuller proof which time has brought, and is bringing, of predictions that were literally fulfilled, and the fulfilment of which compels us to recognise a superhuman enlightenment of the prophet who could read the unknown future so distinctly. We can confidently ask men to study this phenomenon, and draw their own conclusions from it. The Old Testament claims to be an authoritative revelation for the ages that preceded Christ, and this claim has been abundantly substantiated by miracle and by the fulfilment of predictions that were offered as tests.

§ 4. But when we pass from the Old Testament to the

New Testament, though some very manifest parallels in this respect do present themselves to us (Matt. xii. 38–42, xxiv. 3–34; John ii. 18–22; Acts xiii. 6–12), yet the case, as a whole, is very different; and even if miracle and fulfilled prediction could be invoked in evidence of a claim for authority preferred by the New Testament itself, the modern spirit would dispose of such a claim by urging that alleged miracle and predictive prophecy are two of the principal stumbling-blocks in the way of modern thinkers, who are asked to receive the Bible as an authoritative Divine revelation. We are therefore thrown back upon another line of argument, better suited to the positive and scientific methods of the nineteenth century.

Before indicating this line we must examine the claims which the New Testament is often supposed and said to make in its own behalf, to be authoritative in matters of religion. When, however, we refer to the passages adduced, we do not find that any of them can fairly be interpreted as claiming authority in matters of religion, either for the New Testament as a whole, or for the Old and New Testaments together. One text which used often to be cited in this sense (Rev. xxii. 18, 19), is manifestly limited in its application to the single prophetic book in which it is found. We cannot extend it to cover the other books which now happen to precede it in the bound volume of Scripture, but which were certainly not in the mind of the writer when he penned these words. This text refers to the Apocalypse only, just as the similar passage in Deuteronomy (iv. 2) refers only to the Pentateuch. Another text which also used to be quoted as claiming Divine authority for all the Bible (2 Tim. iii. 16), is not only ambiguous in the claim which it does make, but also refers, not to any New Testament writing (unless it be by inference, and the help of evidence to be brought from outside the Bible), but to those Jewish writings which Timothy had known from a child.

Of course, with regard to all the sayings of our Lord which are recorded in the Gospels, there is a distinct inferential claim of authority of the very highest kind; for Christ professed to speak, not of Himself, but as His Divine Father

gave Him commandment. If any one failed to recognise His absolute authority as a religious teacher, it was because this rebellious hearer was a stranger to God (John viii. 26, 28, 38, xii. 49, 50, xiv. 24). Again, our Lord promised His disciples that in their witness-bearing for Him, the Holy Spirit should instruct them, and should complete their knowledge of all the truth pertaining to His mission (John xv. 26, 27, xvi. 12–14), so that we may infer that each one of these disciples taught with authority equal to that with which their Master had spoken.[1] We also find several of these disciples claiming this authority for themselves and for their fellow-apostles (1 John iv. 6; Jude 3; 1 Cor. xiv. 37; and Peter in 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16). We ought not, however, to expect any claim to be made by a New Testament writer for Divine authority in the New Testament canon, for that canon was not collected until after the living presence of apostles and prophets was withdrawn from the Churches. Hence our argument in this matter must be mainly inferential in its character, compounded out of a proof of the genuineness of each New Testament Scripture, and an application to each of these books of the far-reaching promise of Christ, already cited from John xv. and xvi. Putting all these separate arguments together, we can frame a strong presumption in favour of the Bible as a whole, viz. that it does possess the authority for doctrine and for practice which Protestants have been accustomed to ascribe to it. And this *à priori* proof of our position agrees with, and is supported by, another and an *à posteriori* argument, which may possibly have convincing weight alone when fairly considered by people who profess to rely upon positive evidence, and upon the proof of accomplished facts and crucial experiments.

---

[1] Matt. x. 19, 20, Mark xiii. 11, Luke xii. 11, 12, xvi. 14, 15, are not properly cited as promises commensurate with those just mentioned.

CHAPTER II.

THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE.

§ 5. For what is it precisely that we claim on behalf of the Bible as a whole? It is that this book alone, amongst all other books, gives safe guidance to souls that seek after God, and the assurance of His forgiving mercy and favourable regard. We say that if any man accepts the teaching of this book in sincerity and humility, he finds a real remedy for moral and spiritual ill, under which it is undeniable that humanity labours; and that this result is not by happy chance, but by the gracious purpose of God, who has given us the Bible for that very end. These are claims that can easily be brought to the test of experiment; they have been thus tested by millions of credible witnesses, and they are being tested daily by men and women in whom the spiritual and moral healing wrought through the instrumentality of the Bible is as much a fact of scientific observation as is any phenomenon of the material world which Positivists accept as real in itself and real in its alleged causes.

§ 6. The deference which Christians pay to Holy Scripture is not a little ridiculed by many superficial sceptics, and Protestant Christians especially are often sneered at as "Bibliolaters," and are told that they are not fit to engage in any investigation of the alleged authority of the Bible, because

they have already prejudged the question by putting this book upon a pedestal from which it is sacrilege to take it down. We are asked, "Why not treat the Bible like any other book?" and from this challenge we need not shrink. We can plead that our reverence for and trust in the Bible are the result of a long course of such treatment to which it has been subjected by ourselves and others. We have treated, and by all means let us go on treating, the Bible as we treat any other book of its kind. But this last stipulation is all-important. For it is well known that books are not all of one kind, but some books sort themselves out into classes of their own. Nobody treats all his books alike. Every man has certain books which he puts mentally in a class by themselves; which he regards as his "authorities," and to which he yields a more or less implicit obedience or trust. Thus, a man about to travel selects one or more guide-books to the unknown land which he proposes visiting; and having exercised due care in his selection, he afterwards trusts to these books absolutely, until he finds experimental and clear reason to disbelieve them. So a student selects grammars and dictionaries, and gives his absolute confidence to them, until he is sure that they are misleading him; a lawyer has his books which are his undoubted authorities in legal points; and a medical man has similar written authorities for his treatment of disease, which he never thinks of questioning until his own distinct experience proves that they are false authorities. None of these men would allow a stranger, unacquainted with his own special province or his present and actual need, to convince him of folly because he does not treat these particular books as he would treat a novel, or a magazine, or a play. Hence we have no objection to the principle, "The Bible should be treated like any other book of its class"; but we wish also to know what is the class to which the Bible belongs; and that last question can be answered only by persons who have both made themselves thoroughly acquainted with the contents of the Bible, and who are also practically interested in the matters to which those contents refer.

Such persons declare without a dissentient voice that the

Bible stands for them in a class by itself; that there is no other book like it; and that it impels their implicit confidence as the highest, nay, as the only authority which they know concerning such infinitely important subjects as Sin, Salvation, Life, Death, God, a future state, and the countless painful mysteries of the world outside us and the world within our own heart. To them the Bible occupies a distinctly exceptional and unique position, being, as it were, their only attested guide-book to the unknown regions of Eternity; their only worthy key to the hidden knowledge of God and of Divine things; their only valid manual of the Law under which they feel that they live; and the only Book of treatment which experience has proved to be successful in regard to the diseases of sin and of consequent misery, which these men feel to be within themselves, and which they see to be raging all around them. Such persons cannot possibly admit the right of sceptical critics, who are strangers to their position and their experience, to take down the Bible from this exceptional rank and to treat it as they would treat a volume belonging to quite a different class; *e.g.* Shakespeare's Plays, Homer's *Iliad*, Plato's *Dialogues*, or the *Maxims* of Confucius. They say with S. T. Coleridge, "that in the Bible there is more that finds them than they have experienced in all other books put together; and that the words of the Bible find them at greater depths of their being."[1] And they are sure that whoever approaches the Bible as they have approached it must be compelled to acknowledge in it the same overpowering and absolute authority. They have no abstract or *à priori* objection to examine the claims of other books, which may be alleged to belong to precisely the same class as the Bible, viz. such books as the Vedas, the Koran, the Zendavesta, the Buddhist Sacred Texts, etc., only they think the comparison between these rivals has been made sufficiently often and sufficiently at length to put the supremacy of the Bible beyond all doubt; and they hold it an imperative duty of practical morality and common sense for every man who recognises in himself the

[1] *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit*, p. 13.

needs and the conditions which the Bible professes to meet, to make an honest trial of the methods and means which this book sets forth in regard to those needs and conditions. They are sure that if any man will do this, although he may begin with a very limited circle of belief and obedience, yet in proportion to his sincerity, his trust will bring its own vindication, and will lead him on to a wider measure of experimental confidence in the exceptional authority of this peerless book. They find, indeed, that the Bible declares this very result as the certain reward of every genuine testing of its own pretensions (Hos. vi. 3; John vii. 17; 2 Pet. i. 19; 1 John ii. 24–27).

§ 7. But, again, in accepting the maxim, "Treat the Bible like any other book of its class or kind," *i.e.* like any other accepted and well-attested authority for the practical affairs of human life, it is important to inquire whether amongst books of this class there is any particular form or pattern which affects the manner in which the book is used; and if so, whether this fact can give us any hint as to the right way of using the Bible as an authority in its peculiar sphere.

For in the text-books of secular professions, Sciences, and Arts, which have been cited as illustrating the true character of the Bible, there is a very familiar and a very important distinction in form. Some of these books are didactic and systematic, whilst others are historical and descriptive; *e.g.* a guide-book for foreign travel may be in the form of a Bradshaw's or a Cook's Time-table; a handbook arranged in routes, with categorical directions what the traveller shall do, what hotels he shall select, what sights he shall see; or it may be in the form of a narrative of travel in the same region, like Dean Stanley's *Sinai and Palestine*, Ford's *Handbook of Spain*, or Captain Cook's *Voyages in the South Seas*. It requires a man of sense to use the last-named kind of authority; but to him it is far more helpful and interesting than a cut and dried itinerary would be. Again, a surgeon's authority may be a book of precepts and rules, or it may be a record of practice by some eminent master of the art, or a history of the cases at some great hospital. And the way in

which the book will be used must depend largely upon its character in this matter of form.

Of late years teachers and students have come more and more to recognise the immense superiority of historical text-books over those which are purely didactic and systematic. The study of Political Economy has already been revolutionised through the influence of this change in the form of its text-books. Theology and Philosophy are fast experiencing a similar revolution. Not only does study become intensely interesting through this changed method, but the results of study are more valuable. Truth is better arrived at, and the mind is better satisfied as to the grounds of its final conclusions and beliefs. But a historical text-book must be used intelligently, and with a clear perception of its aim and of its idea. It would be absurd to expect from its earlier pages the same kind of instruction and guidance which the later pages will give. A careless or stupid reader may mistake the record of imperfect discoveries and the honest story of partial gropings after truth for a categorical disclosure of what the whole truth is; and a hostile critic may even think that he discerns inconsistencies and contradictions between the various parts and stages of the teaching which the writer of the text-book intends to give. Such liabilities to abuse are inseparable from the historical form of practical instruction. But no form of instruction is so fruitful or welcome to real students as this; none is more triumphantly justified by its results.

Now the Bible is an authority in matters of religion of just this historical and descriptive kind. It is not a systematic treatise upon religion; not a handbook of dogmas and precepts arranged didactically in categorical form, although some of its pages contain codes of law and of morals, and formal statements of doctrine. But the Book as a whole is of quite a different character. It is a *History of God's Revelation of Himself in Grace*, a record of the methods and events by which God has disclosed to men at different times and in various portions (Heb. i. 1) His purpose of redemption. A recognition of this fact is all-important for the right use of the Bible as an authority. It must be read, not only with implicit faith in the Holy Spirit, Who is responsible for its existence and for its form,

but also with intelligent apprehension of its Divine plan and design, as revealed in that form. In short, we must treat the Bible as students of philosophy would treat a history of Philosophy which had been written by a master whom they trusted absolutely, and from whose opinions in Philosophy they admitted no appeal; or if that seems too hard a requirement, we must at least treat it as such a book would be treated by honest readers who recognise the Author as knowing more of his subject than they themselves do, and are willing to look at that subject through his eyes until they meet with some clear instance in which he is proved an unsafe guide.

§ 8. If the Bible had always been treated in this way there would probably be little question nowadays amongst serious and reasonable men of its supreme and unique authority in matters of religion. But unfortunately both its friends and its foes have repeatedly fallen into a strange mistake concerning its real character and its design, and have agreed to regard it, not as a history of Divine revelation, but as a didactic textbook of complete and positive revelation. For more than two hundred years this serious misapprehension has taken fast hold upon the majority of Protestants. They have been trained to look upon the Bible as a direct disclosure of the perfect and absolute mind of God, a changeless and unchangeable Revelation of Divine Truth, which from first to last is "infallible," *i.e.* exempt from mistake, so that if only any statement of fact or of doctrine can be shown to be in the Bible anywhere, it is blasphemy to call this in question. "The Holy Ghost has written it; it is a portion of God's own word; of unimpeachable truth, and of absolute authority, alike for belief and for practice."

The consequences of this mistaken view of the character of the Bible have been most lamentable alike for devout Christians, for simple-minded inquirers, and for hostile and prejudiced unbelievers. Christians and honest inquirers have often done serious violence to their intellectual and moral instincts in trying to reconcile the earlier "revelations" of this book with those of later date, or with the moral convictions to which the human race has advanced since those

"revelations" were made. The doctrines of Christianity have been looked for in every book of the Old Testament, and "proof texts" of these doctrines have been offered from every part of the Bible indiscriminately; just as much weight being assigned to a text from Ecclesiastes or the Song of Solomon as to a text from a Gospel or from a Pauline Epistle. And the effect of this has far too often been to obscure the doctrines and the Bible to devout Christian believers, and to awaken suspicions concerning both in the minds of candid and intelligent inquirers after truth. In fact, the whole study of Systematic Theology by means of a collection of proof texts has been brought into disrepute through the manifest falsity of the principle upon which it rests. Men are tempted to build up their theology out of materials furnished by reason, or moral and spiritual intuition, or religious experience of the individual and of the race, rather than out of biblical materials, and to try the Bible itself by the conclusions to which they may thus be led. In this way they have played into the hands of avowed enemies of the Book, who have only too readily accepted the account which narrow Protestant orthodoxy, since the seventeenth century, has given of the Bible; for they have perceived how well that account serves their own hostile purpose. "If every part of the Bible is a direct revelation, an infallible, absolute, and perfect disclosure of the truth, then," say they, "there are many things in it which are hopeless stumbling-blocks to our intelligence, and even to our morality. The Bible contains contradictions, not only in form, but also in matter and spirit; as, for example, in the Imprecatory Psalms, in some of the precepts of the Mosaic Law, and in the examples of the lives of some Old Testament saints, as compared with the precepts, example, and spirit of Christ which are set before us in the New Testament. These differences forbid us from believing that God, who is assumed to be Himself perfect in wisdom and unchangeable in character and will, can have been the Author of a series of revelations so little answering to the Christian's own description and conception of the Book. The Bible must be the outcome of human imperfection and fallibility, not of Divine and absolute truth."

Having thus reversed the Christian conclusion from the Christian's own premises, these hostile critics of the Bible proceed to certain other inferences, by which Christianity is shown to be superfluous and untrustworthy, viz.—(1) that all those distinctive features of Christianity which we draw from the Bible, such as its supernatural elements, its doctrine of the atonement, of Christ's divinity, of regeneration, and everything else which freethinkers dislike, are superstitious survivals of undeveloped religious thought among the Jews, and, in any case, notions of purely human origin, and of no intrinsic authority or worth. (2) That any really valuable truths in morals and religion which may be found in the Bible, such as the being and character of God, immortality, retribution, duty to our fellow-men, and the efficacy of repentance, have, in like manner, originated in the minds of advanced human thinkers without any special Divine aid, and have no more authority from the mere accident of their being in the Bible than they have when we think them ourselves or read them in other books, such as the works of Plato, Confucius, Zoroaster, Shakespeare, Emerson, or Comte.

It is well known that some deists and some agnostics of to-day profess a high esteem for the Bible, or at least for certain selected parts of the Bible. They rank the Book along with the books thus named, but without ascribing to any one of these volumes any supernatural character or Divine authority. Others, again, treat the Bible from first to last as a poor and worthless piece of work, a book which the developed human mind has long outgrown, and which is fit for the reading only of women and children, and men who are on their level of ignorance and intellectual feebleness. Sad and reprehensible as is this attitude of many in our time towards the Word of God, it can in many cases be accounted for by causes for which Christians themselves have been to blame. The Bible has been presented to critical, clever, and irreverent men in a wholly false character, which they have easily discerned to be false, and there has been a natural reaction on their part from what they have judged to be a blind and superstitious worship of a fetich. Some of them may even have thought that they were doing mankind a

service, and not dishonouring God, by breaking this Protestant idol, and pouring contempt upon this Bibliolatry. Yet if they had not been asked to believe more than was just, they might have been quite able to recognise the authority which the Bible really claims, and in respect to which no other book in the world can compete with it; viz. the authority of a truthful record of that which God began to do long ago, what He is still doing, and what He has announced that He will do to repair the moral and spiritual diseases which are only too manifest amongst men; in other words, to re-establish His kingdom upon earth, and to bring back the human race into a life of fellowship with Himself for which it was created, but from which it has somehow fallen away. The Bible professes to tell how this fall of mankind has come about, and how it has pleased God to counteract the evil for all who will trust and obey Him. And it claims to be authoritative from first to last in this record of man's spiritual need, and God's gracious provision for the same. Outside of these well-defined limits it claims no infallibility; and within these limits it not only permits, but requires men to read its record with intelligence as well as with reverence and with faith. We are left to discern for ourselves the times and the circumstances of each recorded revelation of the Divine purpose of grace, and to recognise the development of that purpose from a dim and partial promise to a clear and perfect fulfilment. If we fail to bring common sense to bear in this way upon the book, it may very easily make a false impression upon us as to its character and its intended authority; but then we have only ourselves to blame for the mistake.

This is not at all a novel view of the real character of the Bible, or of the authority which properly belong to it as an historical record of progressive revelation, which is something very different from a didactic text-book of complete and absolute revelation. The very earliest masters of Christian Theology in the East, viz. Athanasius, Basil, and Chrysostom, and their Latin contemporaries, Augustine and Jerome, taught this doctrine distinctly. They did not uphold the Bible as an infallible revelation; they fully admitted that there are abundant evidences of human infirmity in the writers who

have recorded the story of revelations that were themselves necessarily progressive, partial, and incomplete. But these great theologians did uphold the unique authority of the Book as the only trustworthy account of God's self-disclosure to a world that needs the knowledge of His grace. Augustine, who thoroughly appreciated the apparent differences which modern infidels delight to publish as though they had just discovered them in our sacred writings, summed up the whole case on our side in this single pregnant maxim, "Distinguish the times, and there will be no discordances in Scripture." This admirable principle was reaffirmed with equal clearness and emphasis by the great Protestant reformers, Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin; and one word of Luther's upon this point has passed into a well-known proverb—"The Bible was written for men with heads upon their shoulders." It was not until a century after the Reformation that a new tradition concerning the Bible began to replace the old tradition concerning the Church and the Pope; and we can trace the gradual rise and progress of this "Protestant Scholasticism," as it has been called, and name the men who are responsible for it; *e.g.* the Lutherans, Gerhard (*ob.* 1637), Calovius (*ob.* 1686), and Quenstedt (*ob.* 1688); and the Reformed divines, John Buxtorf, father (*ob.* 1629) and son (*ob.* 1665). It is to these men, especially to Quenstedt, not to Luther and Calvin, that modern Protestants owe the strange misconception, that in the letter of Scripture there resides an infallible authority as a full and direct revelation of Divine truth. But there have never been wanting intelligent and learned theologians, especially in the Reformed branch of the Protestant Churches, who have held fast to the older and the truer doctrine, claiming for the Bible an absolute and (if you will) infallible authority as a record of Divine Revelation, which interprets itself, not in the mere letter, but in the spirit and substance to spiritual men. For it has ever been held, in accordance with the direct teaching of Paul in 1 Cor. ii. 12-16, that only men who are enlightened by the Spirit can rightly interpret the contents of this book which owes its existence to that Spirit's operations within the hearts and minds of the sacred writers. The Bible reveals and verifies

its authority only to regenerated men. Only they are competent to judge it and to pronounce upon its true character, its purpose, and its value. Other men who are not regenerated can only come to partial and temporary conclusions about the book; and if they are reasonable men, and really in earnest about the things of which the Bible professes to teach, one of the very earliest of these conclusions will be that the book should be trusted and obeyed in its practical directions with implicit faith and childlike docility, until the promises which it makes to the believing and the teachable are falsified in their own experience. If the book is approached and its claims are tested in this reasonable and honest way, the natural man will by and by discover that he has himself become spiritual, that the Holy Spirit has given him a new life through the word (1 Pet. i. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 13). For this is exactly what the Scriptures themselves profess that they are able to do; to bring spiritual life to believing readers, to reveal God to the truly seeking soul (Ps. cxix. 50, 130; Jas. i. 18).

§ 9. There is nothing unusual or arbitrary in this demand of the Bible to be received, in its practical directions to the unconverted, with faith and with docility until its promises to such are falsified in their experience. Every guide to a traveller in an unknown region makes the same demand; so does every physician and every lawyer in respect to their patients and their clients. No teacher of singing or of elocution would accept a pupil on any other terms than these; and in the last-mentioned cases the pupil is told distinctly that one end of his training is to impart to him an entirely new faculty, secrets of breathing, of voice production, and of register, which to his untrained consciousness seem impossible and absurd. He has to believe his teacher in regard to these things, and to obey him with anxious and untiring fidelity, though he may be ridiculed as a fool or as a fanatic by those who care nothing about music or elocution. And when his teacher's promises have been amply fulfilled in his own conscious possession of new powers, he is prepared to listen with great respect to that teacher's explanations of physiology, and every other science which may stand in close

connection with his art, though before this experience of the teacher's skill he might have been very ready to dispute with him upon these points, thinking that he knew quite as much about them as his master. Just in like manner, when a man has become conscious of spiritual things and of spiritual life within himself through the believing reception of some part of God's word, he is ready to examine other parts of that word, *e.g.* the Book of Genesis, the narratives of miracles in the Old and New Testament, the law of Moses, the history of Israel, and the Book of Revelation, with very different pre-possessions from those with which he criticised, and perhaps ridiculed, them before. All these parts of the record of Divine Revelation become intelligible, credible, and self-evidencing when looked at thus from the vantage-ground of a spiritual man. But that vantage-ground cannot be reached until the natural man has submitted his reason to the authority of the Bible, in its claim to be a practical guide in spiritual things for all who desire to become possessed of the new life in the Spirit.

§ 10. This attitude of an earnest soul towards the Bible contains within itself the solution of the much discussed question: What are the right relations of Reason and Revelation? or, as some put it, of Reason and of Faith? This dispute has been very much darkened by the ambiguity of both the last mentioned terms, but especially the term "Reason." To a great number of persons this word means "the Faculty which draws Inferences from Premises," "the Logical Faculty," or, slightly varying the notion, "the sum-total of our Intellectual Powers." Others, again, mean by the word a certain intuition into the reality of things which rises above the mere "reasoning faculty," a power of the mind which discerns truth even though logical proof may be wanting. In this sense of the word, "Reason" is so far from being opposed to "Faith" that it may become identical with it. But, in general, when people talk about the competing claims of reason and faith, they mean on the one hand the demand of our understanding to know or to have valid intellectual proof of things, and on the other hand the demand of

some person or principle outside of ourselves that we shall submit to his or its authority, and shall believe without knowing or without having proof satisfactory to our intellect. As thus stated, the conflict is very old, especially in regard to Religion and the Bible. The one party demand that faith shall always depend upon reason. "Let me understand," is their motto, "in order that I may be able to believe," *e.g.* Abelard and modern Rationalists. The other side declare, "You cannot understand, you must accept this doctrine blindly;" and mottoes have even been invented by this school of dogmatists which set their position in a very ridiculous light. "I believe, because it is absurd or incredible." "I am sure, because it is impossible."

Midway between these two extremes is a third position, which has commended itself in every age to men who have been alike pious and reasonable, *e.g.* Augustine, Bernard, Pascal, viz. that reason and faith have each of them a proper province and a necessary task, which, so far from conflicting, are mutually complementary. Reason has to discover the fact of her own incompetence to pronounce concerning certain things which are offered by faith through revelation; and, further, she has to examine the credentials which the alleged revelation brings, and to say whether it is reasonable to accept this offer of light in the absence of any other certitude. And faith has to assert her dominion over all the field thus relinquisbed to her by reason, to guard it jealously against any suspicious and querulous attempts of her sister to resume possession of what she professed to yield; and, finally, to vindicate her right to independent rule by practical results which reason shall be compelled to acknowledge are real evidence that what is revealed to faith is true, even though it cannot be wholly or even partially understood. Very often, indeed, this self-vindication of faith comes in the form of a proof which the understanding can grasp now that the man has been lifted up to a higher level of spiritual vision; and so the well-known mottoes of Augustine and Bernard are justified—"I believe in order that I may understand," and "God can be known only in proportion as He is loved (*i.e.* trusted)." But far oftener the result of a fair trial of the

leadership of faith is to convince the reason more and more that there are mysteries beyond her ken, yet that God's revelation to faith is trustworthy, and that it is in the highest degree reasonable to accept and obey it without asking to understand it.

§ 11. We may now claim to have reached a very intelligible and defensible conclusion in regard to the Authority of Scripture, *i.e.* its Right to command in certain departments of Action and Belief. We have followed a strictly scientific method in arriving at our results; *i.e.* we have collected facts, we have put our hypotheses to the test of those facts, and we have tried the claims of the Bible in exactly the same way as any book of its own peculiar class is wont to be tried and should be tried. The summary of the whole is as follows:—

1. The Bible deals with the religious needs of men, and with a certain gracious provision which God has made for those needs, and which our human reason could not have discovered for itself. Hence it is to be judged only with reference to these things, and only by persons who are both conscious of the needs and willing to give the book an honest trial on its own profession and terms.
2. The Bible professes to be the record of a progressive series of revelations by which the provision of Divine grace for man's religious needs has been brought gradually and piecemeal into light. Hence it is to be interpreted with common sense and with discrimination of the times when, and the circumstances under which, each portion of God's purpose was disclosed to our race.
3. The Bible does not profess to verify itself to any except spiritual persons. The Divine purpose of grace which it unfolds is a purpose to give spiritual life to believing souls. It has indeed a message to every man, and in proportion as each reader recognises its personal appeal to him it requires obedience and faith, through which he will be enabled to enter more and more into its meaning, and more and more

to realise its power. But it warns the unspiritual that they can neither know nor prove its most important contents. They must first be initiated into the school of Him Whose self-disclosure in grace it records, and it offers to instruct them in all things concerning this initiation. In this preliminary condition the Bible simply occupies the ground which is taken up by any book of special practical importance; and when we read it prayerfully and believingly, asking God's Holy Spirit to interpret it to us, we do most emphatically treat the Bible as any other book of its own peculiar class should be treated and daily is treated.

4. Reason may be appealed to for justification of this submission to the authority of Scripture as a thing which is altogether and eminently reasonable.

CHAPTER III.

INSPIRATION.

§ 12. It is for many reasons desirable that Christian apologists and teachers should content themselves with affirming the absolute authority of the Scripture in the sense which has now been explained, and that they should vindicate that authority by the inductive and experimental method which has also been described. But there is a phrase which has been associated with this topic so long and so closely, alike by friend and foe, that it is impossible to leave it out of view; and though we may avoid using it ourselves (and shall do so if we are wise), we must be prepared to discuss it, and to understand the sense in which it is used by others who will still insist upon employing it. This phrase is "Inspiration." Scripture is said to be "inspired"; its peculiar authority is affirmed to rest upon its inspiration; and a man's orthodoxy is often tried by this test, first of all others, "Does he believe in the Plenary Inspiration of the Bible?" Nothing, however, could be more foolish than to ask or to answer such a question without very detailed explanation of both the noun and the adjective which are its leading terms, for there is scarcely any leader of orthodox Christian thought who has not put his own interpretation upon one or other or both of them; and of the noun Inspiration it has been truly said by

Professor Jowett, that it "has received more numerous gradations and distinctions of meaning than, perhaps, any other word in the whole of theology." Definitions of it might be multiplied, a different one being extracted from each of the best acknowledged text-books of Evangelical doctrine. But to start with a definition which, of course, implies a foregone conclusion, a proposition which has to be explained and justified, is never satisfactory to an earnest seeker after God's truth. This is the old *à priori* and synthetic method of scholasticism which in every science except theology has long been set aside in favour of the analytic and *à posteriori* method. And if we are to use the term "Inspiration" correctly and profitably we must adopt this modern method, and must find out from Scripture and from history what are the facts which have given rise to the phrase, and what lights, if any, those facts reflect upon the authority in matters of religion which we have shown the Bible to possess.

§ 13. "Inspiration" is a Latin word, theological in its origin, and meant to reproduce the idea which Jerome and the earlier Latin translators of the New Testament supposed to underlie the Greek term *Θεόπνευστος* in 2 Tim. iii. 16, the only passage in all the Bible to which the phrase in question can be referred. The Greek term, like the Latin, is not of classic usage, but is distinctly theological in its origin. This New Testament passage is apparently the first in all literature which contains it, so that it is possible that the writer may have coined it, though it is more probable that he had heard it in Hellenistic circles, for it appears in one of the Sibylline books (v. 308), which is usually credited to an Egyptian Jew of the first half of the second century. It belongs to a class of adjectives which may be explained either actively or passively, *i.e.* *Θεόπνευστος* may mean either "divinely breathing" or "divinely breathed." The last is the meaning which is generally given to the term in 2 Tim. iii. 16; but Cremer insists that the active sense is to be preferred, and translates "breathing the Divine Spirit." If this active force is given to the word, then the passage in question

will simply affirm that Holy Scripture is charged with a Divine influence and power, and there will be no ground of dispute between the Old Theology and the New in such a statement. But even if the passive sense be recognised in the word, and if we translate as in the Authorised Version,—"given by inspiration of God,"—still this passage does not decide any controversy, nor can we found upon it any doctrine of Inspiration, for the Greek construction of the verse is elliptical and ambiguous, and the adjective *Θεόπνευστος* may be either an appellative or a predicate; *i.e.* we may render either "every Scripture (being, or which is) Divinely breathed is also profitable," etc.; or "every Scripture is Divinely breathed and profitable," etc. The first of these renderings would be altogether inconclusive for any dogmatic purpose, for it would leave us uncertain as to what Scriptures the writer had in his mind; and the second rendering could not fairly be made to cover more than the Scriptures of the Old Testament, to which reference has been made in the preceding verse. Some interpreters have wished to translate *πᾶσα γραφή* in this verse as "all Scripture," *i.e.* "the whole of Scripture," which is decidedly forcing the ordinary usage of Greek grammar; but nothing would be gained for any complete dogma of inspiration by admitting this translation; for (1) the reference would still be limited to the collection of "holy writings" which Timothy had known from his childhood, and which certainly did *not* contain any part of the New Testament; and (2) the original ambiguity would still remain in the term *Θεόπνευστος*. It is impossible to show that the passage means anything more than this: "Every writing which breathes a divine spirit is also profitable for teaching, for conviction, for correction, for training, which (begins and ends) in righteousness." In other words, the affirmation here may not be dogmatic in any sense, but a mere practical hint for Timothy in his use of any and every Scripture which he recognises as breathing the Spirit of God. Thus this famous text does not really give us any help in our inquiry after the ground and cause of that peculiar authority which we have found by experience to reside in the Christian's Bible, for it is this unknown

ground or cause which we suppose to be intended by the theological phrase, "Inspiration of Scripture."

§ 14. We do, however, get a little help in this direction from another passage, which is always set in the forefront of any dogmatic exposition of the notion contained in "Inspiration." This passage is 2 Pet. i. 20, 21. The best rendering of this is: "No prophecy of Scripture comes (into the power of) any (man's) own interpretation; for prophecy was never borne along by a man's will, but men spake from God, being borne along by (the) Holy Spirit." Two points need to be noticed in the foregoing translation—(1) The Authorised Version is founded upon a different reading of the text in the last clause of ver. 21. But this reading is certainly wrong; and though the text from which the translation above given has been made is found only in B among Uncial MSS., it approves itself to be the true and original reading by all the accepted Canons of Textual Criticism. Nothing, however, of dogmatic importance turns upon this difference of readings in the Greek. (2) The other point concerns the rendering of the last words in ver. 20, *ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως γίνεται*. It is idiomatic, just as in Luke xx. 14, 35; Rev. xi. 15; the idiom being well known in classic Greek. The meaning of the clause so translated is that prophecy is not a matter of subjective interpretation; no man can explain it by his own unaided mental power, but its explanation requires the same illumination from God's Holy Spirit in which the prophecy originated; for, as the next verse goes on to affirm, prophecy was never the outcome of merely human will, but a Divine impulse and origin always lay behind its matter and its manner. This, however, is not the only reading which can be given of the last words in ver. 20. We may translate thus (with Alford, etc.): "No prophecy of Scripture arises out of a private interpretation," etc.; *i.e.* no prophecy is uttered because the prophet wishes to give a message of his own. The prophet does not know what his prophecy means; he speaks because he cannot help himself (ver. 21), and his ignorance of the true import of what he says is a guarantee that a greater than man is behind him.

Whichever of these renderings is adopted, a very substantial contribution is made to our Biblical matter for a doctrine of Inspiration. We learn distinctly that the Old Testament prophets spoke as the result of a Divine "afflatus." They were borne along as a ship is carried by a strong wind, and the Force which thus moved them was "from God" (according to the reading above defended); it was, indeed, the personal power of the Holy Ghost. This exactly corresponds with the passive meaning of the adjective *Θεόπνευστος* in 2 Tim. iii. 16, "divinely breathed." Only we must not force this statement of Peter so as to make it cover more than the prophetic Scriptures, *i.e.* the Old Testament predictions about Christ, for only these were in Peter's mind (see vv. 16–19). Nevertheless, a reasonable and thoughtful man will infer that what is so positively affirmed about the predictions of the Old Testament may also be true about every other part of the Old Testament which points onward to Christ, and that a corresponding principle will hold good for Peter's own utterances about his Master, and for the New Testament writers generally (cf. 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16). This is a fair use of the passage in question, and we shall return to it presently as one of the strongest Biblical proofs of that Theory of Inspiration which seems on other grounds most helpful and most likely to be correct.

If we accept Alford's rendering, which is probably the favourite one, we get a still stronger and more important contribution to our doctrine of inspiration. We learn that the Old Testament prophets might be utterly unconscious channels of utterances, the meaning of which was hidden from them by the Divine Spirit, who yet compelled them to speak. In his First Epistle (i. 10–12) Peter affirms this same fact in language which cannot be mistaken; and so far he certainly gives support to that Theory of Inspiration which is called "Mechanical" or "Organic," because it represents the sacred writers as mere machines or organs through which the Holy Spirit breathed. But we may accept that doctrine in regard to many Old Testament prophecies, and yet hesitate to extend it to every part of Scripture, or indeed to any except a few very special parts.

The passages just examined in Peter are most valuable, so far as their direct teaching goes, but they do not give us materials for a complete doctrine of inspiration.

§ 15. The passage that carries us furthest in that desired direction is 1 Cor. ii., especially vv. 12–16. The whole chapter requires careful consideration. The following doctrinal conclusions stand out very clearly from its argument:—(1) The Apostle Paul both recognises and lays great stress upon a certain essential difference between a sphere of existence of thought and of utterance, which he calls "spiritual," and the ordinary sphere of human consciousness, wisdom and speech (vv. 4–6, 12–14). (2) He affirms that not only is the spiritual sphere distinct and separate from the sphere of ordinary human consciousness, but, further, no ordinary man can "receive" spiritual things except through a special instruction and revelation from the Divine Spirit (vv. 9, 10, 14). (3) He claims for himself and his fellow apostles that this special instruction and revelation have come to them for the definite purpose of "declaring God's testimony" and setting forth the mysteries of Divine wisdom (vv. 1, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, 16). In fact, he makes this claim the basis of that authority which he exercises over the Corinthians, both in declaring what is true Christian doctrine, and in forbidding certain practices which are contrary to the Gospel. (Cf. xiv. 37, xv. 1, 2, vii. 40, a characteristic Litotes.)

One verse in the second chapter requires particularly close examination, viz., ver. 13; for if there is any Scripture passage which suggests a reasonable theory of inspiration it is this one. There are two unimportant variations in the text, for all the best MSS. omit the adjective *ἁγίου* after *πνεύματος*, and one primary uncial (B) reads an adverb *πνευματικῶς* instead of an adjective in the dative plural *πνευματικοῖς*. The simplest rendering is as follows: "Which things also we speak, not in words (or discourses) which are taught by human wisdom, but in those which are taught by the Spirit interpreting (or appropriating) spiritual things to spiritual persons." This verse evidently takes up and carries

further a thought already expressed in ver. 10. God's Spirit has not only revealed the matter of spiritual things to Paul, but He has also taught Paul the right manner in which to express these things; the form as well as the substance of Christian doctrine has been given to the apostles. Some have thought that this passage supports the notion of verbal inspiration, because Paul says that the "words" which he uses are taught him by the Holy Spirit; but the Greek term λόγος does not mean "word" in this sense, but rather "discourse," "form of speech." If Paul had wished to convey the idea of mechanical dictation of particular words, he would have used another term, ῥῆμα. Moreover, the notion implied in the term rendered "taught," suggests a living inward assimilation of Truth, not a mechanical reproducing of it from outward dictation. The last clause in the verse has been rendered in many different ways. The participle συγκρίνοντες generally denotes the bringing together of two things with a view to fix their relative value (cf. 2 Cor. x. 12). Hence the Authorised Version translates here "comparing spiritual things with spiritual." But in the Septuagint a special meaning is given to this verb, viz. "to interpret" or "explain," especially in regard to dreams; and it is easy to see how this usage arose, for a dream is interpreted by comparing its pictures and images with well-known ideas (Gen. xl. 8, 16, 22; Dan. v. 15–17). Hence the favourite modern rendering of this passage adopted above, "interpreting spiritual things to spiritual men." Another fair and quite admissible rendering is "adapting (or appropriating) spiritual words to spiritual things," *i.e.* providing a suitable language for the wisdom which the Holy Spirit has inwardly revealed. Godet proposes yet a fourth translation, viz. "appropriating or applying spiritual teachings to spiritual men," *i.e.* the Holy Spirit teaches Paul to impart his treasures of Divine wisdom in suitable measure—form and time—to those who can receive the same. This idea is borne out by what follows in vv. 14–16 and in iii. 1–4.

Whichever of these renderings we adopt, the passage, as a whole, is exceedingly important and valuable as a help to formulate some doctrine of inspiration. Any such doctrine if

true, must embody at least these three leading points—(1) The essential distinction between things natural and things spiritual. (2) The responsibility of God's Holy Spirit for both matter and form of the utterances in which apostles have conveyed to us Christian truth. (3) The necessity of a spiritual preparation in the persons who are rightly to receive this truth, as well as in the apostles who have declared the same.

§ 16. We may now proceed to search the Scripture, both of the Old and the New Testaments, for any possible light which they may throw upon the idea which underlies these leading passages which have been so thoroughly examined. We often meet in the Bible with phraseology such as this, "The Spirit of God came upon" such a one; "The Spirit moved" such a one; such a one "Spake by the Spirit," and so forth. The connection of these passages may help us considerably to decide whether it is lawful to speak of "Inspired Scripture" or "Inspired writers of Scripture"; and, if so, what these phrases really mean.

Typical examples of the phraseology above referred to are Ex. xxxv. 30–35; Num. xxiv. 2–4; Judg. xiii. 25, xiv. 6, 19, etc.; 1 Sam. x. 5, 6, 10, xi. 6. It would be a perfectly fair representation of these passages in an English translation if we were to say that they show us Bezaleel and Aholiab as "inspired by God" for mechanical and artistic work in connection with His sanctuary; and Balaam as "inspired by God" for the utterance of prophecy; and Samson as similarly "inspired" for feats of physical strength and warlike prowess in connection with his championship of the Hebrew people; and Saul as "inspired" at one time for what the narrative describes as "prophesying," and at another time for a deed of heroism such as makes the name of King Alfred dear to an Englishman, or the name of Wallace or of Bruce dear to a Scotchman. These passages may be compared as to their phraseology with others which will probably seem more closely related to our topic of Holy Scripture, *e.g.* Ezek. xxxvii. 1, 9, 14; Isa. viii. 11, xi. 2–4, lxi. 1 et seq.; 2 Sam. xxiii. 1, 2. No difference is discernible in the form

of expression used in these passages respectively; there is even one passage in Isa. xxviii. 23–29 where the origin and development of ordinary agriculture are attributed to exactly such a Divine operation on the human mind as that by which Aholiab and Bezaleel were enabled to accomplish their special work for the Tabernacle, or as that by which Jehovah's servant in Isa. l. 4, 5 is enabled to speak words in season to him that is weary. Very many other examples might be cited to show that men may be "divinely breathing" or "divinely breathed" for many purposes besides that of writing books "able to make us wise unto salvation"; and all these examples further suggest that any notable display of human intelligence, emotion, and activity, by which the purposes of God are effectually realised, may be, probably will be, the result of some special influence exerted by the Holy Spirit upon the mind, heart, and will of selected individuals.

§ 17. Shall we then say that inspiration is only another name for genius? and that Holy Scripture is neither more nor less inspired than Shakespeare's Plays, or Newton's *Principia*, or Raffaelle's Pictures, or Beethoven's Symphonies? This is the doctrine of a large school of modern thinkers of whom J. D. Morell may be accepted as the spokesman in England. He says (*Philosophy of Religion*): "Genius is the possession of a remarkable power of Intuition with reference to some particular object." And if any man possesses such a special intuition into Divine things, his religious genius is "Inspiration."

This view has seemed very shocking to persons trained in the older schools of Theology, and it was no doubt intended by its authors to lead the way to conclusions which would overturn the peculiar and exclusive authority of the Bible; but there is much truth in it, and, so far as it is true, it enhances rather than depreciates the old orthodox estimate of the Bible. It does not so much lower our thoughts of a Divine origin and authority in Scripture, as it raises our conceptions of a Divine origin and authority in things which we have been, perhaps, accustomed to regard as triumphs of unaided human wisdom and strength. A devout Christian

ought to rejoice in every new sign of the Holy Spirit's working in human history and life, and not to be mistrustful of a theory which fits so perfectly with so many Scripture testimonies to the fact that the Holy Spirit has worked and still works in every startling manifestation of what the world calls "genius," when the results are for God's glory. If it is lawful and good for us to trace the Divine power actively at work in nature, *e.g.* in the motions of the stars and the change of seasons (Job xxvi. 7–14; Ps. xxxiii. 1–7, xlvii. 15–19), it cannot be less right or possible for us to recognise a similar, immediate Divine operation in the great discoveries and achievements by which science, art, morality, high thinking, and noble living have been successively advanced among men. What Isaiah says about agriculture (Isa. xxviii. 26, 29), we may say about astronomy as developed by Kepler and Newton; about chemistry as developed by Dalton; about electricity as developed by Faraday; or about the heroic deeds of a Joan of Arc or a William of Orange; the marvels wrought by a Luther; the successful statesmanship of a Cromwell or an Abraham Lincoln. All these individuals may well have been specially instructed for their work by God, specially moved by the Divine Spirit for Divine Ends, in the natural and secular realm and sphere, just as prophets, evangelists, and psalmists have been specially instructed and specially moved in the spiritual realm and sphere. But it does not follow that all these individuals stand upon the same level of "inspiration" or of "genius," whichever word we may prefer to use. That could only be if the natural and the spiritual were identical, whereas we have learned, alike from Scripture and from experience, that the natural is distinct from the spiritual, and that though the same Divine Spirit moves actively in each sphere, His ends and His methods are different in each. Just as earth differs from heaven, sense from spirit, so does the glory of terrestrial science, literature, and activity, represented by a Newton, a Shakespeare, or a Joan of Arc, differ from the glory of the celestial revelation which has come to us through a Moses, an Isaiah, and a Paul (1 Cor. xv. 40, 41, 44).

§ 18. The nineteenth Psalm may be usefully studied as illustrating this resemblance and yet difference between the Divine operation in the sphere of natural science, and the operation of the same Divine Being in the sphere of spiritual consciousness. The same Psalm may also be used to suggest the important fact that in no sphere can the Divine working be recognised except by minds and hearts that have been prepared, made susceptible to the right impression. A blind man could not receive any knowledge of God's glory or of God's handiwork from the starry heavens, for this revelation belongs to the sphere of sense. The beauties of colour and light would be hidden from him through the defect of his own nature, which closes to him one avenue of knowledge. Or again, an irrational animal which has the sense of sight, and which therefore can discern the visual phenomena of day and night, sunrise and sunset, does not and cannot refer these phenomena to a Divine cause, for it lacks the intellectual conditions and preparations under which alone such a process of reasoning could be made. It lives in the sensual sphere, not in the rational sphere. Exactly in the same way a man who lives in the rational sphere, and who therefore can pass a literary judgment upon the Bible, classing it with other books of history, romance, poetry, or moral teaching, may be utterly unable to discern a Divine purpose of grace revealed in Holy Scripture, because the spiritual sphere is fast closed to him, because he does not know himself as possessed of spiritual capacity, or as related to spiritual things, but regards the entire universe as limited by his merely natural consciousness of human thought, emotion, and will.

§ 19. It is in this conception of an ascending range of spheres in which we may consciously exist, either successively, or simultaneously, or exclusively, that the true key will be found to this problem of inspiration, and to many other problems in both theology and philosophy. Any one of us can satisfy himself that he does live in a sphere of animal or sensuous consciousness common to the brutes along with himself, and in which the pleasure which attests life is connected with such purely animal functions as eating, drink-

ing, muscular exercise, repose, and such like. We can, perhaps, recall the moment when we discovered that there is a higher sphere of conscious existence than this, and began to make acquaintance with the activities of the soul in regions of speculative thought, of poetic imagination, of affection in which nothing sensual was mingled. And we are living to-day in both these spheres at once, passing at will from one to the other, or taking up the lower sphere of sense into the higher sphere of reason; for this subordination of the two spheres is always possible, and very much of our happiness results from our being able to make the senses the servants of the soul; as in the case of the Fine Arts, and as in the intercourse of friends. But although a man who is living consciously in the higher sphere of reason can reach down into the lower sphere of sense and ennoble its phenomena by association with its rational activities; a soul that is living in the lower sphere of sense cannot reach up into the higher sphere, or be conscious of anything that pertains exclusively to it. A beast would need to be "born again" of Reason, in order to share our consciousness of abstract thought and love, and to appreciate our pleasures from painting and poetry and music.

Exactly in the same sense, and for the same reason, a merely natural or rational man needs to be "born again" of the Spirit before he can enter into those experiences which are peculiar to the spiritual sphere, *i.e.* before he can know God and hold communion with Him, and realise that reciprocal complacency and desire in regard to God which is described as "the love of God shed abroad in our hearts" (Rom. v. 5). The "bliss" of such a consciousness as far surpasses the utmost happiness of which the soul is capable in the Rational sphere, as that happiness surpasses any sensuous "pleasure" (1 Cor. ii. 9, 10). And just as the rational man can reach down into the sensuous sphere and ennoble its activities by association with his higher consciousness, so can the spiritual man reach down into the rational sphere and sanctify all its legitimate activities by association with the love of God. He can even sanctify in the same way the lawful phenomena of his sensuous existence (1 Cor. x. 31, vii. 39; Eph. v. 25-32).

But his consciousness of the three spheres respectively remains distinct, and he is in no danger of confounding an experience which belongs to one of them with an experience which belongs to another. If, for example, he has keen natural vision, and can discern many stars with his naked eye which his neighbour cannot see at all, he discriminates that experience of sense from the intellectual exercise by which he reasons concerning light and space, velocity, undulation, and all the abstractions which belong to physical science; and the proof of this is that if he became blind, he could still pursue these scientific speculations, although the sensuous scaffolding by which he climbed up to them had been for ever removed from him. And in like manner he discriminates these scientific activities of his soul from the spiritual realities, which he has clothed in such language as this, "the Lord is my Light and my Salvation"; "in God is no darkness at all"; and although he has used his rational experience to interpret these Divine mysteries to himself and to others, he does not confuse these mysteries with anything that belongs to the rational sphere. Rational conceptions, such as time, space, cause, genus, species, and so forth, might vanish utterly from his consciousness, yet he would still realise an unspeakable bliss in the love of the Father, the grace of Christ, and the communion of the Holy Spirit,—a triune glory after which he may have groped feebly in lower spheres by means of his philosophising upon the wonderful sense phenomenon of the Triunity of a ray of pure white light.

§ 20. Therefore, to come back to our starting-point, Inspiration may be recognised in all the spheres and sub-spheres of conscious human existence, and the Holy Spirit may be acknowledged as preparing and moving men for their greatest triumphs of what the world calls "genius," and yet this inspiration may be essentially different from the inspiration by which holy men of old were prepared and moved for their spiritual task of revealing to us the Divine purpose of Grace in regard to our fallen world. We are not at all obliged to put Holy Scripture on the same level with Shakespeare, or

Newton's *Principia*, or an oratorio, or any other production of natural human genius that we may rightly call "inspired." But we mark off the Bible from all other literature by this peculiarity, which alone is enough to lift it high above comparison with masterpieces of sense or of reason. Its end and its matter have to do with the spiritual sphere of consciousness. Whatever may be its form, the living Reality which it conveys to our consciousness is higher than sense, higher than reason; and the breath by which its writers were borne along is not only from God, as is every good and profitable impulse,[1] but it is the medium and environment of God's own existence.[2]

§ 21. We are now in some measure prepared to fix a definite meaning upon the word "Inspiration," as used in connection with the process by which the Bible has come to be the unique book which experience and history have shown it to be. One favourite modern meaning we can set aside without any hesitation. It is quite common, nowadays, to hear advocates of what is styled the "New Theology" say, "We recognise the Bible as inspired just because, and just in so far as, it inspires us. Its Inspiration is neither more nor less than its power to breathe into us beautiful and elevating impulses." Of course, from this point of view many other books would equally deserve to be called inspired; but we have seen how misleading it is to confound together impulses and experiences which belong to distinct spheres of consciousness, and therefore we shall carefully avoid such a use of the term Inspiration as would equally fit the Bible and Wordsworth's Poems or Emerson's Essays. Especially are we bound to do so, because our examination of Scripture has not led us to regard the two phrases "inspiring" and "inspired" as synonymous. And the only New Testament passage in which either of these ideas seems equally appropriate is the one[3] which we have found least helpful in suggesting any clear account of the nature, the extent, and the origin of that

[1] Jas. i. 17.
[2] John iv. 24; Rom. viii. 14.
[3] 2 Tim. iii. 16; see § 13.

peculiar authority which, by inductive reasoning, we have shown to reside in Holy Scripture as a whole.

But the other passages which we examined, and which we found more helpful in this direction, do give us a consistent and very suggestive notion of what inspiration is. They all point to such a definition as this, "the preparation of a man's heart or mind, or both, by the Holy Spirit, in view of some task for which God would use that man." And since the particular matter about which we are now inquiring is the utterance and recording of religious mysteries, we cannot be wrong in saying that Inspiration as a theological term ought to mean, "the inward spiritual preparation of a man to know and to feel what God chooses to communicate of His Divine thought and will."

§ 22. Now several important consequences will result from our agreement to use the term Inspiration strictly and exclusively in this clear and reasonable sense. (1) First, we shall cease to talk about the Bible as an "inspired book," or to accept, unless under protest and for purposes of argument, the phrase "Inspiration of Holy Scripture"; for we shall see that our definition fails to explain and to justify such language. But it does justify us in talking about the writers of the Bible as inspired, and it throws full light upon the meaning of that language. An inspired prophet, psalmist, evangelist, or apostle is a man who has been divinely prepared in the spiritual sphere of consciousness, so that he can know and feel God's thought and God's purpose which a merely natural man cannot possibly receive. (2) Secondly, we shall perceive that Inspiration gives us only one half of the idea, which we need to grasp thoroughly if we wish to interpret such key passages as 2 Pet. i. 20, 21, or 1 Cor. ii. 12, 13. In the second of these passages, Paul says that he had "received the Spirit which is from God, in order that he might know the things which are freely given by God." Now, knowledge is always explained in every sensible philosophy as a relation between a subject or being who knows and an object which is known. It is a sort of flash, such as that which results from the contact of flint and steel, or of a positively and a

negatively electrified conductor. If in this matter of the knowledge of Divine mysteries we agree to recognise the knowing subject in an inspired heart and mind, what shall we recognise as the other factor, *i.e.* as the object which is known? Surely it is that "hidden wisdom" which Paul affirms that God had "revealed unto him by His Spirit" (1 Cor. ii. 7, 10). Thus we get in clear juxtaposition two most important notions, viz. Inspiration, as the Divine preparation of human consciousness in the spiritual sphere; and Revelation, as the presentation of Divine Truth to a consciousness so prepared; and then a third notion emerges as the consequence and result of the coming together of these two, viz. Religious or Spiritual Knowledge, the possession by some human consciousness of certain thoughts or purposes of God.

Now, all Theologians recognise an important distinction between the two notions of Inspiration and Revelation, though they have differed widely in their explanation of what the distinction is. Some writers have turned the true relations right round, so as to confuse all right apprehension of the matters in which these two terms are employed. A very common account given in the old-fashioned text-books was, that Revelation means the supernatural and immediate making known of the before unknown, or the communication of new truth. But inspiration means the supernatural and immediate infusion of things both known and unknown into the minds of the sacred writers in the very act of their writing. Accordingly a favourite concise formula used to be, "All Scripture is inspired, and the new truths of Scripture are revealed." The Bible was said to be inspired in this sense, viz. that a special influence from the Holy Ghost rested upon its authors in every part and process of their task, covering and guaranteeing all that they wrote. There were several theories as to the detailed explanation of this statement which we must notice by and by, but in all these theories inspiration was treated as a notion that included revelation under it. It was the same thing as revelation only looked at from a special point of view, and very often it was difficult to see what distinction was intended by the two terms.

But for some time past the true distinction as already out-

lined has been forcing itself upon thinkers of all schools of theology, and it is safe to predict that before very long every text-book will recognise Inspiration and Revelation as correlative terms,—twin factors of knowledge in some human consciousness, inspiration being the subjective factor, and revelation being the objective factor. Such is already the usage of the terms accepted by Westcott, Alford, Atwell, and other representatives of undoubted orthodoxy, by Morell for the heterodox, and by Ladd who represents a new and increasing school that seeks to modify old orthodoxy by assimilating into it the best results of free inquiry and hostile criticism: only it is as yet impossible to restrict ourselves or to compel others to the rigorous limitation of each term respectively to its proper meaning as thus agreed upon. Both words—Inspiration and Revelation—are still, and long will be, used by multitudes of persons to describe, not the separate elements in a resultant fact of consciousness, but that fact of consciousness itself, or the process by which it comes about, the Divine movement or operation within a human soul by which that soul gains an intuition of Divine truth. This is almost exactly what some old theologians explained as their conception of inspiration, and it is what Dorner understands by both inspiration and revelation; the only difference between the two notions being, that inspiration is the subjective side of this movement, and revelation its objective aspect; or to put the point in another way, the term Revelation bids us think chiefly of the truth which is received into consciousness, and of the intellectual conditions of the total operation; but the term Inspiration bids us think chiefly of the human consciousness which receives the truth which is quickened and exalted in all its faculties, including feeling and will as well as Intellect. Thus, to quote Ladd, "To have a revelation of truth is one and the same thing with having inspired insight. (And) the Divine activity which produces the insight may be called either Inspiration or Revelation;" or again, "the word Revelation lays emphasis upon a product,"[1]

[1] *The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, by George T. Ladd. T. & T. Clark, 1883, vol. ii. p. 461.

but the word Inspiration lays emphasis upon a process, viz. the process by which Divine truth is received into the consciousness of a man.

If these distinctions are clearly grasped, modern discussions about Inspiration and Revelation will not be hopelessly confusing, as they certainly would be if only the old-fashioned conceptions of the two notions respectively were kept in mind. But the best of all courses for the student will be to settle with himself once for all never to use the word Inspiration unless he means "the inward (or subjective) preparation of the human heart or mind by the Holy Spirit," nor the word Revelation unless he means the presentation by the same Spirit of some truth or duty to a mind and heart so prepared." The personal value of such a rule will be inestimable, and the longer the student lives the more surely he will find everybody else coming over to his own familiar mode of speech and thought in this important matter.

§ 23. Now, if Inspiration thus means and is to mean the special preparation of a heart or mind by the Holy Spirit, it is easy to see that there may be many different kinds of Inspiration, according to the sphere in which consciousness is active, and also according to the end which the Holy Spirit had in view when He wrought the special preparation. We are here in agreement with both the Bible and popular language, and can recognise the perfect propriety of talking about the inspiration of Aholiab, or of Samson, or of the Ploughman in Isa. xxviii., or of Newton, or of Raffaelle, or of Beethoven. But let us confine our attention to the spiritual sphere to which none of these examples belong, and think how many kinds of inspiration there may be in that, according to the ends for which hearts, minds, and wills may be prepared by the Holy Ghost. One kind will certainly be the inspiration which fits a man for discerning, appropriating, and proclaiming Divine truth; another kind will be the inspiration which fits him for recognising and performing duties which he owes to God; another kind will be the inspiration which fits him for realising the love of God revealed to himself personally. For example, Martin Luther might be said to have been inspired

to discern and to republish the doctrine of Justification by Faith; William Carey and Henry Martyn to undertake the self-sacrificing task of evangelising the heathen; Charles Wesley, St. Bernard, and Madame Guyon for the ecstatic raptures which are celebrated in some of their hymns. These three inspirations are not to be confounded with one another. They are distinct and separate alike in the form of consciousness which each respectively affects and in the end to which each is respectively directed. The only points in which they are alike are—(1) their sphere, and (2) their origin or source, for all these different preparations are wrought by one and the same Divine Spirit. And they all pertain to the Divine Life which is awakened and sustained in men by the Holy Ghost. All spiritual men can be partakers in any or all of them, and therefore one very thoughtful writer, M'Leod Campbell, proposed to classify all these experiences of a renewed soul under the common title "Inspiration of the Divine Life."[1] He made this proposal chiefly with a view to distinguish that kind of inspiration from another kind which he calls "the Inspiration of Revelation"; and though his terms are not perhaps the best which could be devised for his purpose, they will serve to mark out the real distinction which separates the inspiration of those men to whom we owe the Bible from the inspiration which is possible to any spiritual person, and for which prayer is made in the two collects previously cited from the English Liturgy.

For in the case of what M'Leod Campbell calls an "Inspiration of the Divine Life," the experience may be new to the particular individual who receives it, but it is not a new thing in the history of the Church or of the Human Race. Multitudes of men and women have renewed the respective experiences of Luther, Carey, Wesley since their day, or anticipated those souls in earlier ages of the Church. And, as a rule, all these experiences have sprung out of some contact of the human soul with the written word of God. The Bible has been the instrument and means which the Holy Spirit has used in preparing the hearts, minds, and wills of Christians

[1] *Thoughts on Revelation*, 2nd ed. 1874. Macmillan, pp. 75–81, 109–133.

for their appointed call as reformers, teachers, missionaries, and so forth. And even if we go back in thought to the days when the New Testament was not yet written, we shall find that these Inspirations of the Divine Life came, as a rule, through the ministrations of apostles and prophets, *i.e.* the same class of men through whom Holy Scripture has come into being. But if we inquire concerning these prophets and apostles themselves, we shall find that their hearts and minds were prepared for knowledge and for emotions which were altogether new in the history of the world, even for mysteries which had purposely been kept secret from earlier ages, and which were now for the first time revealed to a few select souls, that by them they might be communicated orally and in writing to all other spiritual persons (cf. Rom. xvi. 25, 26; Eph. iii. 2–9; Col. i. 25–27). And this constitutes a very real distinction between the inspiration of these New Testament writers and the inspiration of which we and other ordinary Christians may be partakers. They were inspired with a view to utterances that were new, fresh disclosures of God's thought and purposes; we are inspired with a view to the appropriation of their utterances, and to a recognition of their unique and high commission as stewards of the mysteries of God for us and for all other spiritual men.

What we have thus noted in regard to the apostles and prophets who wrote the New Testament, is equally true concerning nearly all the writers of the Old Testament. But we shall have to return by and by to this point for more careful examination of one class of Old Testament Scriptures, *i.e.* the Poetical and Devotional Books, in order to decide what was the difference, if any, between the inspiration of their authors and the inspiration of many men amongst ourselves whose prayers and hymns seem to be the outcome of a spiritual consciousness that is not inferior in elevation and sincerity to that of David himself.

§ 24. Meanwhile we can enlarge the conclusions, to which we have been led from purely scriptural premises, concerning the two notions Inspiration and Revelation. They cannot be too often recapitulated, or impressed too deeply as funda-

mental elements, in any doctrine that we may finally construct concerning Holy Scripture. Holy Scripture, then, is the outcome and the written record of a long succession of operations by the Divine Spirit upon selected individuals whom it calls prophets (Heb. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 19–21; Eph. ii. 20), and through whom God has chosen to make known His purpose and work of grace towards a fallen world. Each separate portion of it is a "prophecy" in the true sense of that word, that is to say, an utterance for and on behalf of God, an interpretation of God's thought and of God's will into the language of men (Ex. vii. 1, iv. 16). For every such prophecy the soul of the prophet has been specially prepared in the sphere of spiritual consciousness, and this spiritual preparation we call Inspiration, whilst the subjects of it are called "Inspired men." To the soul thus prepared some new aspect of the Thought or Will of God has been presented, and this objective presentation of spiritual truth we call Revelation. The manner in which the presentation can be made is various. It may be by a vision set before either the bodily or the mental eye (Isa. i. 1; Job iv. 12–16), or by a voice audible to the outward or the inward ear (Ex. xix. 19), or by a strong suggestion, a violent inward possession of the man's whole being with the fact which God thus impresses upon him. This last experience is often referred to in the Hebrew Scripture by a peculiar phrase "the hand of the Lord," or "the hand" alone (Jer. xv. 17; Isa. viii. 11). In it the presentation seems especially to be addressed to the emotion or to the will, whilst the presentation by a vision or a voice specially affects the intellectual part of an inspired man. We may fairly judge that some portions of Holy Scripture are the outcome of an inspiration and revelation that have equally embraced all three departments of human consciousness, whilst other portions are the outcome of inspiration and revelation that have been confined to one or to two of those departments, or which have mainly affected one only.

Revelation has been explained a moment ago as the presentation to an inspired soul of some new aspect of the thought or will of God, and we have also seen that this notion "new" is rather important as discriminating prophets and apostles to

whom we owe the Bible, from the case of ordinary spiritual men who are also prepared by the Divine Spirit to receive a revelation of Divine truth in conversion and in many subsequent stages in their regenerated life. The newness of a revelation as an element in prophecy may be found, not only in the fact presented to consciousness, but also in the relations and bearing of that fact in connection with other things. A fact may be old and perfectly familiar, and yet may suddenly be set in so new a light to a mind correspondingly prepared to receive it, that it deserves to be called a revelation, just as the familiar spectacle of a falling apple became a real scientific revelation to Sir Isaac Newton, at a certain moment when his mind was suitably prepared to grasp the world-wide significance of so simple and common an incident. Exactly in like manner, Peter, Paul, and every Jew knew perfectly well that the Promise of Abram concerned the Gentiles; yet this familiar fact was suddenly set in a new light to the apostles of Jesus Christ, and became to them "the revelation of a mystery," which formed a large element in that Gospel which they have transmitted to us in the New Testament (Eph. iii. 3–6; Acts xi. 1–18). We shall see by and by that revelations of this kind, *i.e.* presentations of old facts in new relations and bearings, entered largely into the process out of which the historical portions of Holy Scripture have arisen.

§ 25. The resultant of Revelation and Inspiration in a human consciousness is knowledge, which knowledge, as soon as it is expressed in words, orally, or by writing, becomes Prophecy; and Holy Scripture is only the organised aggregate of all the knowledge which God's providence has ordained should thus be perpetuated as the authoritative guide of man in spiritual matters. But here again we must note a possible misunderstanding of the term just employed, "Knowledge." That term describes a conscious relation of the inspired subject to the revealed thought or will of God, therefore the knowledge, even of the apostles and prophets, will be subject to all the limitations due to their measure of spiritual preparation, and the extent of truth presented to them. No man in any sphere of consciousness can know more than his soul is

fitted to know, or than God chooses to set objectively before him. His knowledge may be real and unspeakably useful and important, and yet it may be most imperfect; and he may be conscious that it is so at the time. Thus prophets of the Old Testament frankly acknowledged that in many of their utterances they declared things which they did not fully comprehend, but which they had received for the benefit of subsequent generations (Dan. xii. 8; 1 Pet. i. 10, 11). It was sufficient for God's purpose that they should apprehend these things well enough in language that would have a larger meaning to others than it had to themselves, just as a careful and conscientious English scribe might be employed by a Hebrew scholar to copy a writing in that unknown language for the use of another scholar. Even Paul confesses that he knew and prophesied only in part (1 Cor. xiii. 9). This acknowledged imperfection and relativity of the human knowledge out of which Holy Scripture has arisen, will go far to explain many of the difficulties which unfold themselves to any one who tries to formulate a doctrine concerning the Bible, and must be borne in mind by every one who frames or criticises a so-called Theory of Inspiration.

§ 26. There can be no doubt that many more prophets and apostles were enabled by God to know and to utter Divine truth than the few whose writings have come down to us in the Bible. Also we have good reason to believe that there were written records of prophecy which have perished and which have failed to reach our hands. Paul wrote letters which have disappeared (1 Cor. v. 9, perhaps also Col. iv. 16). John alludes to miracles and discourses of Christ which might have been written down but were not (John xx. 30); and the Old Testament contains frequent references to books which were apparently of equal value with those which compose our canon, but for which we seek in vain (Num. xxi. 14; Josh. x. 13; 1 Chron. xxix. 29, etc.). These facts force upon us the question, Why and How was that precise selection of literature made which forms our Canon of the Old and New Testaments? And we see at once that our doctrine of the Bible and of Inspiration must find room for some account of

the special Providence which seems to have governed the preservation and collection of the Sacred Writings as well as their composition. The formation of the Canon must be included in our conception of the supernatural process by which the Holy Spirit has caused the Bible to be our authoritative rule of Faith and Practice. And on reflection it will appear that the Canon as a whole may well be the tangible memorial of knowledge that resulted from combined inspiration and revelation, just like each separate writing that is contained in it. For the Holy Spirit may have energised spiritual men throughout the whole Church—first the Jewish and then the Christian Church—to recognise what God intended to be a permanent organised record of His purpose and work of grace towards our race. This assumption simply and thoroughly explains why so many writings have come down to us and no more, and some such assumption seems necessary as a part of our doctrine concerning the Bible. It is fully warranted as an inference from such passages as John xvi. 12–15; 1 John ii. 24–27, iv. 1–6, and it agrees with the general principle and plan of God's spiritual kingdom, to which we are led by a careful induction of the facts concerning Christian life and Christian doctrine, as well as by the deductive process which we have actually employed.

In other words, we see reason to believe that the Church collectively has been inspired to recognise the entire Bible as the permanent organised record of God's dealings with man in the way of grace. Each spiritual man knows this book as God's word to him and to his fellow-believers, and he uses and prizes the book accordingly. It seems to have been so in the Jewish Church with regard to the Old Testament; we can ascertain for ourselves, by reading and by personal inquiry, that it is so among Christians with regard to the New Testament. If some one objects that in each Canon there is a loose fringe of a few books as to which spiritual men have not been unanimous or immediate in their recognition of Divine authority, this fact only brings out into stronger relief the marvellous unanimity of recognition in the case of all the other books, and when we inquire candidly

into the matter, the entire Bible, including all these "disputed books," commends itself more and more to us as an organic unity for which the spiritual instinct of an overwhelming majority of regenerated men emphatically vouches. What little uncertainty remains is a testimony to the human conditions and elements which are equally bound up in the problem with those that are Divine. The Bible originated in the joint operation of Divine and human factors; and, as we shall see, this circumstance necessitates a measure of imperfection in the record of God's thought and of God's will which has come to us in the book. There was probably an equal necessity that the Church's recognition of the Record should also be imperfect, *i.e.* not absolutely unanimous, prompt, or unhesitating. At all events a very important moral end is subserved by the fact that neither the entire Canon, nor any single book in that Canon, is demonstrable to any man as of unquestionable Divine authority. For God would commend His Word to us as to responsible creatures, able to feel the constraint of duty, and yielding a willing obedience to the same. The contents of Holy Scripture are not matters of intellectual moment alone,— for which demonstration might perhaps be demanded with justice,— but they are far more matters of right feeling and right conduct, with which Thought and Belief are mingled. Therefore it almost seems to have been morally needful that room should be left for doubt in regard to the written record of God's word by prophets and apostles, even as for the same reason there was room for doubt in regard to the Divine authority of the same word when spoken by prophets and apostles, and by the Lord Himself, the Incarnate Word from heaven. But this consideration ought to make us very anxious to clear our hearts of the moral hindrances which prevented even Christ's claims from forcing themselves upon the majority of His hearers. He has warned us what some of these hindrances are (John iii. 19–21, v. 40–44, vii. 15–18, viii. 13–15, 42–47), and no one who knows how deceitful the human heart is can deny the possibility that much of the alleged intellectual difficulty which is pleaded by rejectors of the Bible, may be only a disguised moral

reluctance to accept the yoke of the Bible, which is so repugnant to our proud and sin-loving nature.

§ 27. We can now summarise the facts concerning Holy Scripture, which we seem to have established with more or less of certainty, and for which a place must be found in any theory about the Bible which can be regarded as satisfactory and true.

1. The men whose utterances have come down to us, though only in part, in the several books of the Bible, were inspired, *i.e.* prepared supernaturally to know and to feel Divine things. Their inspiration was specifically different from what we may call, if we like, the inspiration of painters, scientists, poets, etc., because it pertained to the spiritual sphere of consciousness, which differs specifically from the spheres of rational, æsthetic, and even moral consciousness. This inspiration of prophets and apostles also differs really, though not specifically, from what we may call, if we like, the inspiration of the Divine life; for it was in each case the first example of its own particular kind, and had reference to a corresponding revelation which was immediate from God, whereas our inspiration has reference to revelation which is not immediate, but which is presented through the speech or the writings of these same inspired men.[1]
2. Every utterance of inspired men which has come down to us in the Bible, has in it a supernatural and Divine element, due not only to the inspiration of the men, but also and still more to the revelation which was presented to them. God's Spirit showed them either entirely new things in the Divine purpose of grace, or showed them old things in new lights,

[1] For example, the preparation of Newton's mind in 1666 was really, though not specifically, different from the preparation of a mathematical student's mind in 1889, who grasps the argument and proof of the *Principia*.

by which their knowledge of these old things was distinctly enlarged. Our guarantee for this Divine element in Scripture is partly the unwavering assertion of prophets and apostles that God did really reveal to them His mind and will as they have imparted the same to us,—an assertion which will bear every test of subjective sincerity by which it is possible for us to try it,—and partly the congruity of the whole scheme of Scripture testimony in this behalf with itself, with the unfolding history of the Church, and with the experience of regenerated men always and everywhere.

3. There is in the Bible, as a whole, a certain organic unity by which all its parts are bound together around the central figure of Christ. Preparation for Christ by type, prediction, and providential arrangement, manifestly pervades every part of the Old Testament, and the New Testament is as manifestly devoted to an explanation of these features of the Old Testament; yet no one can say that the preparation is of human design or origin, or that the correspondence between the two parts of the Bible and their meeting-point in the historical person of Christ is the result of deliberate human skill or artifice. It is either a marvellous piece of chance, or else one of the phenomena in which we are compelled to recognise the Divine and supernatural element above referred to. Nor can we pretend to have given even a plausible account of Holy Scripture unless we have found room in our explanation for a reasonable theory concerning this organic unity of the Bible, whence it arises, and what it means.
4. Yet with all the clear evidence of a Divine element in Scripture, there are equal evidences of an element in every part of it that is human. The thoughts and the will of God have come to us in these writings through the consciousness of men, and therefore coloured more or less by the temperaments and mental, moral, and emotional peculiarities of prophets

and apostles. Unmistakable proofs of this fact are to be found in the different narratives given of the same events by different historians, evangelists, and so forth, and in the different aspects in which the same truth or doctrine is regarded by New Testament writers like Paul, James, and John; and Old Testament writers like Isaiah and Ezekiel, or Malachi. There are also undoubted discrepancies in professedly historical narratives, which can be accounted for only on the assumption that the historians of the Bible were, like all other human narrators, liable to slips of memory, or to peculiarities of thought, which more or less distorted their record from strictly accurate lines. It is foolish, or if not foolish, disingenuous, to deny that such discrepancies do attach to the comparison of passages like Matt. xx. 29–32 with Luke xviii. 35–43 (cf. Mark x. 46–52), or Matt. xxvii. 44 with Luke xxiii. 39–43, or Matt. viii. 28 with the parallels in Mark and Luke. The Old Testament, it is well known, contains numerous similar discrepancies, especially where numbers are concerned.[1] To the same class of indications of a fallible human element in Holy Scripture belong such undoubted phenomena as discrepant quotations from the Old Testament in the New Testament, variant versions of the same discourses and conversations as told by different evangelists, and morally questionable sentiments, such as meet us in the "Imprecatory Psalms" and in other parts of the Old Testament, both Historical and Prophetical (Judg. v. 24–27; Jer. xviii. 18–23).

5. The last fact about the Bible which requires to be added to this summary, is our conclusion that the two Canons of the Old and New Testaments were not formed accidentally nor arbitrarily, but providentially, and under the superintendence of God's

[1] *E.g.* 1 Kings vii. 15 cf. 2 Chron. iii. 15; 2 Kings viii. 26 cf. 2 Chron. xxii. 2; 2 Kings xxv. 8, 19 cf. Jer. lii. 12, 25.

Holy Spirit; the Canon, as a whole, having come into being exactly as each separate book in it originated, with this one distinction, that each book is the outcome of knowledge in the mind of an individual man, that knowledge having resulted from inspiration combined with revelation, while the Canon, as a whole, is the monument of knowledge in the mind of the collective Church, that knowledge having resulted similarly from the spiritual preparation of its members, combined with the presentation to them of certain books which they recognised as having Divine authority. Thus Holy Scripture in its totality, as in each one of its separate parts, is vouched for by the consciousness of spiritual men, and we are warranted in regarding it as an organised record of God's Self-disclosure in the way of grace to His fallen creature, man.

CHAPTER IV.

THEORIES OF INSPIRATION CLASSIFIED.

§ 28. We have now to inquire whether any satisfactory account can be given of these facts concerning Holy Scripture in their connection with that peculiar authority which we have seen to belong to the Bible in the region of religious belief and conduct. In other words, can any theory of inspiration be framed explaining how and why the Bible holds its recognised place among the persons who profess to have received it as being God's Word, or as containing God's word, and as furnishing them with a binding and supreme rule of faith and practice? One way of answering the question would be by passing in review the whole history of the Doctrine of Inspiration from the times of the Jewish Rabbins contemporary with our Lord, down to our own day. This review will have to be made at some future period, but just now it will be more profitable to arrange the leading theories of inspiration which have found favour with theologians without any reference to chronology, but simply with a view to logical resemblances and differences. We might base such an arrangement upon more than one principle of classification; perhaps the simplest will be to make, first of all, a broad division between theories of Partial inspiration and theories of Plenary inspiration, for this will bring us at once to examine the proper use of that much-abused adjective "plenary."

An enormous number of deliberate writers, and a still larger number of careless speakers, employ this term as if it were exactly equivalent to the term "verbal." Even Dr. Redford, in his *Christian's Plea against Modern Unbelief*, favours this restriction of its use, and objects to any one professing a belief in Plenary Inspiration unless he is prepared to accept the very words of Scripture as clothed with peculiar Divine Authority. But this is certainly too narrow and arbitrary a view. Dean Alford, in his *Prolegomena to Greek Testament*,[1] has successfully vindicated the term from that unjust restriction, and has shown that a man may be an honest believer in the plenary inspiration of the Bible whilst rejecting the theory of verbal inspiration. The term as used in theology means just the same as it does in ordinary speech, *i.e.* "full," "complete," being merely a Low Latin amplification of the classic adjective "*plenus*" (the ending "*-arius*" indicating the possession of a quality). Thus a plenary commission given to an officer or an ambassador would mean a commission full enough to meet all the possibilities of the case, but not necessarily a code of verbal instructions. Indeed, verbal instructions in such a case would rather hinder than help a plenary commission. In like manner, a theory of plenary inspiration need not assert the verbal dictation of every part of the Bible, but may fairly claim to be so called, if it asserts that the sacred writers were fully and sufficiently influenced by the Holy Spirit in all that they wrote; or, to put the same idea in other words, that they received such a complete equipment of Divine preparation from within and disclosure from without, that their knowledge and consequent utterance answered perfectly to God's designed end. Of course, the notion which any one may have formed as to what the end of the Bible is, will affect the meaning which he puts upon the term "plenary" in this connection. There may be many different conceptions of an inspiration which is not verbal and yet plenary. But the doctrine of plenary inspiration may be fairly said to be held in common by every one who acknowledges a super-

[1] *Greek Testament*, by Hy. Alford, 1849, vol. i. Prolegomena ci. § vi. pp. 14–18.

natural influence as exercised upon the writers of the Bible, causing each and every portion of that volume to be sufficient for the purpose which in it God's Spirit had in view.

The opposite notion to "plenary," as thus explained, will, of course, be "partial," and the distinction between these two ideas may very fitly form our starting-point in classifying all the known varieties of theories of inspiration. A Partial theory of inspiration will be one which assumes that not all Scripture, nor yet Scripture as a whole, but only certain parts of Scripture, are to be accepted by us as having Divine authority. The particular forms which such a theory may assume will be indefinitely numerous, because every man who adopts it may have a different principle and a different test by which to discriminate the inspired from the uninspired portions. But this very fact sets aside all partial theories of inspiration from the region of practical utility. We cannot discuss the authority or inspiration of the Bible, if that authority resides only in some undetermined parts of the book, and if the very part which to us seems to bear most clearly the stamp of Divine authority appears to some one else to have that mark less than any other part. The criterion in such a judgment will be purely subjective and arbitrary, and will certainly depend upon some previous conclusion to which the critic has come in regard to God, or to miracles, or to revelation in general. Indeed, those views concerning the Bible which involve a merely partial theory of inspiration are almost invariably bound up with a denial of the supernatural, and those who hold them for the most part frankly regard the Bible as a purely human book, without any specially Divine element entering into its character or composition. Such were the views of Theodore Parker; such are the views of F. W. Newman, R. Gregg, and Rationalists and Unitarians generally; but there is no good in arguing with them about the way in which the Bible is inspired or comes to have any authority in matters of religion, for they deny the fact which we are ready to assume. Hence partial theories of inspiration may be left altogether out of our discussion.

§ 29. Turning, then, to theories of Plenary inspiration,

there are four which demand attention, either from the hold which they have had or still have upon theological opinion, or from the adaptation which is pleaded on their behalf to the peculiar conditions of nineteenth century thought.

I. The first is known as the theory of Dictation, or the Organic or Mechanical theory, because it represents the sacred writers as having been, as it were, machines or entirely passive instruments (*ὄργανα*) in the hand of the Holy Spirit; like a harp or a loom played upon by the fingers of God, or, as yet another and favourite figure puts it, as simple amanuenses of the Holy Spirit, who wrote down at His dictation the very words which He gave them. In this last form the Organic theory is known popularly as "verbal inspiration." It is the earliest theory of all, and has had the widest and the longest influence in theology. It was borrowed by Christian Fathers of the second century, such as Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Origen, from the Jewish Rabbins, who held it very firmly in regard to the Old Testament, as also did Philo the Alexandrian. It was revived in the Protestant Churches during the seventeenth century, the most thorough exponent of it being Quenstedt (*ob.* 1688) among the Lutherans, and the two Buxtorfs of Basel (viz. the father, *ob.* 1629, and the son, *ob.* 1665, both named John) among the Reformed. These last two men, who were great Hebrew scholars, carried the theory, not only to the extent of verbal, but even of literal inspiration, for they held that the Massoretic vowels and points in the Hebrew text were all given by direct and supernatural authority. Modern advocates of verbal inspiration have been Robert Haldane (*ob.* 1842), F. S. R. L. Gaussen of Geneva (*ob.* 1863), whose book on Theopneustia, published in 1850, is the recognised text-book of the school, and the well-known Dr. C. Hodge of Princeton, U.S.A. (*ob.* 1878).

Now there can be no doubt that the Mechanical theory of inspiration does explain better than any other the origin and character of certain parts of Scripture, especially some prophetical and apocalyptic passages, concerning which we are distinctly told that the sacred penmen did not understand what they wrote under a supernatural and irresistible impulse

from God's Spirit. We have already noted instances[1] in which "holy men of God" were thus nothing but passive instruments or obedient amanuenses for the Holy Ghost. But as a theory for the whole of Scripture this notion of organic inspiration certainly fails; for it does not explain that large collection of phenomena which we have grouped together as constituting an unmistakably human element in the Bible. For this reason Dorner has given to the theory the name "docetic," meaning by this term to compare it to that early heretical notion in regard to Christ which altogether merged His humanity in His Deity, and made Him a man only seemingly and by false appearance. In like manner, if all Scripture were mechanically inspired, it would be human only in semblance, for the chief characteristic of humanity is conscious volition; and a composition in which the penman has been a mere passive instrument, a sort of typewriter, neither knowing nor willing what he writes, may be Divine, but is certainly not human in any real sense. Moreover, all the grammatical and logical imperfections, the historical discrepancies, the variations in quotation and narrative, and other blemishes, whose presence cannot honestly be denied in Holy Scripture, would have on this theory to be ascribed directly to the Holy Spirit. Some advocates of this theory meet this difficulty by ascribing verbal inspiration to the genuine text of the Bible whensoever this shall be certainly recovered and settled. But this is a manifest evasion of the point, and it leaves us under a painful suspicion that possibly no part of our present Scriptures may be really inspired, because we cannot be absolutely certain of the text of any part. Other and more thorough-going advocates of the theory frankly accept the conclusion above indicated, and admit that the Holy Spirit is liable to all the criticisms and charges which it implies. "God is not bound by human rules of grammar, logic, or rhetorical taste; and what may seem to us inelegant or even incorrect is quite otherwise according to a Divine standard. If we occupied God's standpoint, we should find no fault with any detail of Holy Scripture, and what now seems to us a blemish would

[1] See § 25, p. 139; cf. § 14, p. 121.

appear an ornament. As for 'mistakes' or 'inaccuracies,' there are absolutely none in the Bible, as we should know if we had complete materials for judging the cases in which these faults have been alleged." This position is not so untenable or ridiculous as it may perhaps at first sight appear, and it has with some cleverness and plausibility been supported by one aspect of the figure suggested in the word "Organ," as describing a musical instrument through the pipes of which the Holy Spirit may be supposed to breathe. For just as the different "stops" in an organ have been deliberately made by the builder of different materials and on different principles, so that the quality, pitch, and compass of the notes may vary, so it is said God chose men of different mental and moral temperament who, unconsciously to themselves, expressed the Holy Spirit's utterances in the various forms and under all the seeming imperfections and discrepancies which we find in the pages of the Bible. What is really helpful and true in this suggestion applies, however, far better to another theory of inspiration than it does to the so-called organic theory, which is really insufficient to explain all Scripture, though it certainly applies to some particular and important parts of Scripture. It is favoured undoubtedly, so far as it applies, by one of our fundamental passages, viz. 2 Pet. i. 21, but it is not fairly deduced from another, viz. 1 Cor. ii. 13, as a hasty verbal exposition might assume.[1]

There are three cardinal points in the Organic or Verbal theory of inspiration,—points which apply to every book, passage, word, and, as some say, even letter of the entire volume. For each portion of Holy Scripture is affirmed to be the outcome of (1) the impulse to write, (2) a suggestion of matter or thing, (3) a suggestion of form or word. These are the marks of the Verbal Theory, and are fully explained and elaborated in its text-books.[2] Every one of them is open to challenge, and has been challenged in one or other of the rival theories. The truest and best is the second, which

---

[1] See previous note on this passage, § 15.

[2] For a summary account of them, see Redford's *Christian's Plea against Unbelief*, pp. 265, 266.

is actually involved in every real revelation which God's Spirit makes to an inspired man; and this feature and element in the organic theory has permanent value, though not as expounded by Quenstedt and others. The other two features do attach to some exceptional parts of Scripture, but they certainly do not pertain to others, and they are either unnecessary, or even positively harmful, as elements in any general and complete theory of inspiration as applied to the Bible as a whole.

§ 30. II. The second leading theory of inspiration is best described as the theory of Assistance and Direction. It has also been called Dynamical; but that is a misleading and unfortunate name, for it is applied by many writers to the third theory which we are next to consider, and it is also claimed for the fourth theory, so that it had better not be applied to any one of the three. The theory originated in the seventeenth century as a protest and reaction against the iron-bound dogmas of verbal inspiration. Its author was a famous and influential Lutheran, George Calixtus (*ob.* 1656), the founder and leader of the "Syncretists" (so called), from which fact the theory has sometimes been called the "Syncretist"; but the name is objectionable, because a large amount of undeserved odium attaches to it, and "Syncretist" has long been a byword for "time-server," "patcher up of irreconcilable differences, without regard to principles," "loose and slippery compromiser." Calixtus himself was anything but this, and other divines who have held his theory are equally free from such reproaches, *e.g.* Grotius, Baxter, Samuel Clarke, and Dr. Doddridge. Through the influence of Doddridge one particular form of this theory obtained general currency amongst the Evangelical Dissenters of England, and the influence of Grotius and Baxter commended it equally to Evangelical Arminians. Thus it may be said to have divided the field with verbal inspiration in Great Britain up to the middle of the nineteenth century, and nearly all Dissenting and Presbyterian colleges taught it even up to a later date. It is expounded in well-known text-books by Drs. Hill and Chalmers, Pye Smith and Henderson, besides numbers of others of less repute.

Its main point is that in the inspiration of Holy Scripture the Divine activity was limited to giving assistance to the human faculties of the writers, for the purpose of imparting to them what they had not of themselves, or at least of guarding them from actual or material error. In other words, the Holy Spirit employed the sacred writers in conformity with the natural laws of their minds, leaving to them a conscious and real freedom at all times, and not interfering at all with them in some of the less vital parts of their taste, but at the same time so guiding and superintending them as that all which they wrote was substantially accurate and impressed with the seal of Divine ratification and certainty. This leading idea of the theory had been put forth before, especially by Roman Catholic writers of the Jesuit school (*e.g.* Cardinal Bellarmine). They distinguished between parts of the Bible which came by revelation and other parts which came by Divine assistance; the former parts were limited to those which concern redemption and the salvation of our race, and thus a criterion was furnished such as is lacking in all theories of partial inspiration, though in other respects the original Syncretist theory seemed very much like a "partial" theory. Indeed, Richard Baxter frankly declared his opinion that all parts of the Bible are not Divine, and all parts are not necessary,—a doctrine for which he was and is sharply condemned by many as a dangerous heretic, who has opened the door to the rankest infidelity. Dr. Doddridge avoided this criticism by affirming that Divine inspiration attaches to the whole of Scripture, but in different degrees; and he enumerated three such degrees, viz. the first and lowest that of superintendence, the second that of elevation, the third and highest that of suggestion. He ascribed the lowest degree—superintendence—to the historical parts of Scripture, which he thought could be very well composed quite apart from any Divine influence, and which it was sufficient that the Holy Ghost should generally supervise, as a merchant might read over and approve an ordinary business letter written without special directions by his clerk. But this is not an adequate or satisfactory theory as to the historical Scriptures, nor does it explain their

most remarkable features, viz. definite principle of selection, and their manifestly organic or Christocentric unity. The second degree of inspiration Doddridge found in the devotional and ethical parts of the Bible, in which the minds of the writers were "elevated" to a supernatural level of feeling and thought; and the third and highest degree of inspiration —direct suggestion—belongs to those passages in which entirely new truths and doctrines are revealed, and the great mysteries of redemption disclosed and interpreted. One favourite formula of this theory, and one that was a kind of watchword of orthodox dissent until quite recently, was, "All Scripture is inspired, and the new truths in it are revealed." But neither does this formula agree with modern and scriptural conclusions as to the meaning of the two words Inspiration and Revelation, nor does the theory of Assistance satisfy us as a whole. It is needlessly artificial and complex, arbitrary in many of its distinctions, and it does not meet the real difficulties of the Bible any better than does the theory of Verbal inspiration.

§ 31. III. The third leading theory is quite modern: it has been called the Theory of Illumination; the Mystical or Intuitional Theory, and by some the Dynamical Theory; though for reasons given already that name is misleading and unadvisable. It originated with Schleiermacher (*ob.* 1834) early in the century, and was introduced to England by S. T. Coleridge in his *Aids to Reflection* and *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit.* F. D. Maurice and F. W. Robertson helped greatly to give it currency, and it has found wide acceptance in Germany, in Great Britain, and in America, being extolled by its advocates as the only theory which is adapted to the new emancipated spirit of the age in which we live. It starts from the undoubted truth that illumination by the Holy Spirit is the privilege of every believer in Christ, and from the assumption that the inspiration of the sacred writers was identical in kind with this illumination, though greater in degree; anything that arouses our spiritual consciousness has in that fact a witness to its Divine origin and character, and deserves to be called "inspired." But

whilst there is much of this inspired and inspiring quality in other literature, there is an altogether unique body of it in the Bible, or as Coleridge put it in an oft-quoted sentence of the *Confessions:* "In the Bible there is more that finds me than I have experienced in all other books put together, and the words of the Bible find me at greater depths of my being." If, therefore, we are able to understand how any good Christian man is able to write a spiritual hymn or a spiritual book, we can understand how the various books of the Bible came to be written; and there is no difference in kind, but only a difference in degree between the illumination or spiritual intuition which lies behind any one of these as compared with any other. Hence the names which have been given to the theory, and also another name applied to Coleridge's exposition, viz. the theory of Gracious Inspiration, which suggests that the Biblical writings are the outcome of just such a gracious influence or inspiration as every Christian man enjoys.

It has been truly said of Schleiermacher as a religious teacher, that he is almost bound to push his disciples either up or down from his own peculiar standpoint, which only a few minds can occupy with certainty or comfort. This saying was illustrated in the fortunes of his doctrine of inspiration, both on the Continent and in England. The line which he drew between the spiritual and the natural was so very shadowy and vague, that many of his followers found it simplest to obliterate that line altogether, and to destroy all distinction between the spheres of religious consciousness and ordinary consciousness. Of course, to them, Inspiration became only another name for religious genius. Moses, John, Confucius, Mohammed, Zoroaster, Emerson, were all inspired men, and the Bible sank to the level of any book in which noble and stimulating thoughts are felt. This form of the Theory of Illumination is called the Naturalistic, and belongs to the group which we have already glanced at, and set aside as yielding no help whatever in our inquiries concerning the authority of the Bible. It has been expounded by J. D. Morell in his *Philosophy of Religion,* also by J. A. Picton in a book on Inspiration, and has had considerable vogue; but

it is too vague for use, and being based on Pantheistic principles it cannot possibly claim a place in any scheme of Christian theology.

A suspicion of the same vagueness and latent Pantheism attaches more or less to nearly every form in which this theory is presented to us by those who profess to distinguish between the natural and the spiritual spheres of consciousness. If they offered a clear criterion of spiritual illumination, and if they also recognised the essential element of revelation in every part of Scripture, giving it its unique character amongst all other truly spiritual books, their theory would come very near to being perfectly satisfactory. But for lack of these necessary completions the theory condemns itself to an indefiniteness which is no less dangerous than provoking; for example, one great watchword of the theory is, "The Bible contains the word of God, but it is not that word." If this be admitted, we must ask for some test by which to pick out from the Bible so much of it as is God's word; and the only test that is offered us is our own religious or spiritual consciousness. Whatever "finds" us deeply is God's word. Nothing could be more futile practically than this test, for many a passage "finds" us to-day that may leave us untouched to-morrow; every man who thinks himself spiritual may have a Bible of his own, and there will be no means of commending either all Scripture, or any part of it, as a supreme religious authority to any one except so far as he subjectively approves it. So thoroughly is this understood to be the practical result of the theory wherever it has displaced the older views, that it is quite common now to hear the remark, "The doctrine of inspiration is in solution"; "We have no longer any doctrine of inspiration." But we are not really reduced to this distressing penury, nor are we thrown back in despair upon the old theory of dictation, or the complicated theory of assistance. The facts which we have ascertained inductively from Holy Scripture, in regard to the methods and the ends of its composition, fall almost naturally into a fourth theory, which includes everything that is helpful and true in the other three theories, aud which might therefore be called—

§ 32. IV. The Comprehensive theory; but a better name is the theory of Sufficient Knowledge, or the theory of Gracious Purpose. Other names, *e.g.* Spiritual and Dynamical, have been suggested, but they are inappropriate for reasons which have been already given, or which are self-evident. No book has yet been written to expound the theory, but it was certainly held by Dean Alford; it is substantially the theory advocated by Dorner and by Martensen; it has been rather crudely sketched by Atwell in a book called *The Pauline Theory of Inspiration*, and it is taking firmer shape every day in the express words or implied thoughts of all leading evangelical theologians at home and abroad.

This fourth theory is founded upon two assumptions, both of which we have thoroughly examined in reference to their validity. They are—(1) the reality of a spiritual sphere of consciousness, and its essential distinction from the sphere of merely natural consciousness; (2) the definite end of that revelation which is recorded in the Bible, viz. to disclose God's gracious purpose towards His fallen creature man. These being the starting-points, the distinctive features of the theory are as follows:—1. A Divine element is to be recognised in every part of Scripture equally with a human element. The book is to be regarded as an organic whole—a Divine-human organism; and we are therefore warranted in saying that the Bible is God's word, and need not restrict ourselves to the formula of the third theory, "the Bible contains God's word." In other words, the fourth theory is emphatically Plenary and Dynamical, for it represents the Bible as pervaded by Divine power in every part. It is in this point that the fourth theory chiefly differs from the theory of Illumination, which last in many of its forms scarcely seems to deserve to be called a "plenary" theory, but melts away into the category of partial theories. 2. Each part of the Bible must be judged by its manifest special purpose in connection with God's gracious end in revelation generally. Though a Divine element is present in every part of the book, every part is not equally valuable nor equally authoritative; but, as Augustine used to teach, we must "distinguish the times," and we must also distinguish the

particular ends in each case. Here the fourth theory differs from the first or mechanical theory of dictation. It does not regard every part of the Bible as a perfect and infallible revelation, even though it accepts every part as a part of God's infallible and perfect word. 3. Every part of the Bible embodies a sufficient measure of knowledge and consequent utterance concerning some portion or aspect of God's gracious purpose; and this sufficient measure of knowledge was the outcome of supernatural inspiration of, and revelation to, the mind of the sacred writer. This is the most distinctive feature of the fourth theory, and the best key to all its details; it is here also that it clearly differs from the second theory of assistance, for it sets aside the notion of degrees in inspiration, and it recognises the necessity of revelation in the historical parts of Scripture, quite as much as in the prophetical and doctrinal parts. It also differs from the first theory in its dispensing with any supposed "impulse to write," and in its regarding the knowledge of the sacred writers as a sufficient warrant alike for their writing and for our acceptance of what they have written. The fourth theory also dispenses with the supposed *suggestio verborum* of the first theory, for we hold again that if the knowledge of the sacred writers was sufficient for its end in each case, those writers could be trusted to express themselves in appropriate words, and there was no need for the Holy Spirit to supply the form as well as the matter of their utterance in every case, or even to superintend and check that utterance in its spoken or written form. Yet the fourth theory finds ample room for, and explanation of, those parts of the Bible in which the very purpose of God's revelation required not only a suggestion of the matter, but also either or both of the other two notes of the theory of dictation, a suggestion of the words and an impulse to write. 4. Finally, the gracious purpose of God, as revealed in each part of the Bible, and the sufficiency of knowledge in the human writers of each several part, are not impaired nor brought into doubt through the imperfections which may be discoverable anywhere in the form, or even in the matter, of what has been written. For imperfection is inseparable from

the human element which everywhere pervades the Bible, and God has intentionally chosen to put His treasure of His revelation into these "earthen vessels," notwithstanding all the frailties and faults which, in our view, may attach to these mediums of heavenly mysteries (cf. 2 Cor. iv. 6, 7).

The working value of this theory of Sufficient Knowledge can be tested only by a thorough and careful application of it to each portion of Holy Writ in succession, and to each of the many familiar cases in which difficulty rarely fails to present itself even to minds that wish to find in the Bible an authoritative and unmistakable revelation of the thought and the will of God. Every theory of inspiration must be tried by this test of daily practical utility; and as compared with the other three theories which have been passed in review, the fourth theory has been pronounced by all who have honestly applied it to be far more helpful than any other, even when not absolutely satisfactory. In many cases it solves problems which remained in painful uncertainty when tried by other theories. What have been called the "moral difficulties of the Bible" especially lose nearly all their former apparent gravity when approached by this new method. We can accept the story of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac, of the Divine command to Moses and to Joshua to slaughter the Midianites and Canaanites, of Jael and Sisera, and all similar narratives, the Imprecatory Psalms, etc. All these we can accept as the outcome of sufficient knowledge and of combined inspiration and revelation, directed to a gracious end, and therefore parts of a Divine-human whole, without being entangled in any sophistical or painful inquiry whether each of these portions singly is a direct, perfect, and infallible revelation of Divine truth. But all this requires to be examined in detail and at leisure; in other words, we must complete our survey of this branch of theology by an experimental application of our theory of inspiration to the historical, prophetical, devotional, ethical, and doctrinal portions of Scripture in succession, and to the special difficulties which have been alleged as forbidding us to accept the Bible as God's true word, and therefore our supremely authoritative rule in religious belief and practice.

CHAPTER V.

THEORIES OF INSPIRATION TESTED.

§ 33. We now proceed to test the working value of the theory of inspiration which we have found to be most in accordance with the observed facts of Holy Writ, viz. the theory of Sufficient Knowledge; and also to compare the value with the corresponding efficiency of other theories when used to explain the same test cases.

I. We begin with those portions of the Bible which are purely or mainly historical in their character, such as Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Joshua, Judges, in the Old Testament, the Four Gospels and Acts in the New. The theory of Dictation, of course, regards these histories as absolutely unimpeachable on the score of accuracy. The smallest detail of each narrative was dictated by the Holy Spirit to the sacred penmen, and it was impossible for mistake of any kind to be made under these supernatural circumstances of composition. But this theory breaks down again and again in the presence of manifest discrepancies between the accounts of the same events in different parts of the Bible (*e.g.* Kings and Chronicles, the Four Evangelists, Genesis and Chronicles, Samuel and Chronicles), equally manifest improbabilities of statement, especially where numbers are in question (1 Sam. vi. 19), and variations in the reports given by different historians of the same words, even when these were spoken under

important and solemn circumstances, which ought to have guaranteed accurate reporting, as in the case of some of our Lord's utterances. The theory of Illumination finds no difficulty in these facts which are so destructive of the theory of dictation; it regards the histories of the Bible as no better and no worse than any other histories, and as equally liable with other histories to all the blemishes which result from ignorance, carelessness, indolence, and prejudice on the part of the writers. But such an opinion is ruinous to that confidence which we must repose in the Bible if it is to sustain our religious hopes, and to be to us a real authority in matters of faith and practice. If Genesis and the four Gospels have no better guarantee for the truthfulness of their contents than have Livy and the Saxon Chronicle, we can have no certainty either about Christ, or the good tidings which are preached to us through Him. We require a theory which will give us such a religious and theological certainty, and yet find room for the undeniable facts which we have seen to be fatal to a Theory of Dictation. The theory of Assistance and Direction professes to supply this need; but it does this by affirming a most questionable distinction between three grades of inspiration, the lowest of which, viz. that of superintendence, has given us the Historical books of the Bible. Moreover, under this theory of Degrees in inspiration, nothing in the nature of revelation is recognised in the ordinary narratives of Scripture. The writers of these narratives were left alone to select and use materials which offered themselves in a purely natural and ordinary way. No supernatural aid was either needed or granted in the marshalling of the facts recorded, all that the Holy Spirit did was generally to superintend the historians in their taste, and preserve them from serious or material error. No doubt this theory is satisfactory in a way, and a great many thoughtful men have been quite content with it.

But when we compare it with the theory of Sufficient Knowledge, the superiority of the last named as an explanation of all the phenomena of the case becomes very manifest. For, first, the gratuitous complication of a threefold inspiration is at once got rid of; and, secondly, the histories of the Bible are seen to be the outcome of exactly the same kind of

supernatural knowledge as was possessed by the prophets and apostles of the very highest rank. Inspiration and revelation were combined in the same way, and for the same end, in the consciousness of Moses, Samuel, Ezra, Isaiah, and Paul. For Scripture history consists in the truthful tracing of God's purpose of grace towards mankind, from the fall to the end of the world. None but a (religiously) inspired man could possibly write such a history; neither could he write it successfully unless there were supernaturally presented to him "the secret of the Lord" running through the whole course of time, and disentangling itself from all the confused mass of events in which a natural man would see only natural causes and results. Revelation was needed by the sacred penman to mark out on the background of universal history those particulars which pertained to the steady development of the kingdom of heaven upon earth; and when that revelation was presented to the inspired consciousness of Moses and his successors, all the conditions of their task were complete. They could be left to put their religious knowledge on permanent record, and that record would be sufficient for the Divine purpose in giving us the Bible. This is a far better supposition than is that of a mere guiding or superintending degree of inspiration from which to answer the advocate of a partial theory of inspiration, who says that the historical parts of the Bible are not to be taken as inspired because their writers needed nothing more than a good memory or ordinary diligence for compiling them. The ordinary answer to this is that these writers were favoured with a special influence from the Holy Spirit, which preserved them from such errors as the best of ordinary and uninspired historians continually fall into. But many readers would fairly demur to this statement, and say that they find a great many loose and inaccurate details in the sacred histories which seem scarcely in accordance with the idea of a Divine and unerring superintendence exercised over the writers. But without contesting this last point, we can meet the theory of partial inspiration decisively on this question by saying that no ordinary historian could have written the Bible histories, and that inspiration, *i.e.* an inward Divine preparation of the very

highest kind, was needed by the sacred writers to enable them—(1) to contemplate the facts of human history from a spiritual and not a temporal point of view; (2) to make a right selection of those facts; (3) to record and represent them in their due relations and proportions as a revelation of God's purpose of grace. For example, one of the most striking features of the Bible history is the singular gaps in its record; the frequent and long periods which are passed over without any notice at all; and the disproportionate space which is allotted to a few periods, and to certain special aspects of the record. This singularity suggests something more than a merely human industry and wisdom superintended by the Holy Ghost. It is nothing more nor less than the mark of supernatural genius in the spiritual sphere, the outcome of a special and peculiar knowledge of the deep things of God,—a knowledge that has sprung out of the inspiration of holy men, and the presentation to their inspired faculties of a real and heavenly revelation, such as is described in 1 Cor. ii. 6–10 (cf. Isa. lxiv. 4). The process which has thus given birth to the historical parts of Scripture is the same process which has given birth to the Psalms, the Prophecies, the Doctrinal Epistles, viz., *first*, the preparation of a human soul by a special energy of the Holy Ghost; *second*, a presentation to that prepared soul of truth which was previously unknown, either in itself or in its proper relations and effects; the result being that the inspired man breaks forth into words which faithfully embody the Divine thought which God has willed to communicate through him to the world (cf. John xx. 30). And it is quite consistent with this idea of true inspiration in the sacred historians that discrepancies and probable inaccuracies can be detected in many of the details of their narratives. None of these blemishes in the form of their history affects its matter, *i.e.* the clear revelation of God's purpose of grace. And there are reasons for which we might have expected that such blemishes of form would be found in the Bible, and may be glad and grateful that they are there; as to which by and by.

§ 34. II. As the theory of inspiration now given throws

much light upon the composition of the historical parts of Scripture, so does it explain better than any other the various facts connected with the prophetic Scriptures. Room is found in it for the predictions and prophetic descriptions, in uttering which, men were really a kind of mechanical organ of the Holy Spirit. For in these cases we suppose a revelation to have been made to the prophet, which he understood just well enough to express it aright, although much or even all of its meaning was hidden from himself. Such a revelation might come in the form of a vision or picture set before the eye, either of the body or the mind, and here the prophet's task would consist in describing faithfully what he saw (Dan. viii., perhaps also Isa. liii.); or, again, the prophet might hear a voice and record what it said without understanding the full import of his message (Dan. xii. 7–9, cf. Job iv. 12–16). Or a certain thought or suggestion might come supernaturally into his soul, and he be moved to utter it almost as the mouthpiece of the Holy Spirit (cf. Matt. x. 19, 20; Acts viii. 29); or it may be with full comprehension of his message. In one or other of these ways all the prophetic parts of Scripture must have come to be first uttered and then written down.

§ 35. III. Again, all the doctrinal and didactic parts of Scripture are explained in precisely the same way as the outcome of revelation presented to a duly prepared heart and mind; and the revelation in this case need not be a strictly new truth, but it may be only an old and familiar fact set in a new light or relation to other old and familiar notions. Thus Peter in his sermon on the day of Pentecost uttered a truth which was as old as Isaiah at least, but which he did not even then understand in its proper bearings, but which was revealed to him subsequently in those bearings by means of a vision at Joppa (cf. Acts ii. 39, x. 15–20, xi. 15–17). And all the apostles received continual revelations in the supernatural recalling to their memory of words previously spoken to them by our Lord, but which they had either quite forgotten, or failed to apprehend in their true force (cf. John xiv. 26, ii. 22, xii. 16).

§ 36. IV. The devotional parts of Scripture, *e.g.* the Psalms, which are not Messianic prophecies, the prayers and the pious meditations which continually recur throughout the Old and New Testaments, differ slightly from the rest of the Bible, in that the element or factor of immediate revelation does not enter into them so distinctly as it does into the other Scriptures. These portions of the Bible are the expression, not so much of spiritual knowledge as of spiritual emotion. They are utterances of men whose hearts and minds were Divinely prepared for the office of providing models of devotion for their own and all subsequent ages, and as such they are inspired as truly as any other parts of Scripture; but we find in them what we might have expected beforehand, viz. a much stronger subjective tinge than meets us in those passages where the object of the writers clearly is to convey pictures and thoughts which have been presented to them from without. The devotional parts of Scripture, on the contrary, seem intended to convey pictures and thoughts of what has arisen within the personal experience of the writers, and they must be judged from this point of view; *e.g.* the Psalms of Imprecation and such utterances as meet us in Ps. xliv. 17–22, are to be regarded as the expression of an elementary and imperfect religious experience, just as the histories of Jacob, David, etc., describe the acts of men who occupy a similar undeveloped stage of moral and spiritual education. And as it would be a grave mistake to represent the conduct of Jacob with regard to the birthright which he extorted from Esau, or the conduct of David in regard to Achish, king of Gath, as illustrating the ideal of a godly man's behaviour, so it would be foolish to regard Jacob's prayer at Bethel or David's imprecatory Psalms as expressing the ideal of a spiritual man's devotion. Such Prayers and Psalms are on record to show us the stages through which God's Spirit has caused the devotional impulses of His children to rise from the lowest ground of unregenerate selfishness to the purer regions of heavenlimindedness and love. It would probably be correct to recognise varying degrees of inspiration in these devotional parts of Scripture as compared amongst themselves; *i.e.* the spiritual preparation of mind and heart of which these psalms,

prayers, and meditations sprang, would in some cases be more extensive and intense, and in other cases less so, and the resulting compositions would differ in their value to us accordingly; *e.g.* Ps. xliv. or Ps. cix. would rank lower for the use of a spiritual man to-day than Ps. xlii. or Ps. cxvi., and we conclude that the spiritual condition of the writers of these Psalms was lower in the one case than it was in the other. But all these Psalms are alike the outcome of a true inspiration—the minds and the hearts from which they proceeded were specially and supernaturally prepared by God's Spirit.

There are several Psalms which, together with the "Song of Songs" or the "Song of Solomon," present one of the most difficult problems in connection with any theory of inspiration. These are the poems in which the writer seems to speak, partly in his own person, partly in the person of Messiah, or at least in the person of some mysterious individual other than himself, whom we are able to identify with Messiah. In such Psalms as xxii., xvi., lxix., lxxii., the personal and Messianic references are mingled in a very singular and perplexing manner, and a rather high degree of spiritual intelligence is needed to appreciate these Scriptures aright. It must be sufficient just now to say that a very large element of Revelation entered into their composition. It was revealed to the writers that they were types and forerunners in certain aspects and characters of the future Redeemer of Israel and the world; and their utterances are to be judged, like the Messianic predictions, by all the rules and limitations of interpretation which spring out of such principles as prophetic foreshortening and oriental insensibility to perspective.

§ 37. V. The ethical parts of Scripture, such as the books of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, are to be judged much in the same way as the devotional parts, *i.e.* they are the result of the presentation of moral truth to hearts and minds Divinely prepared to receive the revelation; but all manner of varying degrees may be recognised in the measure of that preparation, as compared with the perfect pattern of Divine intuition into

absolute morality, which has yielded for us the perfect ethical teaching of the God-man, Jesus Christ.

§ 38. Notice carefully that this recognition of possible degrees of inspiration as explaining the value of psalms compared with psalms, prophecies as compared with prophecies, doctrines as compared with doctrines, and some actions of inspired men as compared with other actions, has nothing whatever in common with the theory which regards the historical parts of Scripture as the outcome of a low degree of inspiration, the devotional and ethical parts as the outcome of a higher degree, and the prophetic and doctrinal as resulting from a degree of inspiration higher still. The same inspiration has given birth to History, Prophecy, Psalms, Epistles, and every part of the Bible; the same Spirit has prepared the hearts and minds of all the writers for their task, and that task had one common and identical end, viz. to record God's self-revelation to man in grace. It is utterly wrong and misleading to speak of the histories as being less inspired than the prophecies, or to depreciate the Epistles as compared with the Gospels, or the Pentateuch as compared with the Psalms, on the supposed ground that the slighted portions have little or no claim to the special value which stands connected with the notion of inspiration. We are to recognise all Scripture as "given by Divine inspiration," and as having a common and equal value because of that fact, although in the specific uses of the various parts there will, no doubt, be an infinitely varying value, both objective and subjective, in the separate items of the Word of God. But all these separate items are indissolubly bound together by the common fact of inspiration in the minds and hearts through which they have come down to us. In other words, the Bible is an organised whole, and as such deserves the name from first to last of "God's true Word," or "The Record of Divine Revelation." And of every separate part which Providence has caused to enter into the composition of the whole, we are entitled to conclude that it was necessary to the value and completeness of the whole. God's Spirit was presumably a better judge in this

matter than we can be, and whatever He has given us in the sacred volume we are to accept as having its proper and necessary place therein. We are not, in our human self-will, to dissect any such part out of its providentially-ordered place, and to pronounce it "uninspired," or "no part of God's Word," or "unworthy of the name of revelation," for it may be that by such a dissection the very life and spirit of the whole revelation may be distinctly injured and impaired. The totality of the Bible constitutes God's word to man, and if any parts of that totality seem to us "weak and foolish," we may remember with profit the words of Paul in 1 Cor. i. 25–29, and illustrate their lesson from the personality of Paul himself. That inspired man was chosen in his totality to be God's elect apostle to Gentiles and kings and the people of Israel. Undoubtedly his bodily presence was weak and his speech contemptible; his style of argument was peculiar, and open to logical and literary criticism; his cast of thought was somewhat Rabbinical, and in many other respects he fell short of ideal perfection as a messenger from God to men. Yet it would be fatal to the purpose and effect of his apostleship were we to single out any feature in Paul's personality, and to say, "God did not send this—did not choose this." We can even understand how the "infirmities" of Paul were essentially bound up with the intention and with the success of his apostleship, and we find him glorying in them accordingly (2 Cor. xii. 9). We may apply the analogy to the Bible as a whole, and say that if we could look at the whole matter from God's point of view, we should perceive that there is nothing in it unnecessary, nothing superfluous, nothing unworthy of the highest conception of Divine inspiration, as attaching to its subsistence as an organised whole, and to the composition of every one of its separate parts. There can be no doubt that the more a spiritually-minded man familiarises himself with the contents of the Bible, the more convinced he becomes that it is pervaded in every part with the tokens of this common inspiration, and the more fully does he recognise this intimate connection and interdependence of all its parts. He learns to accept the assertion of Rom. xv. 4 in its strictest and

most literal sense, and he applies to the corporate unity of Scripture the same considerations which Paul has applied to a singularly parallel question, viz. the corporate unity of the Church, and the dependence of the noblest members of that spiritual body upon the honourable care of the humblest (1 Cor. xii. 14–26).

§ 39. This aspect of the question evidently involves a certain clear and positive conviction as to the Canon of Scripture, for we need to know the exact limits of that collection of writings to which this corporate unity belongs. It is, in fact, impossible to separate any theory of inspiration from a corresponding theory as to the formation of the Canon, and it is here that the weakness of the orthodox Protestant Theory has generally been detected both by Rationalists and by Roman Catholics. The last named have said, "You could not know what books were really inspired if the Church had not enrolled them in the Canon; therefore the Church's authority is really superior to the authority of Scripture," and rationalists have argued that the formation of the Canon was a purely natural and human process, in which reason alone judged the claims of the various books; therefore, say they, the alleged organic unity of the Bible is either imaginary and unreal, or it is the result of an arbitrary Church opinion which we are quite at liberty to disregard. The answer to both these serious objections is suggested very naturally by the theory of inspiration above given. It is that neither a purely human reason nor a limited ecclesiastical inspiration superintended the formation of the Canon, but it was the same Divine Spirit who prompted the writing of the several books, and Who still bears witness to every regenerate soul concerning their authority and their value. We need not fear to admit that the combined inspiration and revelation which gave birth to Holy Scripture, implied of necessity a corresponding combination of inspiration and revelation in the case of the men to whom Scripture came, effectually preparing their hearts and minds to recognise God's word, and then presenting that word convincingly in the pages of the Bible. We have seen already that the Canons both of Old and New

Testaments were formed, not suddenly or at a single stroke, but gradually and by an almost insensible growth of conviction, amongst the men who were competent judges of the matter, because they themselves possessed the same Spirit who had energised the writers of the Bible. Nor is the question of the Canon settled to-day in any other sense than this, that we have a moral certainty that the voice of the Spirit which has spoken, if not absolutely through all, yet through the great majority of spiritual men up to this time in one way, will not contradict itself in the consciousness of spiritual men who may live from now to the end of the dispensation. It is not the voice of any council or hierarchy calling itself "the Church," nor is it the verdict of pure human reason, that has given us that Canon of Scripture which we recognise as an organised whole possessing corporate unity. But it is the Holy Spirit Himself who caused and still causes spiritual men to receive in grateful meekness the separate books of Scripture, and the complete body of God's word in which those books are the appointed members. And it may be fearlessly affirmed that the more spiritual any man is, the more heartily and the more unhesitatingly does he recognise "all Scripture" as "given by inspiration of God," the more wonderingly and gratefully does he acknowledge the book, the whole book, and nothing but the book, as the written Word of God.

Hence the theory of inspiration above given, and which we may call the "Spiritual Theory," will carry with it as its complement the belief that a special providence watched over the collection of both the Canons, and insured their completeness and their freedom from superfluous writings. We know that in the case of the Old Testament such a character and consequent authority was recognised by our Lord in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms; nor is there much room for doubt that this enumeration covered exactly our Old Testament Canon, neither more nor less. As to the New Testament, a similar conclusion is warranted by the substantial agreement of all Christendom to accept these books, all of them and no others; and by the steady persistence of that agreement under the most varied circumstances of thought,

culture, religious tendency, and spirit of the age, ever since that early date (about A.D. 170) at which we find the Christian Church in possession of practically the same New Testament Canon as our own, and professing to have received it by unquestioned tradition from its inspired authors. The more the history of the Canon is examined, the more does a religious man feel himself led to recognise the hand of God therein. A special providence is suggested by all the facts; and we know that such a special providence was foreshadowed by Christ in John xvi. 13–15. Whether the result is worthy of the supposition, is a question to be answered by the Christian consciousness of every spiritual man who has been long a diligent and prayerful student of the sacred volume in both its parts.

CHAPTER VI.

SOME DIFFICULTIES OF INSPIRATION.

§ 40. ALL the difficulties connected with the subject of inspiration are not answered finally and conclusively by the theory above given, although there is no theory which meets so many of those difficulties in an equally satisfactory way. There are two points in particular upon which plausible objections can still be fairly raised. The first concerns—

I. The character of the men whom God is alleged to have inspired as the writers of Holy Scripture. It seems at first sight natural to assume that these men should have occupied a higher level intellectually, morally, and spiritually than we find them actually to have occupied. And though the theory above given will have prepared us for intellectual and moral defects in the human mediums of Divine revelation, yet that theory itself would lead us to expect that every inspired man would be eminently a spiritual man, a dweller in the sphere of regenerated life, and that his utterances and his writings would bear a manifest witness to this spiritual state. Now, as a matter of fact, it is decidedly in favour of our theory that the writing of Holy Scripture, so far as we can identify the writers, has been thus committed to spiritual men, and to none others. From Moses to Ezra, and from Matthew

to Jude and John, these sacred scribes were clearly men who walked habitually in the Spirit; but a rigid consistency of theory would require that every case of inspiration which is recorded in Scripture should, in like manner, have been confined to regenerated and spiritual men, whereas we find at least two notable instances in which wicked men were employed as inspired mediums of revelation; and one of these cases—that of Balaam—is very strong, being our chief example for illustrating what the state of prophetic inspiration was (Num. xxii.–xxiv. [especially xxiv. 2–4, 15–19]; 1 Kings xiii. 11–22). The only answer to this objection is, that the prediction of future events is not a matter which necessarily implies a spiritual preparation of the man to whom a vision of the future is revealed, and the cases cited are mere isolated instances of such prediction, which do not destroy the general rule. Moreover, no such person as Balaam, or the Lying Prophet, was employed, so far as we know, to write any part of either Canon.

§ 41. II. The second objection is a very old one, and will probably never be removed by any theory of inspiration, viz. that to the moral character of many of the matters in Holy Scripture which we allege to have been uttered or written as the result of Divine revelation to inspired men, *e.g.* the trial of Abraham (Gen. xxii.), the slaughter of the Midianites by Moses, and of the Canaanites by Joshua; all these being represented as embodying the true commands of God. All the instances that are sometimes classed with these as moral difficulties in the Bible, are not really so, but are easily discernible to be simple historical records of acts which God neither approved nor commanded, and the record of which is given quite as much to test our faculty of discerning good and evil as to make the story complete; such as Jacob's deception of his father Isaac and extortion of Esau's

birthright, Jael's assassination of Sisera, David's polygamy, and others. Of the real difficulties which remain after these false instances have been set aside, some can be met by a fair appreciation of all the circumstances of the case, and by an application of the higher standard of Divine justice, which is without partiality and without hypocrisy; for many objections are flagrantly hypocritical or the offspring of prejudice. Others are very simply explained by the great principle of development, or gradual education of our race in morals and in religion, no less than in intellectual science. And the small residuum of perplexity that may be left even for a devout and humble mind, even when all these considerations have been fairly weighed, will probably seem after deeper light to be amongst the most conclusive proofs that the Bible is really the record of Self-revelation by One whose ways are higher than our ways, and His thoughts than our thoughts. For if, in an alleged revelation of God, there were absolutely nothing which transcended the moral and intellectual apprehension of man, a door would surely stand open for the inference that man might have imagined and invented this story, since there was nothing superhuman in it.

§ 42. A most helpful and instructive analogy is suggested to us in this matter from the fact that the phrases, "Word of God," "Word of Life," are used equally to describe Holy Scripture and that personal manifestation of Deity in the flesh whom history knows as Jesus of Nazareth, called the Christ (cf. John i. 1, 14; 1 John i. 1, 2). There is indeed one passage, Heb. iv. 12, 13, about which commentators have always disputed whether it should be explained of the written letter of Scripture or of the living Spirit of Christ. In other words, one and the same phrase applies to two great phenomena in connection with Christianity, the Bible and the Person of Christ. This suggests—(1) that there is probably some real resemblance between the two phenomena; (2) that similar difficulties will probably be found in the explanation

of both. Now the resemblance lies in the blending of Divine and human elements to constitute, on the one hand, a unique Personality, and, on the other, a unique book. Christ was truly man, born, nourished, developing, living, and dying in all respects like ourselves; yet in every stage and moment of His life something Divine is seen to be inseparably mingled with and underlying His humanity. In like manner, the Bible has come into existence after the fashion of other human literature. We can trace its growth, we can account for the form of each one of its constituent parts; yet in each part and in the whole we are obliged to recognise something that is superhuman, unparelleled, and unaccounted for by any purely natural hypothesis. There is a deep and provoking mystery in each of these related problems to which the same name "Word of God" or "Word of Life" is given. And the history of theological speculation in regard to each problem has run a precisely similar course. The Doctrine of Christ's Person has always oscillated between two extremes, viz. in one direction, Doketism, *i.e.* the view that His humanity was only a semblance and a deceptive veil for the Deity which alone constitutes His real and entire nature; and in the opposite direction, Ebionitism, *i.e.* the view that He was a man and nothing more, having Divinity only in the same sense in which other men possess the Image and Likeness of God. The first of these heresies was the earliest to appear, for it was the more plausible of the two, and seemed both easier to believe and more in accord with religious instinct; but it ignored an extensive and important body of facts; and its extravagance led inevitably to the opposite heresy, which has always been the favourite with those who acknowledge no higher judge than reason. Thus for eighteen centuries orthodox Christology has had to steer a middle course between the error which supresses our Lord's human nature and that which denies His Divine nature.

Exactly in the same way the doctrine of Holy Scripture has always oscillated between a Doketism which reduces the human element in the Bible to a deceptive unreality, and a Naturalism which explains away every Divine element in the book save only those which may be found in any fine

specimen of ordinary literature. And the Doketism came first because it seemed to give the easiest explanation of the phenomenon; but its manifest extravagance has always brought about a powerful reaction towards the opposite and rationalistic pole. And we must expect to find orthodoxy in this department of theology midway between the two extremes, exactly as it is in the doctrine of Christ's Person.

It is, then, a distinct recommendation of the Theory of Sufficient Knowledge that it seems to run parallel with what has long been recognised as the Catholic Christological dogma. One cardinal point of that dogma is that in Christ two natures were united in one personal self-consciousness, the union being "without confusion or change, and also without the possibility of division or separation." These phrases might be used without alteration to describe our estimate of the union between Divine and human elements in Holy Scripture. Again, orthodox Christology accepts, without attempting to explain, the assertion of Phil. ii. 6, that our Lord "emptied Himself" in order to become incarnate; stripped Himself of all that He could lay aside, and still remain Divine; brought down His Infinite self-consciousness to the limits of human conditions of existence in everything except sin. He "increased in wisdom as in age" (Luke ii. 52); and even at the end of His earthly life He declared that certain things were unknown to Him notwithstanding His Divinity (Mark xiii. 32). This mystery of the God-man's earthly growth and limitation exactly corresponds with features which we have seen to attach to the written Word of God in its growth through many ages, and in its limitations even in its completed form. And just as the Holy Spirit was given to the Incarnate Word in fullest measure according to the needs of His earthly work (cf. John iii. 34), so according to the theory of Sufficient Knowledge is the Bible a written record of spiritual knowledge sufficient and complete for every end for which each single portion of the book was penned. Yet, again, just as the unique personality of Christ can be recognised only by souls that the Holy Ghost has quickened and illuminated (cf. 1 Cor. xii. 3; 2 Cor. iv. 4, 6), whilst to all others our Lord seems nothing more than an ordinary man (Isa. liii. 2), so the chief New Testament

passage upon which our Theory of the Bible is based, declares that a natural man cannot receive the things which make up the contents of this book, but they are spiritually discerned by the spiritual alone (1 Cor. ii. 14). Yet the natural man has no excuse for his unbelief and indifference in regard to the Bible, for the wonderful results which follow from the humble acceptance of its teaching by others ought to convince him that it is indeed the "Word of God," just as our Lord declared that those who rejected Him were self-condemned, for they ought to have believed Him "for the very works' sake" (cf. John xiv. 11, iii. 2).

§ 43. The parallel is very close and very instructive, extending even to the difficulties which are alleged in reference to the two doctrines respectively. The only difference between those difficulties is that the one set—that which gathers around the doctrine of Christ's Person—is intellectual, as indeed might have been expected when we try to comprehend the mystery of Deity subjecting His Infinitude to the limitations of finite human existence. But the other set of difficulties—that which gathers around the Bible—is mainly moral, as again we might have guessed they would be when the gracious purpose of a holy and yet a merciful God had to be unfolded gradually under the conditions of human history and human literature. But just as the intellectual difficulties of Christology become insignificant in comparison with the overwhelming certainty which possesses us in regard to Him whom the Spirit reveals to us as "the True God and Eternal Life" (cf. 1 John v. 20), so do the moral difficulties of the Bible dwindle into practical unimportance, when by happy personal experience we learn the value of the book as a very "Word of Life" to our souls (cf. Ps. cxix. 130). And we are entitled to believe that the presence of these difficulties was permitted, or even providentially ordained, for the purpose of testing our fitness to receive the revelation of God's grace, our humility, our consciousness of inward need and insufficiency, our willingness to be enlightened and instructed by the Holy Spirit. Such was one of the ends for which our Lord's incarnation was

made, not overwhelmingly self-evident to all men, but susceptible of doubt and denial by conceited and carnal minds (cf. Isa. viii. 14–17; Luke ii. 34, 35.)

§ 44. The analogy above suggested may be followed into some details, with the result of reciprocal illumination and confirmation of more than one conclusion to which good men come instinctively in regard both to the Living and the Written Word, yet without being able to justify them logically. The letter of Scripture and all that pertains to its outward form, such as style, diction, historical statement of fact, logic, rhetoric, and so forth, correspond to the fleshly and material aspects of our Lord's humanity; and similarly the matter of Scripture, *i.e.* its inward burden of warning, comfort, promise, and declaration of the thought and purpose of God towards our fallen race, corresponds to the human soul and spirit of our Lord; and it is in this last-named pair, not in the first, that the general sense of Christian men regards the Divinity of our Lord and of Scripture respectively to be inseparably inherent. Christ Himself said of His own flesh, and of those words of His which are now recorded in the Gospels, that they were unprofitable so far as their outward form was concerned (John vi. 63); and no reasonable or reflective man would ever regard the actual flesh of Christ as inseparably and for ever pervaded by His Deity. Yet, whilst He wore that flesh, it was truly Divine, and deserved all the reverent and awed consideration which we are sure His disciples felt and showed toward it. It was the indispensable vehicle of that real humanity of thought, feeling, and will to which Divinity has been inseparably conjoined, and which is to-day exalted at God's right hand in the Person of the God-man; and any one who had despised or depreciated the flesh of Christ during His earthly life would have shown himself by that very fact unfit to receive the revelation of Christ's Divine Manhood, which yet was perfectly separable in thought and in fact from that flesh. Similarly the Divine character of Scripture dwells inseparably, not in its letter and outward form as above described, but in its matter and spirit; we can think away the letter

and distinguish it from the spirit, and perceive how comparatively unimportant the mere vehicle of Divine revelation is, yet we instinctively revere and love the Bible as a book; we cherish it devoutly and affectionately as the disciples cherished their Master's material form; and this attitude of ours towards the book is not Bibliolatry, neither is it inconsistent with our freedom of criticism in regard to grammar, logic, rhetoric, etc., in the Bible, which on principle we subordinate to the spirit and substance of revelation in the book, just as Paul says he had learned to deal with his knowledge of Christ, which was merely "after the flesh" (cf. 2 Cor. v. 16).

We can, with all reverence, imagine that physical blemishes might have been apparent in the Person of Christ as men looked upon Him during His earthly life. His members might have been imperfect or maimed or deformed, yet such a circumstance would not have detracted from the reality and power of His Divinity. Some of the Christian Fathers believed that our Lord was thus deformed and unsightly in appearance, and said that He must have been so in order to fulfil such Old Testament predictions concerning Him as we find in Isa. liii. 2, 3; Ps. xxii. 6. We do not accept this view any more than we expect, as do the Jews, that when Messiah is revealed it will be as a Leper sitting amongst the diseased outcasts of the city Rome. But these curious opinions show us that many keen intelligences have found no difficulty in clothing their conception of Divinity in a separable garment of human imperfection and weakness, and have not faltered in their recognition of the Divine reality and substance because of these undeniable blemishes of form. Why, then, should any one allege in regard to the Bible that it cannot be Divine in its matter unless it is also faultless in its literary form according to the ever-shifting standards of human taste, human logic, or human conceptions of perfection in science, in history, in philosophy, and even in morality?

If Jesus Christ would have been none the less the true God-man revealing His Father to sinners for their salvation, even though He had been full of physical blemishes and deformities, it ought not to destroy or weaken our faith in the Bible as in like manner a Divine-human word of life

for sinners, if we discern in it many things that the nineteenth century Englishman might deem bad taste, faulty logic, historical inaccuracy, crude science, childish philosophy, and undeveloped ethic. All these things honestly considered may be but illustrations of the great principle which, according to Paul, pervades the whole economy of Redemption (see 1 Cor. i. 18–29), and to which our Lord undoubtedly referred in such words as Matt. xi. 25, 26; Luke xvii. 20. One chapter in Second Corinthians (ch. iii.) is especially instructive on this point, teaching us distinctly in regard to the Law of Moses that its form was transitory and doomed to perish, yet glorious through its temporary connection with the abiding substance. The apostle extends the lesson of this fact to the New Testament, of which he says that the "letter" might even "kill," but the Spirit giveth life (2 Cor. iii. 6–11).

§ 45. The analogy above expounded is, like Butler's argument of the same name, a double-edged weapon, and, with some minds, the result of using it might be dangerous and even disastrous. If a man has firm faith in Christ as the Divine-human Revealer and Reconciler of God to men, this analogy will throw a wondrous light upon the character of Holy Scripture, and will lift up the written word in his esteem and faith to the high level of his thoughts about the Incarnate Word. But if a man have unsettled and sceptical views about Christ, this analogy may tend to unsettle him still further, and to drag down his thoughts about the Incarnate Word to the low level of his previous thoughts about the Written Word. Hence caution should be observed in the bringing forward of this line of argument. Yet, as in the case of Butler's *Analogy*, the acknowledged risk will often be well worth running; for if a man sees that there is no logical alternative between the acceptance of the Divine-human mystery in both cases and its rejection equally in both, he may pause in just dread of the consequences which would follow the double rejection, and may be led to more serious examination of the questions thus closely linked with the final result of a simple and happy belief in both the Incarnate and the Written Word.

PART III.

LECTURES ON PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

LECTURES ON PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY: TRANSITION FROM COLLEGE TO A PASTORATE.

THE subject of these conferences is that branch of ministerial preparation and practice which bears the technical name "*Pastoral Theology*"—a term which sufficiently describes the scope of the study, viz. all that pertains to the "pastoral" work of one whom Christ sends forth into His Church to carry on the task which He Himself began as "the Shepherd and Bishop of souls." It embraces the administrative and practical part of a Christian minister's office, as distinguished from his office as a teacher; and I need hardly remind you that, in the primitive Churches of apostolic days, the "pastor" was not necessarily a "teacher," nor the teacher a pastor. The primitive organisation made provision in its plurality of elders for the full and economical employment of all the spiritual gifts which were distributed amongst the individual members of a presbytery. One man attended to prophecy, *i.e.* preaching (cf. Rom. xii. 6–8), another to the systematic instruction of the flock in the doctrines and the moral precepts of the gospel; but over against these teaching elders were other elders charged with the administration of the new society's affairs; its discipline; the visitation of its sick and suffering; the gathering and distribution of its finances; the relief of its poor; the watchful care of its weaker and its youthful members; the little children alike in

age and in grace. It is with this second body of functions that Pastoral Theology is properly concerned. Only, as our modern congregational system has concentrated into the single hand of the minister, not only all these pastoral duties, but also the work of the prophet, evangelist, and teacher, the scope of our study is made perforce a little wider than its name denotes. It must encroach a little on ground that strictly belongs to Homiletics; and so well is this understood by professed teachers of the art, that the two subjects, Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, are usually combined in one professorship, and in one printed manual or text-book, whenever the second of these subjects is taken up at all for the purpose of instructing the Christian minister. Unfortunately, in all the denominations, from the Episcopal Church of England to the smallest Dissenting sect, there has, for the most part, been a strange neglect to teach, in colleges and theological seminaries, these two allied branches, but especially the pastoral and administrative branch. Young men have been sent out into the active work of the ministry more or less well trained in Biblical science, in systematic divinity, and in cognate studies, every one of which is indispensable for "a workman who shall not need to be ashamed"; but the science and art of preaching have too often been slighted by the teachers, with the natural result of comparative neglect by the students; whilst the science and art of administration in Christ's Church have still oftener been passed over in absolute silence as though they either could not be taught in theory, or were so easy and natural that they could be safely left to teach themselves.

Now, there is no doubt that if a young man has the true calling of a Christian minister from God, he will certainly learn, by experience in the actual field of Church work, and in the course of a few years, perhaps even of a few months, all that I can offer to set before you theoretically in these conferences on Pastoral Theology. So also, if he is called of God to preach, he will learn to preach by practice, though he have never studied Homiletics at college; just as boys, cast into deep water by their elder brothers, learn to swim without ever passing through the hands of a professor of

natation. But I need not spend time in justifying my present task from the objections of inutility and superfluity. I want, if possible, to save you from the mortifying, and even, in some cases, the heart-breaking experiences which a first pastorate rarely fails to inflict on a young minister who essays untaught to wield the spiritual shepherd's crook. To be forewarned in the matter will be for some of you to be forearmed; and for all of you it ought to be, at least, as useful practically as you have already found a course in Homiletics to be. Besides, I have to think of the Churches as well as of you, and I hope that they also may be benefited indirectly through our conferences, by being spared the sowing of a few of those "wild oats" of pastoral extravagance and folly which, like their analogues in nature, are not to be extirpated in a single season, or even in two or three; but may even become perennial roots of bitterness, springing up to trouble the rash young novice's successors in the charge, long after he has left the field a sadder and a wiser man.

Paul has given, through Timothy, a direction which has ceased to have any practical import for our communities since their compression of the many-membered presbytery of primitive Church polity into the one official personage whom they call "pastor." He recommends that "the elders who rule well be counted worthy of a double salary, especially they who labour in the word and in teaching" (1 Tim. v. 17), as well as in ruling. He means, of course, that if one under-shepherd did his pastoral work well, whilst another did it ill, the money "hire" which was allotted to the second should be taken from him and given to his brother-servant. So far as the good "pastor and teacher" is concerned, I could wish that the spirit of this direction were fulfilled nowadays, in a much augmented scale of money recognition of your future labours in the Churches. For, as yet, there are only a few of our communities that have fully realised what Scripture means when it saith, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, The labourer is worthy of his reward" (1 Tim. v. 18). But having said that, I am bound also to confess a wish, that in the case of poor, inefficient,

and incompetent pastors, the Churches would apply the converse of Paul's rule, and would halve the salary, inadequate though it may be already, of the elder, who being a good preacher is only a bad pastor; who rules ill, and does not know how he ought to behave himself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth. But even this punishment of the shepherd would not cure or compensate the damage which, by his ignorance, self-will, and self-conceit, a young man, fresh from college, where he has studied no "Pastoral Theology," may easily in a few ill-starred months inflict upon the flock.

A theoretical study of Pastoral Theology can do much to prevent the sad, but very common, result to which I have just alluded. It will do much more in the same direction if it be joined with the practical observation of Church work which a student can generally secure, if he chooses, in some large, well-organised, well-officered church in the neighbourhood of his college. The details of Church work pass unnoticed before the eyes of ordinary Church members, including nine out of ten of those young men who are thinking of the Christian ministry as their future life-work; and a student who, before he came to college, rarely missed a Church meeting where he might, if he had known how to use his eyes and ears, have guessed nearly all the secrets of Church management, often finds himself utterly helpless and at sea in the conduct of the first Church meeting at which he presides after his settlement as a pastor. But if, during his college course, and whilst he is studying in books or under teachers the theory of Pastoral Theology, he were to join the best organised Church within his reach; were to attend its Church meetings with his eyes and ears opened, and his professional curiosity awakened; if he were to use with frank alacrity the offers which the minister and deacons of that Church have probably made him in all sincerity to use their society as a minor help to his ministerial training,—he would most undoubtedly amass, little by little, an inestimable store of hints and precedents, of principles and reminiscences, which, when applied by his sanctified common sense, would make his first experience in the pastorate exceptionally easy and

incontestably successful. Even a small church that is not a model of order and decency in its proceedings, might furnish a useful field of observation to a student who has learned how to read the negative suggestions which those proceedings will probably raise for a thoughful spectator. And therefore I hold it on every ground desirable that students in college should formally associate themselves with churches near their place of study, and should diligently use the privileges of members, as well as duly discharge their corresponding obligations. For a Nemesis is very likely to wait upon the pastor who, as a student, grieved his own pastor's heart by neglecting or slighting the duties of Church membership. As in an army, the man who is slow to obey when he is under orders is sure to find slowness in others when his turn comes to give orders to them; so in the Church, the idle, or scornful, or self-indulgent member, should he ever become an officer amongst his brethren, will rarely fail to find retributive pain in the conduct of those over whom he is set. As he gave, so shall it be given to him, loyalty if he was loyal, frowardness if he was froward.

Another great advantage would undoubtedly be found by a student in this matter of his pastoral novitiate, if he could spend it under the guidance of a wiser and an older minister, serving him in the guise of a curate or assistant without stickling for the false point of honour involved in these names, as distinguished from the title and status of co-pastor. Unfortunately, the opportunity of serving such a useful apprenticeship is not often offered, even to the young men who are secretly longing to discern it; and in our body the would-be "rector" is at least as rare an advertiser of his wishes as the would-be "curate." Hence I say nothing more on this point, except that if it should ever be the good fortune of one of you to be called to that inferior post of service in a church which Hugh Stowell Brown called a *ministerial apprenticeship*, you will do wisely to accept the call, and, for a year or two, to bear with meekness and self-renunciation the yoke which may possibly be very galling in some respects, for even a Paul is not always just and considerate in regard to his helper, John Mark. But the profit

which a good man will gain in this trial of his Christian graces will redound unspeakably to his future official success; and Paul himself, though he may have parted in some heat of anger from his young colleague, will be the first to bear witness to his worth, when, by and by, there is required in some place of special trust a man proved, and therefore "profitable for the ministry" (2 Tim. iv. 11).

But it is time to leave introductory matters, and to offer a few hints and opinions on the special topic of to-day, viz. *the Transition of a Student from College to a Pastorate.*

How shall the trying ordeal of a *probationary visit* to a place that is wholly strange be encountered and passed through? It cannot be avoided, and it must always be disagreeable in a hundred ways to a soul that has native refinement and delicacy. I do not say "self-respect," because there is nothing in the general conception of a probationary visit that ought to offend a genuine self-respect; and the Christian gentleman who in his heart "honours all men," and behaves accordingly, will never fail to meet a corresponding honour. But strangers who really respect you, and who honestly wish to be kind towards you, may sorely vex and grieve you by their roughness and want of tact; and no one knows better than he who addresses you, how unpleasant and painful it is to feel that inquisitive eyes are keenly scrutinising you, and shrewd intelligences weighing you in balances of which you never heard before, and in which, for all that, your probationary fate is hung. But recollect that Churches have a clear right on every ground to canvas and criticise candidates from every point of view, spiritual, intellectual, moral, and social. Only *they* know the conditions which a pastor's character and bearing must fulfil if he is to do Christ's work successfully amongst them; and they are entitled to try the stranger in reference to all these special and local tests, as well as in reference to the fundamental requisites of grace and knowledge, and aptness to teach, and a good repute with those who are without. Therefore I say very emphatically—Go frankly more than half-way to meet these strangers to whom you also are strange. Make a fresh and a special effort to mortify self-love for Christ's sake, and for His work's sake

(Rom. xv. 1, 2); try to please every one for his good unto edification, and cease to care about pleasing yourself. Be your very best in everything,—not your worst, your rudest, your least amiable, as some men really seem to be of set purpose on these occasions; supposing, I imagine — but very falsely—that they are doing homage to some Moloch of a fancied virtue. Christian sincerity and truthfulness require us to show in all its fulness the spirit of that we profess to have received. There is a contemptible though common hypocrisy of ungraciousness, of which I am sure students need to be warned, far more than any hypocrisy of holiness and love; and it is treason to one's best self, and still more to one's Master, Whose honour is in our hands, if we wantonly give offence to any, either to Gentiles or to the Church of God (1 Cor. x. 32, 33). The apostle, whose words I am echoing in this sentence, goes on to say, "Even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they may saved. Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ" (1 Cor. xi. 1).

Next, as to the principles and the considerations by which you are to be guided in accepting or in declining a *call to the pastorate* over some particular church, I cannot do better than give you a summary of Vinet's teaching on this point, adding to it one or two reflections of my own. First, Vinet says, "we should regard, not personal conveniences or inconveniences in this matter, but rather the amount of strength, the kind of talent, the circumstances of the parish, the need it has of us rather than any other, or of any other rather than us. When this question has been disposed of, but not till then, we may consult also our convenience and special interest." And then he adds, "Discard also all considerations which are not taken from the nature of things, from interest in the kingdom of God, and from the direct and indirect instructions of the Divine Word;" and speaking of the plan, which some adopt, of remaining passive, he says, "It is true that self-renunciation is very useful, that it is dangerous to use the will where considerations of interest mix themselves up with those of duty. But we must be cautious, lest, while we think we are making a sacrifice to humility, we are in reality presenting

an oblation to indolence. What is prescribed is not inactivity, but that we should purify our intention by prayer, and not act without full conviction." [1]

To this I would add, that in weighing the reasons for and against accepting a certain call, there are two contrary sources of self-deception and false bias against both of which you will need to be on your guard, for each waits upon the other; and the very rebound of the current that may have saved you from the perils of the first, may carry you into the resistless whirlpool of the second danger. These two dangers are, on the one hand, a spirit of self-seeking, a desire to glorify, or aggrandise, or enrich, or in any way to please one's own self; on the other hand, a spirit of morbid asceticism, a craving after the bitter-sweet sensation of self-denial for self-denial's sake, a self-discipline which has its end, not where Christ placed it when He bade us renounce our very life for His sake and for the gospel's, but only in that disguised egoism which expects and desires to save life by losing it,—a paralogism that is as false in religion and in morals as it is in its outward form of language. Not unfrequently the deepest and most poignant self-denial for Christ's sake requires a man to brave the whispers of onlookers and the suspicion of his own jealous conscience and heart, that he is seeking great things for himself in taking up the charge which Providence is clearly forcing upon his hands. It is easier to stand with Moses at Horeb declining the honour of kingship in Jeshurun, even to the face of an angry God, than it is to stand with Cromwell at Westminster, laying firmly hold upon the sceptre, amidst the sneers and the mock congratulations of low-thoughted, ungenerous, and therefore unjust men. If any one of you should be ever brought into the anxious strait between these two snares, the fear of what men may say, the fear of what your own strength may fail to do, let faith in God be the victory by which you overcome the world which speaks in both these coward voices—"For do I now persuade men or God? or do I seek to please men (or myself)? Nay, if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ" (Gal. i. 10).

[1] Vinet, *Pastoral Theology*, pp. 151–153. T. & T. Clark, 1852.

There is, however, one aspect of this matter on which I am very anxious not to be misunderstood. Be scrupulously, nay, even morbidly jealous of your reputation in all that pertains to *the money emoluments of your pastoral office.* Make it impossible for any man to charge you with being "greedy of filthy lucre." There is a converse side to this counsel about which I shall speak in another conference when I come to the subject of a pastor's domestic economy, and avoidance of debt, but with a little necessary reserve which common sense will sufficiently suggest, I am prepared deliberately to say: Let *salary* be the last and the lowest of all the considerations which decide your acceptance and rejection of a call. If you have a choice between two churches, one where the spiritual prospect is bright but the money prospect dull; the other golden or at least silvern in worldly promise, but also of worldly tone and with little of Christ's Spirit in its life; choose the first rather than the second—not as an ascetic, but as a faithful and wise steward, whom his Master has taught that "the life is more than meat, and the body more than raiment." Or if you have but a single call, and your heart and conscience prompt you to accept it, but your natural soul loathes the light bread which its scanty salary alone can buy, take counsel in this matter, not of flesh and blood, but of Him who, though He was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, that we through His poverty might be rich. God will not be unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love which ye thus show toward His name.

Of course, I am not speaking now of calls in which every leading of Providence is plain and urgent, and where the only cause for hesitation arises from the fact that a large, perhaps a singularly large, salary is offered. The student who is most jealous of his reputation for disinterestedness can be quite easy in accepting the Church's largest bounty; for if his heart is right with God, he will know by spiritual instinct how to abound as well as how to be abased (Phil. iv. 12); and God will be glorified in the experiment of this ministration through his professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ (2 Cor. x. 13), and his liberal distribution unto all men. The great thing is to convince men in the Church and outside of it; to

convince them by actions which speak more loudly than words, that you covet no man's silver, or gold, or apparel; that you seek not theirs, but them.

What I have said about a first call to the pastorate applies in all respects to the calls which may afterwards come to you in *the way of removal from one sphere of labour to another.* And this further principle, I hold, is to be recognised in regard to change of pastorate. That the voice of Providence bidding you "Go!" should be as distinct and unmistakable as the voice which seems to say "Come!" God Himself must put you forth from one place and draw you into the other; or else, if you are only drawn and not thrust forth, the inference will fairly be that this is but a trial of your faith, disinterestedness, and love to the flock that God gave you at first to feed. In all these cases our own private judgment may be utterly at fault, and our feelings and conscience unintelligible through their very clamour; whilst the judgment and conscientious vision of a friend may pronounce unhesitatingly upon our duty. Surely God's voice should be looked for in testimonies such as these; and if the testimony be not of one, but of many friends, well, "in the mouth of one or two witnesses shall every word be established."

I had intended to speak about *ordination*, but will content myself with a very emphatic commendation of both the spirit and the letter of this most scriptural and time-honoured form of a pastor's initiation into his charge. And I will add this word of Vinet's concerning the *first sermon* by which a pastor elect "reads himself in" to his pulpit, as the saying is. That sermon "should be scrupulously guarded, disclosing the minister's chief tendencies of thought, and, if possible, his entire personality, announcing himself with modesty and frankness. However, he must not speak of himself more than necessary."

I close by enumerating the best *books bearing upon the whole subject* of these conferences which are within the reach of students like yourselves. Vinet, *Pastoral Theology.* Fairbairn, *Pastoral Theology* (including Homiletics), both published by T. & T. Clark. V. Oosterzee, *Practical Theology*

(Hodder & Stoughton). [Other Manuals by Blaikie and by Shedd are highly spoken of, but I have not seen them.] Spurgeon's *Lectures to my Students* (both series). J. A. James, *Earnest Ministry*. Baxter's *Reformed Pastor*. Spencer's *Pastors' Sketches*. Stanford's *Homilies on Christian Work* (Hodder & Stoughton). Biographies of successful Christian ministers, such as Cecil's *Remains;* Birrell's *Life of Brock*, etc.

N.B.—Also Chrysostom *On the Priesthood.*

CHAPTER II.

THE PASTOR'S PRIVATE, SOCIAL, AND SECULAR LIFE.

I HAVE supposed the student to have passed from College into the pastorate of some Church, and to have become recognised, not only as the official representative of his congregation and of his denomination in the city, town, or village to which he has been called, but also, in no small measure, as officially representing Christianity itself. For such is the inevitable aspect in which men of the world must look upon the Christian pastor and teacher. His concrete personality embodies and represents to them all the ideas by which they are to conceive of Christ's kingdom made manifest upon earth. From his *lips* they expect to hear doctrines and tenets which may be peculiar to his sect, but in *himself* they reckon upon seeing a pattern exhibition of what *all* Christians ought to be. Nor are they excessive or mistaken in this expectation. Christ Himself has imposed this representative character upon His followers; and the apostles, Peter and Paul, whilst recognising the duty thus laid upon every member of the flock, make a special requirement in the case of the bishops, viz. that they shall be "examples of the flock," and "patterns of good works." If you shrink from the very serious responsibility involved in this conception of a pastor's personal and individual life, you had better, whilst there is yet time, retire from a path of service in which more

of holy living, more of model Christian conduct, will necessarily be required in you than in other men who hold no official position in the Church. But if you covet earnestly the honours and rewards of the bishop's office, you must fairly count the cost in the bishop's obligation to uphold the highest standard of ideal Christian life. The burden is not heavier than that which, in other spheres of activity and observation, a high and ambitious profession binds upon the shoulders of him who stands forth amongst men to teach them noble and superior things. What said Milton concerning the man who would be *a poet?* "I was confirmed in this opinion, that he who would not be frustrate of his hope to write well hereafter in laudable things ought *himself to be a true poem;* that is, a composition and pattern of the best and most honourable things, not presuming to sing high praises of heroic men or famous cities, unless he have in himself the experience and the practice of all that is praiseworthy"[1] How much more dogmatically may not I affirm that the young man who desires to make full proof of his ministry in the gospel, must above all else be *a gospel in himself*, even as the Lord unmistakably implied when He said in His Sermon on the Mount, "Whosoever shall *do and teach* these things shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. v. 19). But even if Scripture and reasonable analogy did not thus justify the fact, there would be no escaping the tremendous practical responsibility which the world thrusts upon us in its persistent determination to judge of Christianity by the lives rather than by the teachings of its official representatives. Alike in wider circles and in narrower, we fix for the men who observe us the type of that character by which Christ Himself and His kingdom shall be known and conceived of. Within the Church and outside of it there will be but a very small minority, perhaps there will be none at all, who will dream of looking higher than ourselves for the ideal of Christian perfection. And for their sakes, quite apart from the question of our own future judgment in this solemn matter, it behoves us to think first

[1] *Apology for Smectymnuus.*

of all how the pattern Christian life which they expect to see, shall be wrought out in us. But something more than their comparative profiting is involved in this consideration, even our own salvation, our freedom from the blood of lost souls, and from the blame of unworthy professors, when the heavenly Judge shall make inquisition concerning these in the last great day. "Take heed to thyself," says Paul to Timothy, "take heed to *thyself* and to the doctrine; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee" (1 Tim. iv. 16).

It is therefore only natural that before saying anything about the administrative burdens of the pastorate, and the technical details of a bishop's work within the Church, I should speak of *that life which the Christian minister will have to live* in the fierce blaze of a publicity which his official station courts. *The Pastor's Private, Social, and Secular Life* is my present topic, and I shall treat it with the earnest desire and purpose of communicating to you my own deep conviction that it is by this life that each one of us is made or marred as a "good minister of Jesus Christ."

I begin with *the Pastor's Private Life;* and yet it is only in a relative sense that the word "private" can here be used, for none of the habits or personal modes of conduct which a minister may fancy are the secret of his apartments or of his dwelling-house, are really withdrawn from the knowledge and the comment of a certain circle that represents the outer "public." Servants and visitors; his landlady and his fellow-lodger, if he live in lodgings; his children, if he has a family; and the bosom friends and companions of each and all of these individuals, soon become perfectly familiar with those points of character in him which one may describe as the minor moralities or immoralities of life. If he is indolent and self-indulgent, procrastinating and unpunctual, inconsiderate of others' feelings, hasty tempered, greedy, slovenly, dirty in his person, coarse and indelicate in deed or word or look, all this will soon be noticed; and if it be not talked about to his disparagement and to the injury of those who tell and who hear it, it will do its mischievous work in silence, degrading the Christian ideal, and destroying the

Christian minister's influence for good, for those to whom his little vices, his ridiculous infirmities, his disgraceful defects may have been laid bare. And if, on the other hand, he lives in his most secret retirement as one redeemed and sanctified by Christ should live, the savour of his good name will insensibly steal forth, and become a precious blessing to himself and to all that are in the house. Ay! and far beyond the walls of this consecrated dwelling shall God be glorified in the gracious power of His consistent servant's life.

The pastor's private life will, of course, like his public and professional life, be grounded upon the firm, the abiding conception of an unreserved self-consecration to God. He will not dream of keeping back or excepting from his professed sacrifice any fragment of time, occupation, or enjoyment into which the consciousness of devotion to his Master shall be forbidden or begrudged an entrance. And a life thus devoted will inevitably be interpreted to closely observant eyes by what we have learned to call "devotional habits." *Private prayer* and *reading of God's word* and *meditation* are the very foundation of that character through which one will vindicate his title to the name "man of God": a title by which Paul addresses Timothy, and which every young pastor must deserve, or else he is not walking worthily of his vocation. On this point I would urge you to read the third chapter in the first series of Spurgeon's *Lectures to my Students;* an admirably conceived and expressed summary of all that needs to be said; and I can commend this lecture all the more heartily, because there are other lectures in the series which fall far below my ideal of the counsel likely to profit you; notably is this the case with the twelfth lecture, on the topic which I am treating gently to-day: "The Minister's ordinary Conversation."

This matter of private devotion is far too little considered by ourselves, and therefore no one can marvel that amongst ordinary Christians its neglect should betray itself far and wide; as it certainly does by signs which every one laments in regard to the prayer-meeting, the family altar, and the lives of professors from which every "devotional" feature has evaporated. I should like you all to become familiar with a

little work which more than one competent critic (Dr. Chalmers, for instance, and Sir James Stephen) have praised as "the best book on prayer available for English readers," I mean Mr. John Sheppard's *Thoughts on Private Devotion.* And though it might seem very unnecessary to dwell so long on a point so elementary, so self-evident to a really spiritual man, yet I will add an entreaty that none of you will allow himself to sell or to lend to study or to sermon-making the time which should be given to private prayer every morning and every evening. The bargain, however fairly promising to the natural reason, will result in even more of harm and loss than spiritual instinct forebodes. The deliberately recorded experience of a man like Luther ought to outweigh all the sophistical arguments by which students as well as pastors are tempted to this sacrifice of prayer to study. "*Bènè crasse est benè studuisse.*" Mark you, not "to have *prayed*" alone, but *to have prayed well, i.e.* at the proper time, for the proper things, in the proper spirit. He might have added, "He has not prayed well whose prayer does not fit him to study well."

Private reading of the Scripture is a matter that needs to be firmly fixed—as a daily conscientious habit—in close alliance with the habit of private prayer. This reading is something quite distinct from study of Scripture which has sermon-making or Bible-class teaching for its end. The pastor's own soul needs nourishing by the word of God, and cannot be nourished properly by the food which is gathered and set aside expressly for the flock. Yet the time which is spent in personal appropriation of Divine inspiration is rarely lost, even in respect of those professional tasks which are always absorbing the preacher's anxious thoughts. The wise and sympathetic preacher cannot realise the power or preciousness of a Scripture passage in his own soul without the conviction at once arising in his mind that here, surely, must be a word of might and of worthy price for other souls. And so, no sooner are his own devotional exercises at an end, than he finds employment for his pen in noting down hints, and texts, and sketches, and perhaps complete skeletons of sermons, which certainly will not be reckoned among his worst when he comes to preach them, and which he never

would have conceived but for the suggestions wherewith God's Spirit has borne witness that his prayers have been accepted, and his pastoral vocation has been sealed afresh.

In this private and devotional reading of Scripture I should, without hesitation, advise that the whole Bible should be perused in course; in portions of varying length, according to the spiritual richness of the book before one. For example, a psalm of some six or ten verses that demands to be pondered, would be more than equivalent to fifty verses out of Numbers or Daniel; and for one perusal of Chronicles, Ezekiel, or Esther, six perusals of the New Testament would not be disproportionate. Yet those books of the Bible which may seem to some of you to be least necessary, and least full of spiritual edifying, are by no means to be neglected or read listlessly, and without a lively expectation of profiting therefrom. The conscientious student of Scripture is again and again astonished to find how literally and strictly true are testimonies which he may have supposed to have been but hyperboles of devout enthusiasm on the lips of Paul and David: "*Every word* of God is pure" (Prov. xxx. 5); "As silver tried in a crucible seven times" (Ps. xii. 6); "*All Scripture* is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness" (2 Tim. iii. 16). I would only add an opinion, that, for devotional purposes, it is best to read the Bible in a good revised English version, at least until one is so familiar with the original tongues that he needs not to consult any dictionary or other help to understand the surface meaning of what he reads. If he realises difficulties below the verbal surface, these should be noted for investigation, with all the helps at his command, at the first possible moment that can be secured consistently with his plan of study and arrangement of his time.

For that is the next point on which I would dwell: the immense importance, nay, the absolute necessity of a scheme —*a Plan of Daily and Weekly Work*—framed with a view to the closest possible economy of time, and adhered to as steadfastly as the accidents for which one's own foresight and one's own will are fairly without responsibility. I imagine that your own experience as students has taught you already

the value of this principle and practice, and I hope that by the end of your college course, the habit of systematic work will have become so formed that your pastoral duties will seem naturally to arrange themselves, very much as your student tasks do now, and will be performed as well as arranged beforehand, each day's work within the day. In such a scheme, you ought always to be able to reserve one morning, perhaps also one evening, in the week for study or work that is unconnected with your pastorate; in some favoured situations you may be able to double this allowance, and to set apart two days or parts of days to reading, writing, teaching, studying in branches of science or art, or in literary toil that has nothing immediately to do with your church or your pulpit. And this time, may, if necessary, be spent in work that will earn pecuniary reward; for, if the salary given by the church is small, it is most desirable that the pastor should supplement it by the gains of secular labour; according to the example, not only of apostles like Paul, but also of honoured fathers and brethren of later days whose hands have ministered to their necessities, sometimes with the pen, sometimes with tools that are more industrial than literary.

But if there is no necessity to earn money by the work to which your reserved day or days be devoted, you should enter on some course of study or reading worthy of a Christian minister, and likely to react beneficially upon your ministerial efficiency; and it is surprising how much may be done by systematic improvement in this way, of one single morning each week. As I cannot within due limits go into details in this matter, I will give you a sketch of my own system towards the end of my pastorate, when habit and experience had settled many an early difficulty, and this will serve as a specimen from which any one of you can map out the scheme which will meet his future needs *mutatis mutandis*.

First of all, each week day of mine began at seven punctually, and closed, as a rule, at eleven; for I can bear witness alike from observation and experience, that when work is prolonged to midnight or beyond, either it is done

badly, or the worker's physical powers are spent in most wasteful disproportion to the results secured. At half-past eight I went to my study, and continued there until two, working steadily at one thing; and though, of course, interruptions could not be wholly avoided, yet tact and firmness, and co-operation by friends and servants, rarely failed to reduce these vexing hindrances to a tolerable residue. The afternoon I gave to pastoral visitation; save on Saturdays, when the afternoon was spent in outdoor exercise and recreation. Five evenings in the week were spent at chapel, or in official work abroad. Friday and Saturday evenings were sacred to pulpit preparation, in addition to the morning hours bestowed upon that object previously. Sunday, of course, had a plan of its own,—a plan which began at six o'clock instead of seven, and ended at ten o'clock instead of eleven.

Next, for the distribution of the six week-day mornings, each of 5½ hours' length. *Monday* was given to the preparation of the Wednesday evening's lecture, and the children's service or inquirers' Bible class on Tuesday evening. *Tuesday* was given to work not belonging to the pastorate; it might be literary, remunerative or gratuitous; it might be scholastic and tuitional; it might be the writing of lectures for literary and scientific institutions, young men's Christian associations, Sunday-school unions, and so forth; it might be private study, historical, theological, or linguistic, those being the specialties that had attraction for me. On *Wednesday* I began a sermon for Sunday, and sometimes, but very rarely, finished it the same day. *Thursday* was set apart for official work, not pastoral, of which I had a bewildering abundance, being secretary, treasurer, or president of seventeen different organisations, *e.g.* county association, town mission, district foreign missions, etc., the united correspondence reports and visitation belonging to all which was great, and could not have been got through without careful prearrangement, and careful fidelity to the arrangements thus made. *Friday*, like Wednesday, was sacred for pulpit preparation, and it might be needful to take in part of Saturday for this purpose as well; but, if possible, *Saturday* morning

and afternoon were kept for recreation, so that Sunday duties might be approached with a mind and a body refreshed by every healthful and lawful relaxing of the six days' previous strain. I have omitted to say how the evenings of each day were spent after the work at chapel, or at the public meeting or class, was over. The interval was never long, two hours at the most, and this time I gave to friendly intercourse at home or abroad; to reading the newspaper and general literature, and to clearing off arrears of correspondence due for that particular day. I will only add, that but for some such system as I have sketched, and a rigid adherence thereto in spite of far more temptations and obstacles than most of you would guess, I could not have done the work I did, which seemed very great to those outside, but which in review to-day seems little enough, even pitifully so, to me.

I have spoken of recreations, and this is an aspect of the pastor's private and social life where many a subtle case of conscience will arise. Common sense, a tender conscience, an enlightened spiritual insight, these three, in conjunction, are the only safe guides of the young minister, who would settle one by one the detailed relaxations, the physical and mental indulgences, which shall be deemed by him both lawful and expedient. I will recall a few tests by which his conclusions in such matters may be brought to the standard of God's word. "The youthful lusts." "Let no man despise thy youth." "Destroy not by thy food, him for whom Christ died." "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." There is a general and an emphatic agreement amongst all writers on pastoral theology that *certain amusements* the Christian minister *must wholly renounce:* such as the chace, games of chance and cards, the theatre and opera, races; and Vinet adds: "*Generally a passionate devotion to any merely sensuous or æsthetic art.*" I quite agree with him in this.

Another point on which I must address to you an earnest word is, that whatever sacrifice of pride, or ease, or comfort it may cost, you will *never incur debt*, but will always honestly and punctually pay your way, and be able to look every neighbour frankly in the face, conscious that you owe him nothing save love. This is quite possible, even on the

low salaries which are too common in our churches; but possible only to the man who has both acquired habits of self-denial and economy, and who makes it an invariable rule never to incur a liability which he is not able to meet, or which he has not a moral certainty of being able to meet, when the hour of payment comes. This point is so serious, so fruitful in sad and humbling reflections, as I recall the reputations and families and churches that have suffered injury, sometimes irreparable, through the inaptitude and sinful recklessness of Christian pastors who have run quite needlessly into debt, that I could speak long and even passionately about it. I forbear, and yet I half doubt whether any word is so needed by some of you as that which I withhold. Debt is as disgraceful, as unpardonable, as damaging to the man and to religion when incurred wilfully by a theological student as it is when incurred by a pastor, and I do not believe that any debt can be counted sinless unless both the debtor and the creditor have entered upon it with equal deliberation and pious purpose, seeking the glory of God in what they do, and sanctifying their act by His word, and at least by silent or implicit prayer.

One word of caution which I know to be very needful. Withstand all seductive offers of strangers and friends to make you rich through commercial speculations,—mines, bubble companies, gambling transactions in shares and stocks, called "options," foreign lotteries, and the like. Hundreds have been ruined through these delusions; but apart from that, all these things are of the foulest species of the mammon of unrighteousness; and the pastor who is known to have dabbled therein, or even touched this mire with the tip of his fingers, can never afterwards command the least respect when he chides those who make haste to be rich, and who love this present world, or when he testifies against covetousness, which is idolatry, or the love of money, which is the root of all evil.

I am again obliged, as I was last week, to pass over matters on which I had intended to dilate, notably the principles and rules which should guide a Christian minister in his *relations towards local, public, and political life.* No

doubt one's duty in this respect will vary with places and circumstances; but, in general, I should say, at the beginning of your ministry abstain from political strife and public secular business altogether, and never engage in either unless you are fully persuaded that you will thereby serve your generation according to God's will, and that you will not dishonour your ministerial calling, nor weaken your influence for good with any one. Also, be very chary of preaching sermons that might appear political and secular rather than tending distinctly to religious edification.

Finally, beware of the temptation to write smart and angry letters to individuals, and never write such letters to newspapers, whether anonymously or over your own full signature. Write as little as possible to people whom you do not thoroughly know and trust; and when you have an important written communication to make to any one, draft it overnight, read it again in cool blood next day, and examine your better self very closely as to the effect that letter would make upon you if you received it from the man to whom you think of sending it. And whether by writing or by word of mouth, study to "show out of a good course of life your work in meekness of wisdom." Remember what Baxter says in his *Reformed Pastor* (c. i. § 8): "One proud, surly, lordly word, one needless contention, one covetous action, may cut the throat of many a sermon, and blast the fruit of all you have been doing."

CHAPTER III.

THE PASTOR'S OFFICIAL RELATIONS AND DUTIES.

THE pastor of one of our Churches sustains certain official relations and responsibilities outside his own particular community. He represents his congregation in those local circles, both narrow and wide, which constitute what is often called "the religious world" of an English district or town. He will probably be put "*ex officio*" upon more than one committee; and will certainly be asked to speak very frequently at public meetings, philanthropic and religious; and in his discharge of the duties thus laid upon him he will win praise or blame, not only for himself as an individual, but also for his Church, his denomination, and in some cases for Nonconformity, which will be regarded as represented in his single personality. Therefore I deem it well to devote a little space to this by no means unimportant class of relations into which you will by and by be brought towards ministers and official representatives of other communities and bodies than your own, and in which the reputation of all Baptist ministers may rest in your hands for enhancement or for injury.

First, then, it is possible that you may be brought into close and friendly relations with *clergymen of the Established Church*—clergymen who may be expected to belong to the Low Church, or Evangelical school; for it is rare, indeed, for a High Churchman to give a Dissenting minister the chance of

meeting him on a common official platform. The occasions, when this meeting which I am supposing is most likely to come about, are the anniversaries of Bible and tract societies, hospital and infirmary boards, school board meetings, town's meetings, and public festivals. Sometimes, also, there are private houses where the notabilities of Church and Dissent are brought together with studious intent; and in such gatherings a new Dissenting pastor's character for amiability and good breeding is often established or ruined in one momentous hour, and through circumstances the most trivial and insufficient. Hence there is perhaps more urgent need for care and discretion when the young Baptist minister meets the State Church clergyman, and still more, the clergyman's wife and daughters, in a drawing-room, or across a private dining-table, than there is when a public platform is the scene of their encounter.

Now all that I can do in prevision of these testing moments is to remind you of the principles which underlie any and every manifestation of *Christian gentlemanliness*; for the Dissenting minister who unmistakably shows himself a Christian gentleman need never fear for the results of his meetings with churchwarden, curate, rector, canon, dean, or bishop. The principles of which I speak are two—(1) *Self-respect*, so real and genuine, that it produces an utter absence of self-consciousness; (2) *Kindliness*, so disinterested that no effort to please, or to avoid displeasing, is necessary. In one word, what is wanted is a practical exemplification of that ancient summary of all law—"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"; and rules of politeness and gentlemanly behaviour may always, when analysed, be resolved into some specific application of this wondrous precept which only God could have given, and which only Christ's spirit can rightly interpret. We have often heard of "nature's gentlemen." Nor need we look very far to find some specimen of the class. For "nature's gentlemen" are just the simple and unselfish souls who understand that man is made in the image of God, and who revere that image in themselves and in all others; whom not flesh and blood, but a Divine Teacher, has instructed not to please themselves, but to please their neighbour for his

good unto edification. Such individuals know by instinct how to behave themselves in the cottage and in the palace; and though they may have been born in the one of these, they find themselves at once at home in the other. Not all the "clergymen" whom you may meet will belong to this class, but the obligation of Christian love remains the same on you, whether or not it is recognised reciprocally in the company where you have to discharge it. Not even the temptation to pay in his own coin a supercilious, rude, brow-beating "parson," should make you forget the law and the example of your Master; and fidelity to principle in such a trial will be more than rewarded in the verdict of all by-standers whose good opinion is worth obtaining, and who will bear witness—to cite words which I once actually heard used concerning an encounter of this kind by a bluff Tory squire who had no love for Nonconformists,—"The Dissenting chap was the better gentleman of the two."

Some of you will, no doubt, think that a principle such as I have laid down, will be only spoiled by detailed enlargement upon its application. Others may be glad if I go on, after the fashion of the Jewish fathers, to "make a hedge about the law," by naming a few of the things which it is well to avoid or to do if one wishes to be perfect in the character of a Baptist minister, whom clergymen and laymen of the Established Church shall acknowledge to be also a Christian gentleman. First, then, concede naturally and graciously, on all occasions, *that social precedence* which belongs to the officials of a State Church *as contrasted with the ministers of a free Church.* Not a few Nonconformists seem to make it a point of honour, nay, even of conscience, to dispute inch by inch every privilege of courtesy which long usage in England has accorded to clergymen. Now this is a grievous mistake in respect of good breeding, and as false in policy as it is unlovely in appearance. Every clergyman is as much a representative of the Queen in ordinary society as a naval or a military officer would be. And if you would cheerfully allow a colonel or a captain to take precedence of you in a drawing-room, or in a public procession, or on a platform, or at a banquet, you need not be less ready to walk or to stand

or to sit behind a canon, a vicar, or even a curate. There is no conscientious conviction involved in the matter, but rather a principle of loyalty to the British Constitution. So long as that remains what it is to-day, every clergyman represents one of the three legal estates of the realm, and is entitled to the same social respect that is due to the younger son of a peer. If you are intrinsically a better man than the "parson," to whom you thus yield precedence, there are other fields besides the social and conventional where you can make your superiority evident. There is no unwritten law forbidding you to stand ahead of him as a preacher, a lecturer, a platform speaker, a writer, a political or educational leader of men; but even if you do surpass him in all these matters, you will only confirm your position there by a scrupulous observance of the social law, which I imagine not even disestablishment of the English Church will ever make obsolete. For even when the Episcopal body has come down to the level of the sects, its prestige of centuries will make it still, what Sydney Smith—by no means wholly in joke—declared it to be, "The only Church fit for a gentleman," in the hollow, conventional sense of that word.

This leads me to my second caution, viz. in regard to the great *Disestablishment movement* which, as intelligent Baptists, you are bound to sustain and promote by every means consistent with Christian righteousness, truth, and love. Naturally there is no point so sore with a clergyman as this fast-approaching probability of his being disestablished and disendowed. And if you are known as a member of the hated "Liberation Society," your friendly advances will very likely be regarded by the average "parson" as a monstrous and insulting piece of hypocrisy. Now there is no need for you to parade your zeal for what many honestly regard as nothing better than "robbery and sacrilege," and a young man who has not yet made himself respected on other grounds, will act foolishly if he at once and recklessly arrays against himself all the rancour of a party that in country districts is often numerically the strongest. Therefore my counsel is, "Do nothing rashly" in this warfare; wait for the fitting time and place in which the avowal of your free Church principles

and aims cannot fail to be justified by men of common candour and courage and honourable feeling. But when such an occasion arises, stand forth honestly, yet modestly, for what every Baptist feels to be the cause of justice and true religion. Refrain from harsh, unkind, and reviling language; keep scrupulously from trick and misrepresentation and sophistry in argument; err rather on the side of generosity than of relentlessness towards a weak opponent in dispute; and remember in all your controversy that the kingdom for which you plead is "not of this world." Then I can promise you that the sharpest conflicts on the field of "Disestablishment" shall not lose for the respect or the love of any Churchman whose friendship would be desirable or profitable to you. And the good cause will prosper all the more speedily and widely, because the weapons by which you defend it are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds.

Lastly, and this caution holds good, not only concerning ministers of the Established Church, but also concerning *all your fellow ministers* of any and every denomination, be studiously respectful to the aged, show fitting deference to acknowledged experience in pastoral work, and to scholarship, whether stamped by a university degree or not. Never obtrude your opinions unasked when you enter for the first time a circle of professional men who are strangers to you; and, until you are very sure of your ground, in that or any other company, remember that if "speech is silvern, silence is golden." I know not that I can sum up my meaning better than by recalling one of St. Peter's pastoral counsels: "Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder; yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility: for God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace unto the humble" (1 Pet. v. 5).

In many towns you will find a very useful institution, to wit, the *minister's monthly meeting*, in which brethren of all the free Church denominations come together for periodical conference and social intercourse. You will do well to attend such a meeting diligently, observing for a long time the apostolic rule, "Swift to hear, slow to speak"; and if

the opportunity is offered you, you should gladly cultivate a brotherly acquaintance with the Presbyterian and the Independent first, the Methodist next, never begrudging such professional services as one of these may ask at your hands, and yet taking care not to become a common hack and drudge for selfish brethren; for there are ministers who, in this matter, invite such a satirical rebuke as Canning administered to our Batavian neighbours—

> "In matters of commerce, the fault of the Dutch
> Is giving too little and asking too much."

Nevertheless, even the abuse of kindness will not make the saying of the Lord Jesus untrue, "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

Let me add a word concerning a very serious danger which waits upon our modern system of ultra-independency in the mutual attitude of churches of the same denomination in the same city or town. I say our "modern system," for I do not believe the primitive organisation recognised more than one church in any one centre of population; but we have multiplied separate churches, and so have made a fruitful field for jealousies, envyings, suspicions, and evil surmisings on the part of pastors and congregations, who find themselves, in a measure, rivals and competitors. Perhaps there is no department of conduct in which a minister stands more in need of grace than this—his behaviour towards brother ministers who seem to be prospering better, and becoming more popular than himself. Let me read you here a few words of Christian truth and spiritual wisdom from Vinet, which will help you against this danger by something more potent than formal rule.

"It is evident that nothing is so calculated to bring the ministry into discredit, and to damage its moral effect, as the absence of a proper understanding between pastors. This is a touchstone, the application of which would be fatal to more than one Christian work which regards itself as pure. As long as the pastor was alone, he thought that he was performing the work of God from pure love to it. But when he has seen it to be done by others as well as, if not better, than by

himself, and has learnt to his cost that he would rather that the work should not be done at all than that it should be done by others too much at the expense of his own personal vanity; when he is surprised and distressed at the blessing that attends their labours, and rejoices at their ill-considered measures and their unfortunate failures,—then he may know whether he is more attached to the good itself which he does, or to the glory which accrues to himself from doing it." [1]

Now I come to *the pastor's official relations and duties within his own church*, and first I will speak of his behaviour and his feeling towards his deacons. I hope and trust that no one of you will adopt the foolish and pernicious cant that some enemy has set flying about our ears, to the ridicule and disparagement of deacons. There are bad deacons just as there are bad ministers,—far too many of both, and perhaps in about the same proportions to their respective classes. But there are also as many deacons who are excellent in their order as there are ministers; and a minister who really deserves to have good deacons will rarely fail to find at least some such in any church to which Providence shall guide him. Let him go prepared to trust and respect them, to esteem them very highly in love for their works' sake, to make for their faults the same excuses which he would like them to make for his own, and he will have no reason to quarrel with this much-abused part of our congregational polity. It must be remembered that our "deacons" have long ceased to answer accurately to the conception of their office which prevailed in New Testament times, just as we "bishops" have also departed from the primitive model and idea. Modern deacons are practically "fellow-elders" with the pastor, and he ought to think of them as such; not as his inferiors, but as his equals in the Presbytery. The affectation which some young men parade, in their first settlement, of "putting the deacons in their proper place," is both ridiculous and unworthy of our congregational traditions. What is more outrageous than the impertinence of a youth fresh from college, who rudely sets aside the counsels and wishes of

[1] Vinet, *Pastoral Theology* (T. & T. Clark, 1852), pp. 281, 282.

Christian fathers whom the Church delighted to honour before he, perhaps, was even born? What could more strikingly exemplify the despotic and Popish spirit with which we are wont to upbraid prelatic sects? But, quite apart from the unseemliness and inconsistency of pastoral arrogance in such a case, experience teaches that no young minister amongst us can be useful or happy in his work, unless his relations with his deacons are fraternal, not magisterial or parental; unless he frankly accords to these, his helpers in Christ, their full honour and right as his "true yoke fellows"; assuming no authority over them, but respecting the limits of that administration which they severally claim, just as scrupulously as he would have them respect the limits of his own bishopric, within which, for a year or two, he will certainly find quite enough to fill his hands without overstepping the border of another man's district or field. A young minister who acts upon this principle, and who proves that he has the gift of administration and wise rule, will not be long in gaining all the personal influence in his church that he could possibly desire; indeed, he will probably have thrust upon him more of power and responsibility than is good for him; for, absurd as it may seem to some of you, it is nevertheless true, that deacons who seem most jealous of violent encroachment upon their rights by an untried minister, will be the first to subordinate those rights to the wishes of a pastor whom they have proved to be capable, and whom they know to be seeking, not his own glory, but the honour of Christ and the welfare of the Church.

In the *business meetings of deacons*, although the young pastor will no doubt be asked to attend and preside, and although he ought to use his privilege in this behalf, he will be wise to act the part of a mere watchful spectator and registrar of proceedings for some considerable time; in fact, until he feels that he understands the whole system on which the business of the church has hitherto been carried on, and the reasons for and against every custom and rule that may seem to him unusual or questionable. Even if he has strong conscientious objections to any detail of congregational management which may come under his observation, he ought not to declare war

against the same until he has studied the matter quietly and impartially from all points of view, and inquired concerning it in frank and conciliatory manner, free from all semblance of passion, defiance, or pharisaic virtue. He should be very open and candid with his deacons concerning all the changes which he is preparing to introduce into any part of the order or work of the church. If there is one thing more than another that will defeat his most honest ends, it is a semblance of dishonesty in the means which he is seen to use. Diplomatic scheming, underhand management, tortuous ways of any description, are as ruinous practically as they are unworthy theoretically, in the relations of a Christian minister with his deacons, or indeed with all men.

As to church meetings, I would say, first of all, the less of secular business and of unspiritual discussion that can be introduced into these the better for pastor and people alike. Happy is the church that appoints a fairly representative committee at the beginning of each year, and is content to leave to it all the details of administration which so often afford matter of wrangling and debate when they are presented to the General Assembly. Then the monthly church meetings are left free for edifying discourse—for review of the spiritual work that is going on in the pastor's inquirers' class, in the Sunday school, in the village stations, or the cottage meeting. I would strongly advise that, as soon as, and wherever it is practicable, *the observance of the Lord's Supper* should be introduced as a stated part of the proceedings at the monthly church meeting, which, in that case, will be most conveniently held in the middle of each month rather than the end. Three desirable ends will be secured by this custom. First, there will be a closer approximation in our modern order to the spirit and the letter of New Testament Church polity; for in primitive times the Church never met, as a Church, except upon the sacramental ground and centre of this commemorative ordinance. Secondly, the risk of dissension, quarrelling, and unprofitable talk, is reduced to a minimum in a meeting that has come together "to eat the Lord's Supper," and in which the Lord's table is already spread with the emblems of Christian unity and of

Christ's self-sacrificing love. Thirdly, the spiritual love and life of the Church will be marvellously improved by this more frequent use of the means which God has been pleased to ordain as a real channel of grace to devout and believing souls. If Romanists and Ritualists make too much of the Eucharist in this sense and from this point of view, many of ourselves have undoubtedly been accustomed to make too little. Because we have not discerned the Lord's body in His sacrament, we, like the Church at Corinth, have had our sickly and weakly members, and many are fatally asleep. I may add, that the offertory at this week-night communion will form an extra fund, which, however small in amount, will be of great value from its origin, and for its applicability to any special purpose, such as continually comes before our Churches with an appeal for sympathy and money help. In my old association all the churches which observed the communion at their church meeting gave the offertory to a most useful fund, for paying annuity and life assurance premiums for the poorer ministers in the association.

Whilst I am upon *this topic of the Lord's Supper*, let me say that it is of far greater importance than some of you may suppose, that the pastor should profess a simple, reverent, and graceful manner in the oral and manual parts of his administration of this ordinance. Awkwardness and clumsiness of gesture, slovenliness in the handling of the bread and the wine, forgetfulness in the little ceremonies of the table, flippancy or even commonplace verbosity in the address or in the prayers,—any one of these things will distress devout communicants, and will disgust, and properly so, spectators of the rite. Make a study, therefore, of even the smallest details of this ordinance, watching every experienced minister who may preside at the Lord's table when you are present, and comparing critically the advantages and drawbacks of every variation from the common method.

One point more before I leave the subject of church meetings. Whenever *discipline* has to be administered, and the moral conduct of a church member is brought under discussion, be very careful as to what is said in accusation of this person, and especially as to the part you personally take in

the debate. A *church meeting has no legal privilege* in regard to any action that a revengeful man or woman may bring against his pastor for slander or for libel, therefore make no charges against any one unless you are prepared to repeat and to prove them, if needs be, in a court of law, and before a jury of "worldlings." There is only one safe and wise and kind course to adopt whenever it becomes necessary to vindicate the purity of Christian fellowship. It is to ask the church to appoint a small, a carefully selected, and, above all, a confidential sub-committee, specially to investigate this case of discipline, and to report simply the conclusion to which it has come, without entering into any of the grounds for that conclusion. The church may fairly be expected to adopt and to act upon this report without any further discussion; and if any ill-advised or partisan member should seek to force on such a discussion, the meeting should be asked either to negative his proposal promptly, or to remit the matter for further private investigation by the original or an enlarged committee.

Another prudent caution. Be slow to meddle with your *chapel choir or singing gallery;* for to do this, even with the most laudable intent, is proverbially to stir up a hornet's nest. By all means take a cordial interest in the musical part of your Sunday service. Make a friend, if you can, of the organist or choirmaster; and if he is not already a member of the church, seek wisely and prayerfully to bring him within the inner and spiritual circle of converted men. If he is a communicant, try to make him feel, if he does not feel this naturally, how weighty is the influence which he can throw into the scales where your ministerial usefulness is balanced. He can be your best helper, or one of your worst hindrances, in your public Sunday work. If he turns out to be plainly and incorrigibly the last, you had better open the whole case to your deacons, and confront the lesser evil of a reform in the singing pew to escape the greater miseries which would wait upon a false and hollow truce with the foe.

The conduct of marriages is a detail of your official duty which deserves considerate and tactful attention; for awkwardness, vulgarity, or contemptuous disregard of time-honoured

forms on these occasions has often estranged from a thoughtless young minister the love and respect of those who were prepared to be his warm and enthusiastic friends. You should study to perform this service so feelingly, so gracefully, so orderly, that no one shall be able to remember any special feature of your function, but only the general impression that everything was in perfect taste. Especially beware of affronting the just susceptibilities of poor couples, by making the marriage-service in their case a hurried, informal, heartless thing. Never let it be said of you that you have a grand guinea style for rich bridegrooms and brides, and a pauper style when you expect no fee. Be as punctilious and as sympathetic in the one case as in the other, and use the same service and the same words for rich and poor alike. If you are invited to the wedding-feast, and you know it would give pleasure to kindly and loving souls that you should accept the invitation, go, although it costs you a morning in your study; and in the speech which, of course, you will have to make, don't try to be funny; leave jokes to those who are not required by their spiritual calling, as you are, to be always "sober, grave, of good behaviour," having "a good report of them which are without." If your hosts propose it, welcome with alacrity the opportunity which such an occasion in a Christian household gives for the reading of God's word, and for prayer, supplication, intercession, and giving of thanks.

Finally, cultivate with care and diligence *business-like habits in every official relation and duty* which falls to your lot. In matters of money account be scrupulously exact. Never take away the proceeds of a collection until the sum has been verified and recorded by a deacon, a secretary, or a treasurer, as the case may be. Have as little to do with the chapel finances as possible; but if you are obliged to keep accounts and cash, let no bank cashier surpass you in accuracy, neatness, or remembrance of the day for paying in or for paying out. Be very punctual in beginning and ending your public services. Always be in your vestry in good time to arrange preliminaries without hurry or confusion. Have an orderly, intelligible system for announcing notices; and if you are a

hopeless muddler at this task, as some very good preachers are, hand over the duty to the most business-like of your deacons. Never forget an engagement, in your own chapel or in any other place. If you do not mean to attend a meeting, do not allow any one to think that you have promised to go; if you have promised, keep your word at any and every cost. If you will always act in the spirit of these friendly and well-considered admonitions, you will contribute to a noble result, which I grieve to say is despaired of by some even of those "laymen" who love and honour us most sincerely; you will help to rescue the Christian ministry from the vulgar reproach of being a refuge to any poor but pious stick, who would never earn salt to his porridge at any other trade except preaching.

CHAPTER IV.

THE PASTOR'S "CURE OF SOULS."

My topic in this fourth conference touches the very heart of the work to which you are looking forward in the Christian ministry; for that work is essentially a "cure of souls." The Christian pastor is set by the great Shepherd of the sheep to "*watch for souls*,"—the souls which Christ has redeemed, but which His servants are to seek and to win, securing thus their part in "the joy of their Lord," when all that the Father hath given Him shall be safely gathered in. I assume that you are thoroughly at one with me in that conception of the Christian ministry which the phrase "*cure of souls*" implies. To a common English ear it is happily ambiguous; and though you may not discern in the etymology what another might think he sees, yet the scriptural associations of this solemn theme have deeply impressed upon you the fact that conversion of sinful souls is the first end which, as pastors and preachers, you have to seek; that your ministry is above all else to bring healing to souls that are mortally sick; yea, real life to men and to women who are dead in trespasses and in sins. The work of the Christian ministry does not, of course, end here, but it can begin nowhere else; and a good minister of Jesus Christ—a workman needing not to be ashamed—is not the preacher who receives from other hands ready converted subjects for his establishment in holi-

ness and grace; but he is the man who is wise and skilful himself to quarry out the king's precious stones, and after winning these, to fashion them for their place in the eternal temple. If I were not assured of your unreserved concurrence in this sentiment, I should dwell very earnestly on the fatal mistake which some men make when they enter upon an active pastorate, in leaving quite out of their plan any methods or aims or desires that have to do with the direct and positive conversion of the unsaved members of their congregation. Every book worth reading upon "pastoral theology" lays stress upon this point; and yet it will bear more pressing home than it receives in any one of these, or in all of them put together. Doubt not, *that* ministry is a failure to which the Holy Spirit does not set the broad and unmistakable seal of souls converted,—not developed and educated alone, but radically changed, turned right round, brought out of darkness and death into the new and spiritual birth which is not of nature, nor of human will, but of God's grace alone. Read the life of any great and successful minister whom the Church has delighted to honour, and whose calling has been manifestly from the Church's Head, and you will find that the burden of such a man's continual prayer and labour has been to have given him the souls of his careless, impenitent hearers; to receive evidence that through his instrumentality these souls have passed from death unto life. And whenever such a minister has experienced a fresh baptism of the Spirit, and has realised anew his Divine consecration and calling, this precious experience has been accompanied by an almost agonising sense of past neglectfulness, and insufficient apprehension of his great responsibility towards the unconverted. I know few things more affecting, or more heart-searchingly suggestive in this way, than the testimony of a justly celebrated Congregational divine of the last generation but one, Dr. M'All, whose life was written by his friend and brother minister, Dr. Wardlaw. The passage is quoted in J. A. James' *Introduction to Spencer's Pastor's Sketches*, and I could wish that every one of you possessed, and often read, that little summary of devout wisdom upon this department of the "cure of souls." It is one of

the best and most fruitful monographs in pastoral theology that I could bring beneath your notice. Mr. James has alluded to the fact recorded by Dr. M'All's biographer, that "his preaching was not very useful in the way of direct and palpable conversions. He knew, confessed, and lamented this. To his friends he often referred to it, and was wont to say, 'I have admiration enough, but I want to see conversion and edification.' He spoke of some neighbouring ministers, whose churches, he said, resembled a garden which the Lord had blessed, or whose spots of verdure were more vivid than his own; but added, that his emotions in making the comparison partook of a gladness for them that absorbed or overwhelmed him with sorrow for himself. 'I remember,' says one of his friends, 'on one occasion, after a brilliant speech from himself, he listened to a much plainer and less oratorical brother, whose address, however, seemed much more penetrating on the minds of the audience, and produced an appearance of being deeply effected on their countenances. At that moment the speaker, hearing a loud sobbing behind him, turned round. It was M'All. 'Ah,' said he afterward, 'that effect, in such a legitimate way, I would give the world to be able to produce.' To another ministerial friend he said, 'I care nothing what people think of or say of my abilities, if I may but be useful to souls'; and once with a swelling indignation, 'God knows, I do not want their applause—I want their salvation.'" [1]

Mr. James adds: "And are there not many of us who should seriously consider this? Are any of us sufficiently earnest about conversion? Does not the subject press far too lightly on our minds, hearts, and consciences? Do we really believe the principles we profess, concerning the soul, and the soul's salvation or damnation? If so, let us act up to our principles, and be anxious, restless, and laborious for direct and palpable conversions. Then, and then only, do we obtain the chief end of our ministry, when these are effected. The grand design of the gospel in regard to men being their conversion to God and what follows it, the primary element in

[1] Spencer's *Introduction*, pp. xxxii, xxxiii.

the usefulness of its ministers must consist in the accomplishment of this purpose." [1]

It does not fall within my present purpose to discuss the influence of such thoughts upon your preaching; but what I have to speak about now is *the pastor's work outside of the pulpit in regard to the unconverted and to inquirers,* his treatment in private and personal ways of individual cases of religious concern.

I think that the very first thing which a young minister should do, after being inducted into his charge, is to ascertain quietly and by wise inquiries the religious position and something of the religious history of every person in the congregation whose name does not appear upon the members' roll. Very many of these, of course, will be children and young people in the Sunday school, in regard to whom I shall have more to say in a future conference. But a good proportion of the non-communicants will be adults: young men and young women who have ceased to attend the school, or who never belonged to it: married people; some, well advanced in years, with grown-up sons and daughters; forming, perhaps, an entire family long identified with the chapel, and very regular in attendance, yet altogether outside the inner circle of "baptized believers." Now, a careful study of many such cases, in a great many different churches all over the country, and in several denominations besides our own, enables me to say with positive assurance, that a most hopeful field for conversions lies open to the young minister here; that, if he acts wisely and prayerfully in this opportunity, he is very likely to receive his earliest tokens of pastoral blessing in the souls of just these very individuals of whom his predecessor, for good reasons, had ceased to think as candidates for baptism and fellowship. But if he allows the first year of his ministry to pass without having made any personal, direct attempt to win these souls, the prospect of their being given to him in future years is very remote and doubtful; and he is more than likely to hand them over to his successor, undecided and unconverted, even as he received them from the pastor whose place he took.

---

[1] Spencer's *Introduction*, p. xxvii.

It would not be difficult, as some of you, no doubt, see at a glance, to show the reasons why all this should be. The coming of a new pastor to a church is a distinct shock to those persons in the congregation who have settled down in comfortable habits of religious unconcern, which the former minister despaired of breaking up. Such persons are aroused for just a little season to new and lively interest about the things which pertain to salvation. Perhaps there is something in the fresh preacher's style of presenting God's word which moves them, as they have long ceased to be moved under the most faithful gospel utterances. A time and a mood of strange softening has come to them; it is emphatically for them, "the acceptable year of the Lord." I entreat you, watch with keenest vision for souls thus prepared by God's Spirit for your winning, and boldly cast the net on that side of the ship, though it has been just there that others have toiled all night before you came, and caught nothing. Make a direct, a personal appeal in private to every one of these individuals. In all probability some of them are expecting that you will do this; and if you refrain, though they will say nothing, they will in their hearts accuse you of slackness and ignorance in your calling; and your influence with them for good will be diminished for all future time, in just the same degree in which it would have been increased and confirmed had you exercised the fidelity, and shown the anxious desire for their conversion, which they instinctively looked for at your hands. And even if some of these persons are a little startled at your personal address, for which they were scarcely prepared, not one of them will resent it; the conscience of each man and of each woman will bear you witness in this matter of your conscientious duty; and whether you win another's soul or not, you will have delivered your own.

Again I say, make an early, a determined effort after the conversion of those adult, middle-aged, perhaps even old people, whom you find to have settled down into the class of habitual attendants, but non-communicants. But before you speak to any one of them, find out something about his history, and know, if possible, all the circumstances which account for

his having remained heretofore an "alien from the commonwealth of Israel." Then, when the ground has been well reconnoitred, and specific prayer for Divine guidance in this particular case has been presented, seize or make your opportunity for bringing your hearer face to face with the great decision on which his soul's salvation hangs. And if your eye has been single to God's glory, I can promise you that your heart will rejoice in many an unexpected reward to your anxious efforts; "your heart will rejoice, and your joy no man shall take from you!"

The same fidelity which you thus observe towards non-communicants who have long been members of your congregation, is due from you to all new-comers who are reported to you as having taken seats in the chapel, and so giving evidence of their desire to profit by your ministry. If they do not at the same time seek to join the Church, you ought with kindness, discretion, and unfeigned sympathy to inquire from their own lips why they refrain from confessing your Lord and theirs; and if this abstinence from profession means also the absence of conversion, the longer you leave the performance of this duty, the less natural and easy will it be felt, both by you and by the persons to whom you address these close and delicate questions. And what would be welcomed as a proof of genuine interest—during a first interview—may even be misconstrued as officious meddling, if after long apparent indifference you suddenly begin to deal directly with the affairs of such an unconverted person's soul.

I have dwelt at some length on this special opportunity which a young pastor has for exercising a cure of souls,—an opportunity which soon passes, and which is scarcely likely ever to return to him in such favourable circumstances as at the first beginning of his relations with the persons of whom I speak. I have been thus precise and emphatic because the matter is one whose importance has been impressed on me very strongly, both by past experience and by wide observation; and it is not brought forward very prominently in even the best and most practical text-books of pastoral theology which I have recommended to you. I can touch more lightly upon the fact with which all of you will be familiar, viz. that

a perennial and ever-fruitful field for the wise winner of souls is found amongst *the young people of his charge*, the sons and daughters of his deacons and his influential members, the members of the Bible and select classes taught both on Sundays and on week nights, and the ordinary scholars in the Sunday school. It would be a scandalous proof of ministerial incompetency if a young pastor were to miss garnering the harvest which year by year seems thus to be provided for him by the Master whom he serves. Yet a little counsel may not be out of place in regard to the methods by which this harvesting may be accomplished most speedily and with most of that joy which is at once the successful pastor's strength and present reward, and pledge of future and eternal glory.

First, then, engage in this part of your pastoral effort the sympathies and the co-operation of as many as possible of those who are already members of the church. In your sermons and in your private conversations make it to be distinctly understood that you reckon on the eyes, the lips, the hands, the feet of all your fellow-Christians to help you in adding to the Church such as are being saved. Their eyes can discern many a secret inquirer, many an impressed and anxious hearer who would remain hidden from you; their tongues can speak the little word of persuasion or encouragement which may be all that is needed for sending these seekers after salvation to you; or if they find them very timid and doubtful of themselves, they can bring them to the minister, and break the dreaded ice by their own bold, warm, and hearty introduction. A pastor who has managed thus to enlist a zealous band of recruiting officers among the young, will rarely be found without inquirers on his list. Therefore I counsel you to draw as close as possible the bonds of confidence and sympathising effort which the earliest months of your ministry ought to knit betwixt you, the pastor, and the Christian parents and Sunday-school teachers of the young people under your care. Ask the parents pointedly if they have noticed signs of religious concern in any of their children; perhaps your word may open their eyes to a part of their parental privilege and duty which they have failed aforetime to recognise; and so you will be discharging your pas-

toral office effectively in their case as well as in the case of their sons and daughter. At any rate, if nothing seems to follow immediately from your action, you will have made these parents feel that you are earnestly desirous of the spiritual welfare of old and young in their homes, and they will be the more ready to send their children to you, or to open their own hearts in personal confession when the season comes, as in most households it does come sooner or later, in which a faithful, tender minister of Christ seems the most needed, the most precious of all human friends.

As for the teachers and officers of your Sunday school, if they have the right spirit and understanding of their calling, it will be enough for you to give a few unmistakable signs of your reliance upon their aid in the addition of new members to the church; and their zeal will in all likelihood need wise control and perhaps occasional repression, rather than continual stimulation. You will soon discover that some of these willing helpers are over sanguine in their judgments concerning young inquirers; but you will find that others have a wonderfully correct discernment of the Spirit of God in His operations upon human souls; and when you have learned thus who are the wise fellow-workmen and workwomen whom the Master has given you, take these into your frankest counsels, and use their spiritual gifts without stint, without jealousy, and without affectation of official superiority. If they are not already numbered amongst your fellow-presbyters, they ought to be, and the sooner you get them elected deacons or deaconesses the better for them, for the church, and for you.

Whether you know of particular persons who are to be brought to you as inquirers by their parents, or teachers, or friends, or not, you ought, very soon after you begin your ministry, to set apart and announce publicly a stated evening, once or twice a month, or oftener if needs be, for seeing all persons who may wish to have religious conversation with you. You can make the vestry, after service on either the Sunday or week night, the first place for this interview; and you should secure the services of some discreet lady, and some experienced deacon or other male member, to receive the

inquirers in the outer vestry, to keep them engaged till their turn comes for seeing you, and to encourage the more timid among them; for I have known inquirers to turn away with a failing heart when their hand has been on the knob of the vestry door, still more on the bell or the knocker of the pastor's private house door. Have paper and pencil before you at all these interviews; take down the name and address of every person whom you do not already know well, and make a memorandum of everything that you feel is of importance for the successful treatment of their spiritual case. Act, in short, exactly as a wise doctor would act towards yourself, if you went to consult him for physical symptoms which had made you anxious, but as to whose nature and meaning you were yourself very much in the dark. Do not be inquisitorial in your tone; and when you first meet with a timid youth or girl, be content if you find a good listener rather than a forward talker. But never propose a candidate for church fellowship to the church until you are sure, from what that candidate has said out of his or her own untutored experience, that there has been a real change of feeling and of will, and a real apprehension of the solemn meaning of this step.

If your congregation is large, or if you have been holding special services with a view to religious awakening amongst your flock, it will be found very useful to adopt some appropriate modification or form of the well-known "after meeting" to which only inquirers remain.

A married pastor who has a comfortable home of his own will do better to make that home the place of meeting with inquirers, rather than the chapel vestry. He should appoint and publicly announce separate evenings for males and for females, and should adapt his whole domestic arrangements on these evenings with a view to the happy and yet arduous labour which he is expecting. For example, the house should be clean, quiet, and orderly; the sitting room should be given up to the inquirers who are waiting for their turn, and on the table should be a good supply of interesting and suitable religious books, including one or two about baptism, and not forgetting two or three copies of the Bible. If it is the evening for female inquirers, the pastor's wife should be in

the room all the time; and on the male inquirers' evening it will be very useful to secure the presence of a sensible and friendly young man, a member of the church. He can be asked to stay afterwards to supper, and the intimacy thus cultivated may become one of the pastor's greatest future blessings. You will, of course, see the inquirers one by one in your study; and you should accompany them to the door, or back to the waiting-room, when you dismiss them. Thus you will see who are still waiting for an interview; and, if necessary, you can say a preliminary word to one and another or altogether, and find out whether any individual is particularly pressed for time, and therefore anxious to see you out of the regular turn. I will say nothing as to your conduct of the actual interview, except, indeed, this: that you should always kneel down and pray with each inquirer, if it be only in half a dozen words bearing upon his or her special case; and that it is useful to give him, written on a slip of paper, a few Scripture references to read and to ponder before his next visit. You can at the same time ascertain if your visitor reads the Bible privately, and can give him hints and directions as to this essential means of sustaining and nourishing spiritual life.

Every pastor should have a good supply of "Guides" and "Manuals" for religious inquirers and young Christians; and should lend these with a wise discrimination to the persons for whom severally they may seem most suitable. He should keep a note of the books thus lent, so that none of them may be lost; and should, as a rule, require their return on the next visit of the candidate, or the next visit but one. The contents of these volumes will often suggest topics of conversation; and the new lights thus gained upon old matters of doctrine and experience will be invaluable to the preacher who, in his pulpit ministrations, desires to be ever fresh and practical; and, like a good steward of his Lord's treasures, to bring thereout continually things new and old.

Whilst speaking about this matter of the loan of books to inquirers, let me say that if the pastor can spare the money, or can get it from any generous friend, or from some proper source under the control of his church treasurer, he cannot

lay out a few shillings to better advantage,—in all points of view,—personal and ministerial, than in buying copies of good and handy books on Christian experience, Church membership, baptism, and so forth, and giving one of these to every person whom he baptizes, as a memorial of that memorable event. He should write the name of the recipient on a blank page; and it will do no harm if a well-chosen text is added—say, the text from which he preaches on the occasion of the baptism. I will give you a list of the books which I have been accustomed thus to lend and to give; few, if any of which, exceed the average prices of one shilling, eighteenpence, or, in rare cases, two shillings.

Some of you may wish to inquire how long a candidate for Church fellowship should be kept waiting before baptism, and what limit of age should be observed in such cases? I can only answer, that both these questions depend upon particular circumstances for which no general rule can be given; and a pastor, whose head is properly fixed upon his shoulders, can always decide them best for himself as each individual occasion arises. For one inquirer, a month or even a week may be long enough interval between the first interview with yourself and the proposal of his name to the church; for a second, common prudence will suggest slow caution and long delay—delay, perhaps, for twelve months or even more. Then as to age, eleven or twelve years may not be too young where the child is intelligent, well trained by Christian parents, and resident in a Christian home. Fifteen, sixteen, or seventeen may be too early an age in other cases, specially in the case of flighty and impressionable girls, of whose bringing-up you know little, or whose occupation is such as to expose them to worldly and even vicious influences, far away from the supervision of Christian friends on whose vicarious interest you, as the pastor, can depend. Girls between thirteen and sixteen years are subject to peculiar hysterical affections and moods, which are easily diverted into channels of religious excitement and emotion; and professions of a spiritual change that are made at this critical season are not always to be trusted. The young pastor will do well to put himself —in reference to such cases—very largely in the hands of

some kindly-experienced sensible matron amongst his church members; and if he knows a good-hearted Christian doctor, and can enlist his interest in the spiritual work which is going on, he cannot devise a more prudent or useful plan than to secure his deliberate opinion concerning every young female who is very much excited about her religious state. Nay, whenever a pastor has reason to feel uneasy about the emotional symptoms of his female inquirers, he should indirectly or directly transfer some share of his responsibility in the matter to the mother or the sister of his visitor, or to some motherly person of his acquaintance, who may be presumed to know more about the morbid possibilities of such a case than any young man can know.

These possibilities may seem ridiculously remote to some of you; yet no experienced pastor ever thinks of them lightly, either for himself or the young people in whom religious excitement has tended to become "hysterical." For one thing, the language of religious emotion can easily suggest thoughts of earthly love to a young woman in this peculiar state; and I have known more than one very guileless and innocent young pastor who has been suddenly horrified to discover that a certain female inquirer has gradually slipped from a sacred to a very profane sphere, and has become desperately in love with himself. And even if things do not go so far, the mental and moral balance of a young girl is soon upset if her religious susceptibilities are unwisely handled; and permanent mischief may result to her reason and her physical health. Therefore I entreat you not to despise the warning which I have felt it my duty to give in plain terms concerning a danger of much more concern than many of you could imagine.

This leads me to speak about the selection of deputations or examiners to report to the church meeting concerning those whom you have proposed for baptism and fellowship. The pastor has distinctly the right to keep this selection in his own hands; and he should not surrender to any one this part of his prerogative; though, of course, in the earlier months of his ministry he should avoid any startling innovation upon or disregard of former usages in this behalf. But as he

gains familiarity with the strong and weak points of his members, male and female, he should study carefully the use which it is possible to make of one and another in this official visitation of candidates. He should ascertain from each inquirer what private friendships and confidences he may profess already towards any member of the church; and, other things being equal, he should appoint as visitors persons with whom the candidate will feel easy and free, rather than entire strangers. If there is no insuperable hindrance in the traditions or the prejudices of the church, he should arrange that female candidates shall be examined by visitors of their own sex, and not by men; but if it is a rule that the visitors must be men, he should use his Sunday-school superintendent, and those male members who have daughters of their own, in work so delicate as this. He should recollect what may be befitting to the social rank of the candidate: for example, a lady should be visited by a lady and not by a shopkeeper's wife or a factory hand; a youth of good education and gentle birth should not be committed to the inquisition of an illiterate groom or gardener's assistant. But on all these points, common sense and native wit are better guides than any book or professorial direction; best of all is the quickened instinct of a soul that has made the Saviour's golden rule its own: "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

A word as to the public administration of baptism. Many details of this will be determined by the previous custom of the church; but if the pastor perceives any matter which displeases his taste or even shocks his sense of good order and propriety, he should take the very earliest opportunity of reforming, amending, or correcting, as the point in question may require. He should, in any case, insist upon quiet decency alike in the vestries, the baptistery, the galleries, and the aisles; he should acquaint the candidates beforehand with all that they have to do, and to suffer to be done; showing them the way to hold their hands, and reminding them to keep their mouth and eyes shut in the moment of immersion. He should see that an ample and thick cloak is provided to throw over the female candidates as they come up out of the

water; and that some one stands by with a soft towel or with the candidate's own pocket handkerchief ready to hand him or her at the same moment of emergence, when nostrils and eyes will be full of water. Of course, some one else ought to think of all these things; but, even if his forethought has been anticipated by others, the minister will do well to make sure that these little but important provisions have been duly made. Especially should he put his own wife or some discreet deaconess in charge of all the arrangements in the vestry reserved for female candidates; and it is impossible to be too scrupulous in precautions, that everything both within and without that room shall be done in modest, honest guise, such as becometh saints.

I have in another place expressed my opinion as to the style of sermon and the kind of text most likely to be useful at a baptismal service, and I will only repeat the salient point of that opinion, viz. that spiritual edification of the baptized is more to be aimed at than vindication of our Baptist principles or confutation of Pædobaptist heresies.

My last word concerns the reception of new members at the Lord's table, where it is generally and ought invariably to be the rule, that the minister in the presence of the church gives the right hand of fellowship to each person who has been added to the roll. There are few seasons—few of his official tasks—which are happier to a genuine pastor than this of which I speak; it is at such a moment that he realises, in all its overpowering yet blissful solemnity, "what is the hope of his calling;" and in thus bringing home his sheaves, he both receives wages for past toils, and scatters wonderfully fruitful seed for future harvests. The late Sir Charles Reed was one of many hundreds of whom I have read or heard, who traced their conversion to the impressions sent in through ear and eye from the chastened circumstances of such a service. Thus does his biographer, whom you have seen here, describe a scene exactly similar to one that I can recall in the sanctuary which I attended as a boy.

"The body of the church was completely filled with the communicants, numbering nearly a thousand; while the spectators, hardly less numerous, crowded the galleries. In

the midst stood the venerable minister, calm in manner, though often deeply moved, and swaying the whole congregation at will by his authoritative and impassioned appeals. More people, he used to say, were brought to Christian resolve through that service than by any other agency of the Church; and many are still living who can testify to the effect produced, both on the timid and the indifferent, by witnessing that great company of crowded believers, and listening to the soul-stirring words of their leader."[1]

On such occasions, therefore, as these, put all your heart into the welcome which you give to the men and the women who have come to the Lord's table for the first time in their lives. Address each one of them by name, and as you receive him, give him a text from God's word which he may ever afterwards connect in thought with this day of his soul's espousal to Christ. And do not forget the friends and companions who may be in the gallery as spectators of the ordinance. Some of them will be inquirers already, all of them may, by God's blessing upon this very service, become not only inquirers, but converts in whom your acceptance in the calling of a spiritual husbandman shall be crowned afresh, and perpetuated as a blessing that ever renews itself. For, "behold, days are coming, saith the Lord, when the ploughman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes the sower of the seed" (Amos ix. 13).

I subjoin the LIST OF BOOKS of which I spoke:—

I. *Those suitable for lending to persons under religious anxiety and concern.*—J. A. James' *Anxious Inquirer,* Newman Hall's *Come to Jesus,* Bonar's *God's Way of Peace,* Jackson's *Jesus Only,* Boyd's *Way of Life,* Tuck's *At the Wicket Gate.*

II. *Books suitable for persons about to become candidates for church fellowship.*—Dr. Clemance's (set of three) *Decide for Christ, Confess Christ, Joining the Church* (but these can only be given with discrimination, owing to the strong Pædobaptist bias with which they are written). *Books on baptism*—such as

[1] *Memoirs of Sir C. Reed,* pp. 24, 25.

Stalker's *Kind Questions*, Pengilly's *Scripture Guide*, Duncan's *Baptism and the Baptists*, and specially *Theodosia Ernest*.

III. *Books on Church membership and Nonconformist principles.* — C. Williams' *Principles and Practice of the Baptists*, Johnson's *Our Principles* (which, however, is spoiled by its Pædobaptism), James' *Church Members' Guide*.

IV. *Books for young Christians, specially suitable as presents in memory of baptism.*—James' *Christian Progress*, Newman Hall's *Follow Jesus*, Bonar's *God's Way of Holiness*, Mylne's *Reposing in Jesus*, Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* and *Holy War* (neither of which is half so well known now as it used to be thirty years ago); Culross's, Stanford's, Landel's, etc., well-known little books on devotional and experimental subjects; and very many treatises, old and new, published by the Religious Tract Society.

CHAPTER V.

THE PASTOR'S CARE OF THE YOUNG.

I NEED scarcely remind you, in entering upon my fifth topic of conference, how special and how tender is the association which connects it with the pastoral work of Christ Himself—that is, with the ideal pattern which one of us sets before him when he contemplates his charge as a "shepherd and bishop of souls." "The Good Shepherd," "that Great Shepherd of the sheep," delighted when He was upon the earth to fulfil the prophetic description which had gone beforehand concerning Him—"*He shall gather the lambs with His arm, and shall carry them in His bosom.*" And when He gave His parting charge to Simon Peter, as the representative of all those faithful disciples who should carry on to the end of time the work which He Himself had begun both to do and to teach, His first injunction, as every reader of John's Gospel remembers, was this: *Feed* MY LAMBS. We cannot misinterpret that word as referring to the theme of this morning's consideration, viz. *The Christian pastor's care for the young people of his flock*, the children in the families of his congregation and in the Sunday school, his catechumens, and the more youthful members in the church.

Now my own labour in setting before you fitly this important department of theology has been somewhat lightened by the recent and opportune publication of a little manual

specifically addressed to the very subject. The title of the book is *Christian Ministry to the Young*, and the contents of the work are neither more nor less than a series of lectures delivered in Regent's Park College by the late President of this College, Dr. Green, in accordance with the terms of a bequest by a deceased member of our own body, the late Mr. Errington Ridley, of Hexham—a devoted Sunday-school worker, who thus endeavoured after his decease to make young ministers mindful of what he rightly deemed an essential, but too often neglected, responsibility of their service in the Church. Dr. Green is an acknowledged master in the science and art which he has expounded in this little book, and it will save me much independent toil if I refer you to his pages for most of the details which are professedly treated therein. I mean to summarise a few of the most important of his points; but my quotations will give but a very inadequate idea of the practical worth of the treatise as a whole. No small part of its value consists just in the copious examples and illustrations of principle and precept which could not possibly be indicated here.

There are, however, a few matters which Dr. Green passes over in silence, but which seem to me very proper to mention in connection with this general subject of a pastorate towards the young. One of these is *the great importance of the pastor's cultivating close, affectionate, and confidential relations with those families where children are growing up.* It is in such families that he will find one of the most fruitful fields of spiritual result from his ministry. If he stays long enough in his charge he ought to have the joy of baptizing every one of the youths and the maidens for whom God's Providence has prepared the fostering shelter of these Christian homes; and it is from these descendants of the ancestral supporters and ornaments of God's house that he, as a wise master-builder, may hope to fashion new pillars of the sanctuary, so that "honour and majesty" may ever be before his Lord, "strength and beauty" continually "in His sanctuary" (Ps. xcvi. 6). But these reasonable expectations cannot possibly be realised unless from the very earliest opportunity the pastor has striven successfully to win the love and the sympathetic trust of the

children in whose conversion and spiritual maturity his own ministry is thus to be rewarded. If from the cradle and the nursery the young people learn to think of the pastor as their friend, their confidant in all the innocent concerns of childhood and youth, they will naturally go to him with the first confessions of their religious feelings, and will yield themselves up without reserve to the gentle influences by which he will seek, in due time, to win their hearts to One greater than himself. I can assure you from my own recollections as a child, and from my own very happy experiences as a pastor, that even in families where the father and mother are most genuinely pious,—yes, and wise and loving as well as godly,—even in such households the Christian minister who knows his calling will often gather the first-fruits of praise and confession which spring up in these sacred seed-plots of parental prayer, fidelity, and teaching. When the young hearts of the children begin to swell with a shamefast sense of sin, or a yearning after spiritual comfort; when the strange new flutterings of religious life within their bosoms make them afraid and astonished even more than glad, in all likelihood they will rather come to the minister, if they know him to be their friend, and make him rather even than their mother the partaker of their childish hopes and pains, their fears and longings. They will tell him things which they would shrink from telling to the kindest parent, and will suffer his breath, his smile, to open the lovely buds of early piety in their souls, which might long have remained fast closed and hidden beneath the most genial influences of the holiest home. Nor will a truly Christian parent feel any grudging or envious pang in discovering that the pastor has gained a place in the growing child's religious surroundings, which is more intimate and more influential than that which the father or the mother holds. In the kingdom of Christ there is no room for selfish jealousy among those who together are sharing the joy of their Lord in saving of souls whom they love most fondly. "Both he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together, for each receiveth wages and gathereth fruit unto life eternal" (John iv. 36). The bond of affection will only be drawn more closely between the happy minister and the happy

parents to whom God has given these children, a spiritual seed, pledges of their common love and zeal towards Christ, subjects of their mutual hope and joy and crown of rejoicing in the presence of the Lord Jesus Christ at His coming.

Therefore I counsel you to ingratiate yourselves in every innocent and worthy way with the children of every age whom you find in the homes to which your pastoral office gives you a welcome access. You can hardly begin too soon to lay siege to the heart of the very youngest of these little ones. You ought to have a smile for the baby in arms, that it may associate your face from the very first with pleasant suggestions and hopes. And for children who can talk and communicate their simple thoughts and desires, you should lay yourself out, with no little pains, to please them for their good, to edification. You will lose no dignity by stooping to the level of the things which have most interest to them; indeed, for a Christian teacher it is ever profitable to descend to the childlike mood, and to look through the eyes of the little ones, both at what pertains to this world and at the heavenly secrets which God reveals to babes. Nor is there any surer way for a preacher to keep his own heart pure and his spirit fresh, amid the withering influences of the study and the street, than to go down often into the sweet simplicities and natural unquestioning beliefs which will be reflected on him by the little children whom he loves. If you have no natural desire to prove all this for yourself—no instinctive sympathy with children—you *ought* to have. You would perform your ministry better if this manifest gap in your nature were filled up, and the sooner you try to make friends with the juvenile members of your flock the richer and speedier will be your tokens of acceptance and of usefulness amongst the seniors and adults. And if you are naturally fond of children, do not fear to give the rein to each amicable impulse which their presence will inspire. Show, without either affectation or false shame, the interest which it may cost you no trouble to feel in their pets, their sports, their books, their dawning enthusiasm for the wonders of the universe, and the deeds and the hopes of mankind. If you have any manual skill in the arts and industries, which are charming to many boys

and girls, do not disdain to put this at the service of your young friends. Draw pictures for them, cut out paper or cards, put together cunning artifices of wood or metal, or any new material that is docile to your fingers: you will in this way enjoy a sweet and pure recreation for your own mind and heart; and you will gain the admiring affection of the children even more than you will give them a present delight and joy. But beware of attempting to do anything in this line and way that you cannot do reasonably well; for a grown up man whom a child perceives to bungle egregiously in the work wherein he has professed to be proficient, forfeits irretrievably the confidence of that child, not only in the trivial realm of toys and amateur mechanics, but in the sphere of his own most serious matters of religious doctrine and authority.

It is a very useful practice for a minister who has succeeded in making the children of his more influential members his real and loving friends, to *begin* and to *keep up a correspondence with these boys and girls*, if, by and by, they go away from the parental roof to a boarding-school or on a visit. In such a correspondence you can often introduce religious topics more directly and more appropriately than you could in conversation to which other persons will probably be listening. And I may here say, that a letter is always a ready expedient for religious appeal to any one—young or old—in the flock whom the pastor has tried to accost by word of mouth, but has been baulked in his purpose, as so often happens, through the incongruities of time or company or circumstances. I could tell you of many happy results that have followed a faithful pastoral letter, fitly sent on the wings of prayer. The recurrence of a birthday, or any other natural occasion of congratulation or condolence, will give you fair opportunity for such a missive; and for some shy souls a written word will be easier to send or to receive than the same word spoken would be. Still, whether you mean to use the pen or the living voice for your special religious appeals to your young friends, never miss an opportunity of engaging their confidence and love in a general and human way. Seek them out at their parents' homes, and have them now and then at your own home; stop to speak to them if

you meet them in your walks; and when they are old enough, make them companions of your walks and your secular recreations, and you will hardly fail to find them also your fellow-travellers in the spiritual pilgrimage: going with you from strength to strength, till every one in Zion appeareth before God.

Before I leave this branch of my subject, let me speak a word in unreserved commendation of a practice which, to some old-fashioned Baptists seems very suspicious, and even reprehensible, because of its supposed resemblance to the heretical rite of Infant Baptism, I mean the holding of a *dedication service in the house of Christian parents to whom a child has been lately born*, and who desire to put on record their purpose to devote and to train up that child for the kingdom and the glory of God. I have had indubitable proof of the blessings which may accompany such a service; and I cannot see that there is anything in its idea that is inconsistent with our fundamental principles. I am speaking, mind, of dedications that are made in the home, not of any service in the church. A public bringing of an infant to God in the sanctuary might be a dangerous and a misleading form of worship, and on no account would I ever sanction such a custom. For the Church of the New Covenant is not empowered to take cognisance of the vows of parents in regard to their children. But the pastor is not only the public officer of the church, but he is also the private and personal friend of each man and each woman in that church; and it is in this second capacity that he may be most fitly called in to rejoice with the parents, and to pray with them over the infant whom God has committed to his care no less than to theirs. Therefore, I have no hesitation in saying, Go willingly and without misgiving, if any grateful father, any joyful mother of children, bids you to the domestic circle in which an altar of dedication is to be set up. Associate yourself in all sympathy with their lawful purpose in this service, and take care that their conscience and understanding are fully enlightened as to what this lawful purpose is. Let there be no room for superstition to creep in to their conceptions of the value of this service; but strive that their remembrance

of your prayer, and of the Scriptures which you read, shall make their own parental duty more vivid and sacred than ever to their souls. If you are skilful in the word of God, and apt to teach, as you ought to be, your principles as Baptists may even be enforced more powerfully by the silent impressions of such a service than they could be by any laboured refutation of dogmas, to which you have no need to allude. A Pædobaptist who may chance to be present at your service ought to be, and may be, instructed concerning his error far more convincingly by his inevitable reflections upon what you say, and what you omit to do, than by any references—which would be out of place—to the things which he might have expected to see and to hear in this act of worship.

I come now to the *more beaten track of pastoral work in regard to the young*, in which I can put myself and you under the guidance of one whose praise as an "Instructor of Babes" has long been in all our Churches, and in other Churches beside those belonging to the Baptist body. Dr. Green begins his first Lecture—very wisely—by setting forth the doctrinal ground on which the Christian pastor must build all his plans and all his expectations in regard to the fruits of his ministry among the young. "The child," he says, "needs the gospel: needs conversion. For dealing with the youthful mind aright, we must apprehend its true relations to God. Now we believe in human depravity. In the mind of a child there is no natural religiousness. The love of God will never be wrought into his nature as the product of any culture of his faculties, or direction of his habits, or training of his affections. . . . This is the conviction of us all, with regard to both old and young; and herein lies the necessity of the gospel." [1]

To this end the instructions given by a wise pastor to the children under his care will be wisely discriminated from those which would be suitable for older persons, who have had more knowledge of good and of evil. "These instructions," says Dr. Green, "will be such as are calculated to train in the Divine life. The child will be encouraged to pray, not told

[1] *Christian Ministry to the Young* (R. T. S.), pp. 13, 14.

that he must be converted before his prayer can be acceptable to God. Instead of the well-meaning earnestness with which bewildered young souls are often urged to 'give their hearts to God,' not well understanding what this may mean, the glad tidings will be constantly told that God in Christ is reconciled, and gives us His help to be good and pure. . . . The word will be, not, 'Ask yourselves whether you are truly obedient,' but, 'Obey;' not, 'Am I a child of God or not?' but, 'Serve Him as a child and do His will.' A natural and healthy childhood does not stop to analyse its own emotions. . . . A self-conscious childhood is both unnatural and melancholy. The child has been distracted from the simple endeavour to serve God by restless thoughts and inquiries about his own self. . . . And so, while there is an important meaning in the command, 'Examine your own selves,' there is another injunction, far more appropriate to Christian childhood: 'Looking unto Jesus, the Author and Finisher of your faith.'" [1]

I need hardly point out to you how different the spirit of these remarks is from that which has given birth to some notorious religious movements of modern days amongst children, I refer specially to those conducted by Messrs. Spiers and Bishop, and to those in connection with the Salvation Army. I thoroughly agree with Dr. Green in the judgment, that "there is something almost appalling" in the obtrusiveness and artificiality which have characterised these "juvenile revivals"; and in saying of the children's paper, issued by the Salvation Army, that it is "an illustration of almost everything which children's piety and children's literature ought not to be."

Dr. Green devotes his second chapter to the topic of "Children in the Congregation"; and he gives good reasons for holding fast by the old-fashioned habit of encouraging, or even requiring, their attendance at the ordinary public worship of the sanctuary, in the family pew with their elders, or in the Sunday-school seats with their teachers. He much prefers this plan to any system of "separate services" for children;

[1] *Christian Ministry to the Young* (R.T.S.), pp. 22, 23, 25.

and my opinion is altogether his. Of course, the service must be made as attractive and as suitable as possible to the younger members of the congregation; but the adults will be gainers and not losers by the minister's studious remembrance of the children in his hymns and prayers and sermon. Dr. Green discusses at length some special methods of winning the interest of children in these ordinary services of the sanctuary; such as the introduction of a children's hymn; the delivery of a children's "sermonette," either before the sermon or in the middle of the sermon; or the dedication of some particular exposition, illustration, or appeal in the course of the sermon to the juvenile part of the audience.

Three of Dr. Green's chapters (that is, a full half of his book) treat the important and interesting subject of special services for children, and the style of preaching suited for such occasions. It is impossible to do justice to what he has written by any abridgment or summary. I advise you to read the whole for yourselves; and I think that the result will be to encourage the most diffident amongst you, and the one who has hitherto believed himself least fit to address children, to urge and encourage him to try his hand in the performance of this manifest part of his pastoral duty.

My own custom was to set apart a Sunday afternoon once in every three months for a children's service, which lasted exactly one hour. Many grown up persons attended; indeed, the service was very popular with the poor and the aged, with mothers and with Sunday-school teachers; and a few working men, who did not usually frequent the chapel, were very regular in their attendance on these occasions. I used to begin with a hymn and the Lord's Prayer, which the children recited after me. A short and carefully chosen passage of Scripture was read, and, if needful, expounded, with frequent question and answer between the pulpit and the pew. "The long prayer" was always very short, very simple, and very direct in its petitions; and the children were required to follow every word of it audibly, in a standing posture. The sermon often occupied half an hour, but I never heard of its being counted tedious; if it seemed to me to be becoming so, I broke it off, had a hymn sung,

and then resumed,—a device which rarely, if ever, failed to answer its purpose. I cannot pretend that these extra services were not rather exhausting, but they well repaid all the time and the strength which inclination quite as much as a sense of duty bade me bestow upon them, and many young people were brought to religious decision through the impressions which they received on the quarterly children's Sunday afternoon.

As I am not withholding from you any of my own pastoral experiences, I may dwell for a moment upon another special method which I found of inestimable value for training young people in religious knowledge and life, and for keeping the list of inquirers and candidates for baptism continually full. This was a fortnightly meeting, which, in reality, was a "catechumen class," though, of course, it was not known by that name, but was simply called "the young Christian's meeting"; "the instruction class," or "Mr. Rooke's Tuesday evening class." The average attendance was forty; the youths and boys being seated on one side, girls on the other side of our schoolroom, with an aisle between. The ages ranged from ten years or even younger to twenty-five; and young church members, inquirers, and boys and girls who were neither, sat indiscriminately together. No one assisted me. I played the harmonium myself, or used the services of a lad who was familiar with the instrument; and for one hour I discoursed in an easy conversational way on some matter of doctrine, of experience, or of practice, with a running appeal to and explanation of the Bible. For one condition of admission to this meeting was, that the young person should bring a Bible, and should be ready to read any verse in it aloud on being called upon by me. At the close of the meeting, I used to announce a question, to which written answers might be brought a fortnight later; and a part of each meeting was generally devoted to comments upon the papers which had thus been sent in. I also encouraged the young people to hand in to me written questions of their own, which I answered either privately or publicly at the next meeting; but in the latter case I never mentioned the name of the person who had made the inquiry. The meeting was

both opened and closed with singing and prayer. The girls were sent away first; and before the boys followed them, another verse was sung, or some special word appropriate to boys only was spoken, so that the girls had ample opportunity to get far away from the schoolroom by the time that the rougher sex was dismissed.

In these "instruction classes" I paid attention to Nonconformist and Protestant principles as well as to Christian doctrine and practice; one course was devoted to "ecclesiastical polity" and to "sketches of Church history," adapted, of course, to juvenile comprehension. Even children thus became familiar with the names of martyrs, reformers, pilgrim fathers, and Baptist worthies; but my chief aim was to nourish up these young minds in sound doctrine and the word of life, and I mentally called the staple matter of my discourse, "Theology made easy for youthful understandings." You may like to know something more about this, so I will give you the titles of my subjects during three sessions, each of which extended from August to the April following.

The course in 1870–1 was as follows:—Regeneration, Conversion, Faith, The Tests of Faith, The Fruits of Faith, Love, Obedience, Peace, The Witness of the Spirit, Election, Effectual Calling, Salvation. The course in 1873–4 was on another line.—A Present Saviour, A Loving Father, A Helping Spirit, The Holy Trinity, God's Law, Sin, Spiritual Death, God's Remedy for Sin. The course in 1874–5.—Repentance, Faith, Unbelief, Procrastination, Decision, Counting the Cost, Self-Surrender, Bearing the Cross, Prayer, Temptation, Sanctification.

Dr. Green has a very good chapter on Catechetical and Bible-class instruction, on The Minister in the Sunday School, and on The Teachers' Preparation Class. I agree most heartily with nearly all he says, and also bear witness to the importance of your mastering the principles and pondering the precepts with which that chapter—the last in his book—is filled. I only regret that our time forbids me alike to quote from him and to supplement his advice and experience by my own. I could also have discoursed on the great advan-

tage which a pastor will find from "the Band of Hope" or some kindred teetotal organisation as a medium for salutary religious influence upon the young of his flock. And I should like to call your attention to a much more recent type of organisation which is intended to cope with the terrible "social evil" of sexual impurity and unchastity, much as teetotal societies cope with intemperance. The names which are given to these new societies are "The White Cross Army," "The Social Purity Alliance," "The Social Purity League." The Bishop of Durham, Miss Ellice Hopkins, and other admirable Christian workers are the leaders of this movement, which, of course, enrols only youths above a certain age.

In such a movement as this, and in every other effort by which a Christian pastor can aid young women and young men to "flee youthful lusts," and to keep themselves as "vessels unto honour, meet for the Master's use," I would have you engage, wisely, conscientiously, and prayerfully, after you have satisfied yourself, in God's sight, that your ministry will really be helped and not hindered thereby, as it might be in some exceptional cases. But I would finish with a quaint and homely word of warning, which a good old minister addressed to me when I went fresh from college to my pastorate, which I had the grace to take as it was meant, and which I now pass on to you, endorsed by my own emphatic approval—"Don't light up all the pound of candles at once."

CHAPTER VI.

PASTORAL VISITATION. CONCLUSION.

THERE is a decided ambiguity about the phrase "pastoral visitation," and the popular apprehension as to what that phrase imports is even more indefinite and vague than the ambiguity itself would warrant. The words thus connected as adjective and noun may mean visitation of his parishioners by a pastor in the strict discharge of his pastoral functions, *i.e.* for the sake of spiritual service and supervision; or the same words may be understood as meaning the customary call from house to house "in a friendly way," as the saying is, which one who is a pastor may pay to the members of his flock, not in his official character, but as any neighbour might spend his leisure time in benevolent inquiries after the health and families, the business and general welfare of those with whom he is acquainted.

Now this last, or something like it, is what the great majority of thoughtless and ignorant people understand and intend when they talk about "pastoral visitation." They have a vague idea that it is proper for their minister to go about in his parish either in a desultory or a systematic way, making himself agreeable, talking about anything and everything, "dropping in" to tea or to supper, and interesting himself generally in all the secular affairs that may be occupying the thoughts of the folk whom he thus takes "as

he finds them," and whom he is supposed to leave all the better for their having found in him a sympathetic listener, a correct remembrancer of genealogies and ages, a merry joker, a discreet retailer of gossip, a lively conversationalist, or a handy assistant in the amusements of the circle, as the particular circumstances of each household may require. Of such spurious "pastoral visitation" I have nothing to say, except that the young minister who lowers his own ideal to the level of that wretched parody and caricature, prepares for himself a broad and slippery way of descent into the most fatal depth of pastoral inefficiency. Success in the pulpit is impossible for the man who fritters away his time and his mind in these idle gaddings from house to house; and though at first he may gain a certain kind of popularity among the frivolous, to whose frivolity he panders, in the end his reputation as a "spiritual guide," a "man of God," a "shepherd and bishop of souls," will be ruined even with these. The very people who have courted his company most, when trifles were to occupy their tongues or their hands, will turn to other quarters when real pastoral counsel and help are needed. I have many such instances now in my mind; and were I to tell you some of the unkind and bitter, yet thoroughly deserved things which I have heard said of these pastors who are everlastingly visiting, yet only, as it would seem, to eat and drink, to laugh and to chatter with their people, you would feel that a young minister's worst enemies are those who advise him to be more in his people's houses than in his study, and to go to those houses, not as a parson or as a pastor, but as any other man.

But if I utterly repudiate the notion that idle and gossiping familiarity with one's people at their own homes has any claim to be thought of as "pastoral visitation," I do not wish to restrict that phrase to a mere stiff, perfunctory discharge of ministerial duties. In most of the manuals of Pastoral Theology which I have recommended to you, the pattern and model which is set forth in this department of your work is one which seems to me to defeat its own end; for the social circumstances of our day and generation have quite outgrown it. It might be very good for a former age,—the age, for

disagreeable revelations in this behalf. You will often come home humbled, vexed, even wounded and angry because of the unaccountable ways in which you will have found yourself misconceived, misunderstood, misliked in the very things, it may be, wherein you had intended to produce effects the exact opposite of those which somehow have resulted from your actions and your speech. Some of the men whom you visit, and still more of the women, will have sharp tongues, which they will delight to use in criticising the young pastor's sayings in the pulpit and doings in the church, and you will leave their door a sadder man, and, let us hope, a wiser one too. For the truest wisdom consists in the meekness which consents both to learn wherein one has failed, and to use the fitting means for filling up the felt deficiency. And the roughest critic who has seen your self-restraint and self-improvement under treatment which he no doubt felt at the time to be a little lacking in kindness and respect, will probably admire and love you in the end with a warmth proportioned to his former severity. For such natures are subject to strong reactions: their plainness of speech is often the child of their honest fidelity and love of the cause; they are as anxious to heal as they were ready to wound, and the pastor who thus wins them as his generous friends, will be shielded by them all unknown to himself from many an envious detractor and many a bitter foe.

I may now leave the demonstration that pastoral visitation is not only a useful and remunerative, but also a necessary and obligatory part of the work to which you will shortly be called, and I will address myself to a few other points that bear upon the practical performance of this duty.

Some of you may wish to ask, What is the proper amount of time to be given to this task? To which I would answer, as large a proportion of the afternoons and evenings of the six week days as can be spared with due regard to the claims of health, of the chapel services, and of the minister's own home circle. My own practice was to devote five afternoons in the week, from two o'clock to five, *i.e.* three hours to visiting, in addition to which I used to snatch an occasional hour in the evening for the visitation of certain

artisans or business people whose employment made it impossible to see them except after five o'clock. Of course, a considerable expenditure of forethought will be necessary in arranging one's rounds, if these fifteen hours a week are to be applied to the greatest possible advantage. You must select for each day a limited district, so as not to waste time needlessly in covering long distances between house and house; and you must make out a list of the people you mean to see, and not allow yourself to be diverted from your plan except for causes which promise to yield better results than you would secure by a rigid adherence to the programme. You must calculate the time which it will be inconvenient to exceed in each proposed visit, and when that time has expired you must get up and go on your further way, unless, indeed, you feel an imperative call to give up your former end for the sake of one more important which is within your reach if you lengthen out the present visit.

Your next inquiry will probably concern the manner in which these pastoral visits may be most wisely and most profitably conducted; but no general or comprehensive answer can be given to a question so wide. Much, indeed, nearly everything, must be left to one's native good sense, and the inspiration of a sympathetic and sincere heart for the rest; my counsels will be best distributed separately over distinct summaries of remark concerning each of the seven classes which I enumerated just now as demanding systematic and conscientious visitation by every pastor, or rather concerning six of these classes, for I spoke sufficiently last week about the seventh, viz. the families in which children and young persons are growing up, and where, if anywhere, the minister ought to become a familiar and a frequent visitor, for the sake of those children, and for the sake of his Master's cause.

The class of persons that has the first claim upon the pastor's most assiduous visitation is that of the sick and of those who are drawing near to their end, whether these are believers fully prepared to die, or souls that are void of the comfort and strength which intelligent Christian assurance gives. A servant of Christ ought to hold himself at the disposal of any dying man or woman, even an absolute stranger, who sends

preacher's opportunities for study; but if that false idea be set aside, it may be confidently affirmed that the notion I am criticising is a flagrant reversal of the truth. I am not afraid to say that no settled minister can preach to any good practical purpose unless he conscientiously visits at least seven classes of the flock that is put beneath his care—(1) the sick and dying; (2) the bereaved and persons stricken with any recent sorrow; (3) the bedridden and aged; (4) the poor; (5) the persons whose attendance at the chapel is fitful and lax; (6) the young members whose daily or secular life isolates them from healthy religious influences; (7) the families in which children are growing up. For the practical and experimental topics of his preaching cannot possibly be handled aright except through the positive knowledge, which will never come to him unsought, which must be acquired (like every other positive science) from personal observation within those seven circles which I have enumerated, and nowhere else, and which also requires to be continually corrected, enlarged, and verified afresh by renewal of the former observations; for the phenomena in this field are always changing, and no man can preach powerfully or convincingly to-day from the results of his pastoral visitations ten years ago, any more than he can from the results of reading in the same bygone period, unfreshened by some more recent stream from the current of living human thought. Is it not plain that a minister who shuts himself up all week in his study, and lives there among his books, must fail to know, and, therefore, to touch in his weekly discourses, the peculiar moral, emotional, and mental needs of the great majority of his hearers. As J. A. James truly says:[1] "He may read much, and, as the result, may preach well-composed, sound, and beautiful sermons; but as for any skill or taste in dealing with wounded consciences, worried minds, distressed and anxious hearts, he is as destitute of this as if it were no part of his duty. He resembles a lecturer on medicine rather than a practitioner, or he is like a physician who should assemble all his patients able to attend in the same room, and

[1] *Earnest Ministry*, p. 169.

then give general directions founded on the types of disease which his text-books describe, but who thinks it superfluous to inquire into their several ailments, to visit them at their own abodes, or to adapt his prelections to their individual and specific cases." You can guess how shortlived would be the popularity of such a professor of the healing art, and you can, with equal facility, see how the doctor who diligently visits all the sick within his district who cannot or who will not visit him at his consulting rooms, is bound to amass an enormous fund of invaluable knowledge for his public lectures on health and disease and remedial medicine. Such a physician will have his consulting rooms even fuller than his visiting list. He will never seem to be living in a balloon, as not a few modern preachers most certainly are living, and although their printed sermons may be extravagantly praised by their brethren in aerial habitation, you would find their chapels, as a rule, either half-empty or filled by a "peculiar people" whose thoughts about sin and sorrow and duty and need are not the thoughts of the vast majority of men; but if you ever enter a church and find it crowded with the persons of all those varied classes to whom Christ has commanded you to carry the good tidings of His kingdom, you will learn, on inquiry, that the preacher to this throng has learned his art abroad, in face to face converse with souls like to those who are now drinking in the water of life from his words; in short, that a house-going minister has made this church-going people.

I should like to call your attention to a very wholesome, though perhaps to some of you a somewhat unpalatable truth, viz. that a young preacher, fresh from college, is sure to have faults and deficiencies in his style of preaching which will sorely detract from his general usefulness, and that the only way in which he is likely to discover this fact, and to learn what the particular faults and deficiencies are, is by going freely amongst his people, and encouraging them to cast back upon him the reflection of his thoughts and his language from the strangely various angles at which these rays have struck the mirror of their minds. I will not conceal from you that pastoral visitation will certainly make you acquainted with some very

disagreeable revelations in this behalf. You will often come home humbled, vexed, even wounded and angry because of the unaccountable ways in which you will have found yourself misconceived, misunderstood, misliked in the very things, it may be, wherein you had intended to produce effects the exact opposite of those which somehow have resulted from your actions and your speech. Some of the men whom you visit, and still more of the women, will have sharp tongues, which they will delight to use in criticising the young pastor's sayings in the pulpit and doings in the church, and you will leave their door a sadder man, and, let us hope, a wiser one too. For the truest wisdom consists in the meekness which consents both to learn wherein one has failed, and to use the fitting means for filling up the felt deficiency. And the roughest critic who has seen your self-restraint and self-improvement under treatment which he no doubt felt at the time to be a little lacking in kindness and respect, will probably admire and love you in the end with a warmth proportioned to his former severity. For such natures are subject to strong reactions: their plainness of speech is often the child of their honest fidelity and love of the cause; they are as anxious to heal as they were ready to wound, and the pastor who thus wins them as his generous friends, will be shielded by them all unknown to himself from many an envious detractor and many a bitter foe.

I may now leave the demonstration that pastoral visitation is not only a useful and remunerative, but also a necessary and obligatory part of the work to which you will shortly be called, and I will address myself to a few other points that bear upon the practical performance of this duty.

Some of you may wish to ask, What is the proper amount of time to be given to this task? To which I would answer, as large a proportion of the afternoons and evenings of the six week days as can be spared with due regard to the claims of health, of the chapel services, and of the minister's own home circle. My own practice was to devote five afternoons in the week, from two o'clock to five, *i.e.* three hours to visiting, in addition to which I used to snatch an occasional hour in the evening for the visitation of certain

artisans or business people whose employment made it impossible to see them except after five o'clock. Of course, a considerable expenditure of forethought will be necessary in arranging one's rounds, if these fifteen hours a week are to be applied to the greatest possible advantage. You must select for each day a limited district, so as not to waste time needlessly in covering long distances between house and house; and you must make out a list of the people you mean to see, and not allow yourself to be diverted from your plan except for causes which promise to yield better results than you would secure by a rigid adherence to the programme. You must calculate the time which it will be inconvenient to exceed in each proposed visit, and when that time has expired you must get up and go on your further way, unless, indeed, you feel an imperative call to give up your former end for the sake of one more important which is within your reach if you lengthen out the present visit.

Your next inquiry will probably concern the manner in which these pastoral visits may be most wisely and most profitably conducted; but no general or comprehensive answer can be given to a question so wide. Much, indeed, nearly everything, must be left to one's native good sense, and the inspiration of a sympathetic and sincere heart for the rest; my counsels will be best distributed separately over distinct summaries of remark concerning each of the seven classes which I enumerated just now as demanding systematic and conscientious visitation by every pastor, or rather concerning six of these classes, for I spoke sufficiently last week about the seventh, viz. the families in which children and young persons are growing up, and where, if anywhere, the minister ought to become a familiar and a frequent visitor, for the sake of those children, and for the sake of his Master's cause.

The class of persons that has the first claim upon the pastor's most assiduous visitation is that of the sick and of those who are drawing near to their end, whether these are believers fully prepared to die, or souls that are void of the comfort and strength which intelligent Christian assurance gives. A servant of Christ ought to hold himself at the disposal of any dying man or woman, even an absolute stranger, who sends

to ask his aid. At any hour he ought, without a murmur, to leave his rest, his recreation, his most important study, in response to such an appeal. I say this with deep feeling, for I had the lesson impressed upon me by a truly terrible experience of my first year of pastoral responsibility. A message was brought me about twelve o'clock one morning that a young man whose name I did not know was very ill, and wished particularly to see me. Who was he? Well, he was engaged to be married to a young woman in the congregation who was just then one of my inquirers. What was his illness? I asked, because I was in the most absorbing part of the composition of a sermon for next Sunday, and I felt that to break the train of thought would perhaps be ruinous to the artistic finish of this task. If the disease were not swiftly fatal, I might wait until the afternoon before visiting the patient. He was ill of jaundice, dangerously ill, and thought himself dying. No doubt, said I to myself; but jaundice is not a very rapid slayer of a strong young man, I can safely wait. By three o'clock I was with him. Alas! he had become delirious, and could neither speak nor hear a word of sense. "He was sensible an hour ago," said his sweetheart reproachfully; and you can guess how I felt. He never recovered his right reason. He died without any Christian minister's address or conversation, for he belonged to no special congregation in the town. This circumstance, and some other considerations (my inexperience no doubt amongst them), made his friends lenient in their judgment of my fault. I know that they heartily forgave me, but I never forgave myself.

Persons who are dangerously sick, or who are lingering near to death, may need to be visited every two or three days, in some very special cases daily. Do not begrudge this excessive draft upon your time and your feelings. What you impart, and what you also gain in spiritual things, will immensely outweigh this temporal price that is paid for the same. Your written preparation for the pulpit on the next Lord's day may suffer, but the preparation of your heart and the answer of your tongue will be all the more manifestly from the Lord, and the friends that you win for yourself in these darkened chambers of death, may be as many on earth as the

souls that you win for Christ in the unseen world. The true pastor is both made such and proved to be such, more emphatically in his death-bed experiences than in all that belongs to his calling besides. His own personal faith is confirmed most powerfully by what he sees and hears in the triumphant testing of the saints to whom he ministers; and whether the soul that he sees depart is surely saved or possibly lost, he returns from the house of death with his own soul purified and weaned from the world as it could be by no other discipline, preaching to himself a solemn sermon from this text: "Our citizenship is in heaven, from whence we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change the body of our humiliation, that it may be fashioned like to the body of His glory, according to the working whereby He is able even to subdue all things unto Himself."

Christians who are sick will not need, nor will they expect, such frequent visitation as ought to be bestowed upon the unconverted who lie in danger of a double death. And the tone you will assume in dealing with these two cases respectively will be very different, as your own common sense will suggest it should be. The utmost faithfulness is permitted, nay, is required, in speaking to dying persons of whose salvation you are not assured; but faithfulness ought never to be disjoined from loving tenderness, such tenderness as you would wish to smooth your own pillow if it fell to your lot to die amongst strangers of another creed than yours. You should always ask a sick person whom you visit if you may pray by his bedside; and unless he objects, you should read a short portion of God's word, selected with care (before you come into his room, if possible), with special reference to his spiritual state. For this purpose you should always have with you a pocket Bible of your own, or that useful little volume for sick visitors, *Illustrative Scripture Readings* (Macintosh, 2s.)

A minister often finds himself in doubt as to his duty in regard to cases of infectious disease where his visits are requested. Now, first, let me say, that many diseases which are popularly regarded as "infectious" are not so at all; and that others which are really infectious, loose the main part of their danger to a brave and conscientious man who simply and

quietly does his manifest duty, trusting in God to preserve him. There is no danger in so-called "low fevers," typhoid, or even typhus, if you avoid taking the patient's breath. Cholera is absolutely harmless to one who does not drink fluid that is poisoned with its germs; the only diseases to be really dreaded are smallpox, scarlatina, and scarlet fever. In every case of these last, you are bound to take great precaution lest infection should be carried by you to your own or to other homes. When you have visited an infected room you should go nowhere else that afternoon; you should wear an overcoat even in summer, and keep it tightly buttoned all the time you are in the chamber or the house; if possible, you should swallow no saliva during your visit, and should wash out your mouth with water directly afterwards; and when you leave the house you should take a brisk walk into the country for an hour, letting the air play over your coat, your face, your hair, your ungloved hands, and getting up a slight perspiration, which you should take care not to check by any chill or draught after you get home. Take off your overcoat before you see your wife or children, your landlady or servant, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred no harm will follow to you or to any one else from your act of commonplace Christian heroism, for the feeblest child of faith ought to dare such deeds, and to feel that he has done his duty and nothing more.

Whenever death has visited the house of any one of your flock, the surviving inmates of that house have a special claim upon your pastoral visitation. You should go often to see the bereaved in the earlier months of their bereavement; you should lend them books—if you know any—that will say to them the things which you are almost afraid to say lest their wound should break out afresh beneath the touch wherewith you would cleanse and heal it. To visit the fatherless and the widow in their affliction is one of the pastor's most bounden duties, and in its wise discharge he will endear himself most tenderly to some whose love may be to him a wondrous help and consolation in some future day. If the family is poor, it may be the pastor's privilege to secure from the church fund, or from some generous friend, the money needed for the

funeral, and if he has become already the confidant of these sorrowing folk, he may ask them gently and considerately how the bereavement affects their temporal circumstances, whether a will has to be proved or letters of administration taken out, and so he may put himself in the way of rendering untold service to an inexperienced woman or helpless children, who else might be at the mercy of designing strangers or hard-hearted kinsfolk. If you stay long in a pastorate you will certainly be asked by one and another of your poorer parishioners to be the guardian of the children if the father is taken away by death. Sometimes a well-to-do hearer will earnestly pray you to be his executor or his trustee, and you ought not lightly or selfishly to refuse such a request. Prudence may oblige you to say no, but before you decline make sure that it is really a prudence that God's Spirit approves, and not a mere indolent reluctance to bear for another his burden, and so to fulfil the law of Christ.

I have mentioned funerals, and should like to say more about them and about funeral sermons, but can only advise that the utmost decorum and the sincerest sympathy be combined in the first, so far as you are concerned, and that the old-fashioned style of a funeral discourse be discouraged; but, whenever possible, a death in the congregation should be "improved" for the living, without the accompaniment of a biographical sketch or extravagant eulogy of the departed. Exceptions to this rule will suggest themselves; as when a leading deacon or pillar of the church is removed. But even in such cases the less of detailed personal reference to the dead you make, and the more of direct practical application to the living, the better, both on the score of taste and of spiritual wisdom.

In every list of church members there are pretty sure to be names of some aged and bedridden persons who can never, or very rarely, come out to the public means of grace. These afflicted souls the Christian pastor ought to visit with pleasure and with diligence; and his stated calls, which will be looked forward to with touching eagerness, will probably yield himself as much profit as he feels that he imparts. If these people are poor, as they often are, he should take them some

little dainty—from his own table, or from the table or garden of a richer friend; a flower, an orange, a few grapes, will be doubly sweet to simple and good-hearted souls, if they come from the minister's hands; and the Master will certainly say: "Inasmuch as ye did it to one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." In these visits you should always read and pray, rather more at length, too, than in other visits; and if you have lately come across a new hymn that is not in your chapel hymn-book, and that seems to you full of comfort or nourishment for such souls, you should put a copy of it into your pocket, and not refuse to leave it with your parishioner if, as is very likely, he or she begs it of you, when you have read it with something better than elocutionary art.

I grieve that I am compelled to hurry over my remaining classes, and the hints which pertain to each. The poor of your flock should be visited oftener, in proportion, than the rich; for reasons which it would take me too long to expound. But there are certain delicacies and unwritten conventions in regard to the cottage which, unless you observe, the very frequency of your visits to the poor may make you more enemies than the infrequency of your visits to the rich is ever likely to do. Poor people do not like to be visited when they are at their meals, nor on washing day; nor can they endure prying questions as to their domestic economies and private affairs, which savour of a patronising or pauperising spirit. Keep clear of this common mistake, and you will find that your poorer hearers will take a pride and a keen delight in being visited by you; and by and by they will, of their own accord, begin to tell you their worries and troubles, and to ask your advice and assistance even more freely, perhaps, than it will be wise for you to encourage them in doing. For let me give you two brief hints, which will apply to your relations, not only with the poor, but with all the social classes of your flock. First, *keep aloof from strifes and contentions between married people, brothers and sisters, parents and children, relatives generally, and business partners.* Never meddle gratuitously with any private quarrel, and be very chary of touching such a matter, even if you are asked

to do so; yet, if both the parties make you their confidant, and earnestly seek to engage your services as peacemaker, do what you can to secure the beatitude which is thus put by Providence within your reach. Secondly, *have nothing to do with securities, guarantees, pecuniary responsibilities,* which some unscrupulous members of your congregation may try to impose upon your excessive and foolish good nature. *Never lend a shilling unless you could afford to lose it outright* without crippling your own resources, or putting a creditor of your own to inconvenience. And, as a rule, decline firmly and systematically to give or to lend money to members of your congregation who may seek to sponge upon you. Yet, as there is no rule without an exception, when you have got to know your people thoroughly, it may be very useful and very wise for you to set apart a little fund—say £5 or £10 of your own or belonging to the church—as *a lending fund;* for making small loans, free of interest, to the deserving poor, who would else have to visit the pawnshop, under stress of some temporary money need. I had such a fund, nearly always out in sums of from 5s. to 40s., a maximum that I never allowed to be exceeded, and in ten years, out of a total turnover of more than £60, I only lost 15s. by the failure of one borrower to return his loan.

My fifth class of persons whom the pastor ought to make a point of visiting, includes all those who are fitful and lax in their attendance at the means of grace; church members who are regular at the ordinary services, but who stay away from the communion; and seat-holders whose places are often empty, or who are heard of as being frequently seen at other chapels or at the Established Church. Such persons should be courteously challenged as to the reason of their conduct: and whether the result be to disclose a fault in the preacher, or in some other person, or in themselves; whether that fault can be mended, or is the beginning of a hopeless breach, promptness and frankness in the pastor's dealing are on every ground better than delay and timidity and make-believe evasion of the truth, which the one party has the right to ask and the other party has an equal right to tell.

My last class of persons requiring careful visitation by the

pastor embraces all the members of the church and congregation, especially the young members who are isolated by their ordinary secular life from healthy religious influences; such as servants in ungodly households; shopmen and shopgirls whose employers make no religious profession, and young men who are away from home in lodgings, and are thown amongst irreligious companions. More than a little tact and common sense is needed in visiting such persons; but the cure of their souls cannot be rightly discharged without this special detail; and when such persons leave the neighbourhood, as they constantly do, to seek fresh or improved situations, you ought not to lose sight of them until you have handed them over safely to the care of some brother minister, and duly dismissed them from your church to his.

I have finished, though very imperfectly, the task which I set myself to do in these six conferences. I have tried to show you an ideal of the Christian pastor which is not beyond the fair realisation of any one of you. Let me ask you to resolve, with God's help, that you will indeed far surpass my sketch. Let me hear concerning each one of you in his future sphere, that men speak of him, not as a modern satirist describes the typical parson, "A black-coated gentleman, who talks in the pulpit," but as Luther has drawn the portrait for which he himself might worthily have sat: "There is no more precious treasure nor nobler thing upon earth, and in this life, than a true and faithful parson and preacher. The spiritual preacher increaseth the kingdom of God, filleth heaven with saints, plundereth hell, guardeth men against death, putteth a stop to sin, instructeth the world, consoleth every man according to his condition, preserveth peace and unity, traineth young people excellently, planteth all kinds of virtue in the nation; in short, he createth a new world, and buildeth a house that shall not pass away."[1]

Is there not even a better, a more classic likeness than I can hold up before you, and charge you to make your pastoral life resemble it, as face answereth face in a glass? "Then

[1] Quoted by Van Oosterzee, *Practical Theology* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1878), p. 17.

said the Interpreter to Christian, 'Come in, I will show thee that which will be profitable to thee.' So he commanded his man to light the candle, and bid Christian follow him; so he led him into a private room, and bid his man open a door, the which, when he had done, Christian saw the picture of a very grave person hung up against the wall. And this was the fashion of it: It had eyes lifted up to heaven; the best of books was in his hand; the law of truth was written upon his lips; the world was behind his back. It stood as if it pleaded with men; and A CROWN OF GOLD did hang over his head."

MORRISON AND GIBB, PRINTERS EDINBURGH.